#### December 10, 2021

#### **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Board Members

FROM: Millard L. House II, Ph.D. Superintendent of Schools

#### SUBJECT: ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM EVALUATION, PART B, 2019–2020

CONTACT: Allison Matney, Ed.D., 713-556-6700

Key findings include:

- Achieve 180 Program participation increased from 44 high-need schools with 36,886 students (2017–2018, Year 1) to 54 high-need schools with 45,691 students (2019–2020, Year 3), expanding by 10 schools (22.7%) and 8,805 students (23.9%).
- Forty-three out of 55 total Achieve 180 Program schools (79.6%) participated in three years, 10 schools (18.5%) participated two years, and two schools (1.9%) participated one year.
- The mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating at three-year and two-year Achieve 180 Program schools increased from pre-program to post-program, while at non-Achieve 180 comparison schools the mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating increased at lower rates, reducing the gap by 50 percent and by 63 percent, respectively.
- Achieve 180 Program three-year schools employed Effective and Highly Effective teachers at an increasing rate, but with smaller increases than their non-Achieve 180 comparison schools, while rates declined at two-year and one-year program schools from pre-program to post-program. At two-year non-Achieve 180 comparison schools, the rate of Effective and Highly Effective teachers increased. The gaps widened between three-year (six percent) and two-year (24 percent) Achieve 180 Program and their comparison schools.
- The mean student attendance rates at three-year, two-year, and one-year Achieve 180 Program schools increased more from pre-program to post-program than at non-Achieve 180 comparison schools, reducing the gaps between program and comparison schools by 55 percent (three-year), 64 percent (two-year), and 60 percent (one-year).
- Four-year graduation rates at the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools with graduates increased 1.5 percentage points by the end of the program's second year (Class of 2019), while the rate decreased 0.1 percentage point at comparison schools, narrowing the gap by 9.7 percent. (Pending post-program results.)
- Pre- to post-program four-year graduation rates available for one one-year school showed a 25.9 percentage-point gain from baseline (Class of 2017) to post-program (Class of 2018).
- Indicators of the Achieve 180 Program's benefits on students' District-Level Assessments (DLA) ELA performance showed a 4.2-point (89%) reduction in the 4.7-point gap between program and non-program students' mean scores.
- Indicators of Achieve 180 Program benefits on students' DLA mathematics performance showed the closure of the initial 6.8-point achievement gap favoring non-program students that resulted in a 2.0 percentage-point higher score for program students.
- Program Implementation Fidelity Ratings ranged from 2.4 "Emerging example" (Pillar II Teacher Excellence) to 2.8 "Strong example" (Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment), with only Pillar II's rating falling below a "Strong example" of program fidelity.

- Associations between greater program fidelity and higher ratings of educator effectiveness or improved student performance were found for 31 (86%) of the 36 relationships assessed.
- The largest number of positive relationships of greater intensity were found between program implementation fidelity ratings and scores on DLA ELA (Spanish language versions), followed by associations between program implementation fidelity ratings and Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) ratings.
- Each year that new accountability ratings have been given, the percentage of Achieve 180 Program schools that have met the accountability standard has increased, from 17 of 44 schools (39%) in 2017 (baseline year) to 43 of 53 schools (81%) in 2019 (Year 2).

Aside from both the overt and the insidious impacts of the pandemic on our society, educational system, and HISD constituents, the outcomes detailed in this report are expected (at least to some degree) to indicate the program's impact on creating more effective systems of teaching and learning at high-need schools. The intensive Achieve 180 Program interventions were designed to increase Leadership Excellence (Pillar I), Teaching Excellence (Pillar II), Instructional Excellence (Pillar III), and improve School Design (Pillar IV), Social and Emotional Learning Support (Pillar V), and Family and Community Empowerment (Pillar VI).

The gains being made to turn around Achieve 180 Program schools are apparent in the increasing rates of Highly Effective or Effective school leaders, overall; isolated instances of increasing rates of Highly Effective or Effective teachers; gap reductions in student attendance and graduation, overall; and isolated instances of performance-gap reductions or closures on ELA and mathematics DLA between program and non-program comparison schools. Clearly, the favorable results exist within the context of long-standing deficits and unrelenting challenges, with each of them pointing us towards areas that necessitate heightened and sustained investments to cultivate educators, students, and their families, if we are to truly improve the trajectory to academic and lifelong success for our high-need students and their communities and help produce enduring change.

Should you have questions, please contact Allison Matney in Research and Accountability at 713-556-6700.

Mm 2 Duf MLH

Attachment

cc: Yolanda Rodriguez Andres Salas Claude Cox Superintendent's Direct Reports Assistant Superintendents School Support Officers

### HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

# RESEARCH Educational Program Report

ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM EVALUATION, PART B: 2019-2020

## HISD Research and Accountability ANALYZING DATA, MEASURING PERFORMANCE.



### **2021 BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Patricia Allen, Ed.D. President

Holly Maria Flynn Vilaseca First Vice President

Judith Cruz Second Vice President

Kathy Blueford-Daniels Secretary

Daniela Hernandez Assistant Secretary

Sue Deigaard Myrna Guidry Elizabeth Santos Anne Sung

Millard L. House II Superintendent of Schools

Allison Matney, Ed.D. Executive Officer Department of Research and Accountability

Ngozi J. Kamau, Ph.D. Senior Research Specialist

Yu-Ting Chang, Ph.D. 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.

### **Table of Contents**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	3
HIGHLIGHTS	5
RECOMMENDATIONS	16
INTRODUCTION	20
Program Context	20
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	21
PROGRAM FUNDING	22
PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT	23
METHODS	
RESULTS	24
PROGRESS AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS IN EDUCATOR AND STUDENT OUTCOMES	24
Effective Principals/School Leaders: School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings	24
Effective Teachers: Teacher Appraisal and Development System Ratings	27
Student Attendance Rates, Chronic Absence Rates, and Graduation Rates	31
Attendance Rates	
Chronic Absence Rates	
Graduation Rates (Four-year and Five-year State Rates with Exclusions)	40
Achieve 180 Program Impact on Student Outcomes (DLA)	47
ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RATINGS OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY AND EDUCATOR AND STU	DENT
OUTCOMES	57
Program Implementation and Fidelity Ratings	
Implementation Fidelity and Educator and Student Outcomes (Overall)	61
Implementation Fidelity and School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings	64
Implementation Fidelity and Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) Ratings	
Implementation Fidelity and Student Achievement (DLA)	
TEA ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM RATINGS	74
DISCUSSION	75
REFERENCES	
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS	

#### 2019-2020 ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM EVALUATION, PART B

APPENDIX A: ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	91
APPENDIX A: ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM LOGIC MODEL	92
APPENDIX A: ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION RUBRIC	93
APPENDIX A: TEA COMPARISON GROUP SCHOOLS (TITLE I, PART A ONLY)	100
APPENDIX A: ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE REPORT	103
APPENDIX A: EVALUATION METHODS	109
APPENDIX B: EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS	118
APPENDIX C: EFFECTIVE TEACHERS	122
APPENDIX D: STUDENT ATTENDANCE AND CHRONIC ABSENCE	127
APPENDIX E: FOUR-YEAR AND FIVE-YEAR GRADUATION RATES	156
APPENDIX F: PROGRAM IMPACTS ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	171
APPENDIX G: FIDELITY OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	185

### Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part B: Progress Toward Goals and Objectives 2019–2020

### **Executive Summary**

### **Program Description**

Launched in 2017-2018, the Houston Independent School District (HISD) initially created a three-year Achieve 180 Program to support, strengthen, and empower 45 underserved and underperforming schools and their communities using best practices for school turnaround, including strong principal leadership, effective teachers, and school environments with high expectations for students and staff. Centered upon a comprehensive action plan to increase student achievement, the Achieve 180 Program's six guiding pillars of school improvement (Leadership Excellence, Teaching Excellence, Instructional Excellence, School Design, Social and Emotional Learning Support, and Family and Community Empowerment) provide a framework to strategically transform educational processes at Achieve 180 Program schools. In this last year of the three years initially planned for the Achieve 180 Program, despite the devastating impacts associated with the international Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic, which began for the Houston Independent School District (HISD) in March 2020, the district has again marshaled its extensive resources to focus on the district's most underserved and underachieving schools and students. Except for 10 weeks (from March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020, through June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, which were largely disrupted due to the pandemic) out of the 40 weeks (or 25%) of the 2019–2020 school year, HISD implemented the Achieve 180 Program while maintaining its educational programs for students whose schools were not a part of the Achieve 180 Program, including implementing new virtual learning opportunities from mid-April through June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, for all students.

Among the initial 45 program participants, one of the three charter schools (Victory Preparatory K-8) closed during the 2017-2018 school year. During the 2017-2018 school year, the Superintendent's Schools Office supported 10 schools with 4-8 years of IR status and the Achieve 180 Schools Office supported the remaining 34 schools with 1–3 years of IR status or former IR status. At the end of the school year in 2017– 2018 (Year 1), there were 44 participating Achieve 180 Program schools with a total of 36,886 students, including the 26 schools that received the Texas Education Agency Campus Accountability rating of "Improvement Required" (IR) in 2016–2017 and 18 former IR schools that received the IR rating in 2015– 2016 but received the "Met Standard" rating in 2016–2017. Another of the initial three charter schools (Victory Preparatory South HS) closed following the end of 2017–2018 school year, leaving 43 participating schools. In 2018–2019 (Year 2), based on the final 2017–2018 Accountability ratings, HISD added 10 schools to the remaining 43 schools, resulting in 53 participating schools with 42,478 students. The additional schools were comprised of five campuses that were not rated due to the Hurricane Harvey waiver and five campuses that were rated IR in 2017-2018. In 2019-2020 (Year 3), based on the final 2018-2019 Accountability ratings and assessment of campus-based needs, HISD added one school (Wisdom HS) to the program, resulting in 54 participating schools with 45,691 students. Appendix A (Figures A-1 and A-2, pp. 89-90) provides student enrollment and demographics by Achieve 180 Program affiliation.

Five treatment groups (called "Tiers") were formed for the 54 Achieve 180 Program schools in 2019–2020 based on their final 2018–2019 accountability ratings, number of years with the ratings, the campus' level of

support needed to turn the school around, and the specific HISD school office assigned to address the campus' needs. Achieve 180 Program intervention strategies, known as centralized support, are aligned with the program's six guiding pillars of school improvement. The Achieve 180 Schools Office supported 33 schools with the greatest levels of need in Tiers 3, 2, and 1. Other area schools offices supported 21 schools with the lower levels of need in the Area Support and Light Support tiers. The program's six pillars of school improvement provided the framework used to strategically transform educational processes at Achieve 180 Program schools as depicted in the Achieve 180 Program Objectives (**Appendix A**, **Table A-1**, p. 91), 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Logic Model (Appendix A, **Figure A-3**, p. 92), and Achieve 180 Program Rubric **Table A-2**, pp. 93–99).

The purpose of the Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part A, 2019–2020 report released on January 15, 2021, was to summarize the Year 3 program implementation activities that supported this massive program, as detailed in Achieve 180 Program 2019 Fall and 2020 Spring reports collected from various HISD Departments in September 2020. Part A of this report includes those reports and provides fidelity of implementation findings for the 54 schools participating in the Achieve 180 Program in 2019–2020. The report may be found online <u>here</u>.

The purpose of this 2019–2020 (Year 3), Part B, Achieve 180 Program report is to assess (1) progress made toward program goals and objectives from 2016–2017 (baseline year) to 2019–2020 (Year 3), (2) performance differences in educator and student outcomes between (a) Achieve 180 Program schools of different school levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high) and between (b) Achieve 180 Program schools and non-Achieve 180 Program, Title I, Part A, TEA-matched comparison group schools of similar demographics (Appendix A, **Table A-3**, pp. 100–102), (3) impacts of the Achieve 180 Program on student outcomes, and (4) associations between the Achieve 180 Program's level of implementation fidelity and specified educator and student outcomes.

Unless otherwise specified in this report, results are presented for the 55 schools that participated in the Achieve 180 Program for one complete year or more, including 2016–2017 (baseline year), 2017–2018 (Year 1), 2018–2019 (Year 2), and 2019–2020 (Year 3) of the program. Results are grouped by the number of years schools participated in the Achieve 180 Program, including 3-year schools (n=43) that participated from 2017–2018 to 2019–2020, two-year schools (n=10) that participated from 2018–2019 to 2019–2020, and one-year schools (n=2) that participated in either 2017–2018 (n=1) or in 2019–2020 (n=1).

#### 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Schools by Tier The 2019–2020 (Year 3) program included five treatment groups of the 54 underserved, underperforming Achieve 180 Program schools, based on their level of need and 2018–2019 school accountability ratings. Tier 2 Support (12) Area Support (13) Tier 3 Support (10) Tier 1 Support (11) Light Support (8) IR, FIR FIR, IR2+, IRI IR, FIR FIR FIR School School Feeder HS School Feeder HS School Feeder HS Feeder HS School Feeder HS Highland Sterling Washington Codwell ES\*\* Blackshear Yates Bonham ES Sharpstown Belfort ECC Chavez Heights ES ES Cook ES Weslev ES Foerster ES Westbury Kashmere Gallegos Milby Washington Bruce ES Wheatley ΕŜ Fondren ES^ Westbury Hilliard ES North Forest Deady MS\*\* Milby Kashmere Dogan ES Wheatley Kashmere Gardens ES Madison Looscan ES^ Northside Montgomery Henry MS Sam Mading ES Sterling Lewis ES FS^ Chavez Houston Gregory-Heights C Martinez ES Northside Marshall North Forest Lincoln PK-8 Shearn Yates HS Ahead ES\*\*^ ES\*\*^ Acad. MS<sup>A</sup> Woodson Worthing Pugh ES Wheatley Sherman Northside ES Reagan Madison Sugar Grove Sharpstown Cullen MS Yates ES\*\*^ PK-8\*\* MS\*\* Attucks MS Worthing Holland Furr Stevens ES^ Waltrip Milby HS Williams MS\*\* Washington Milby Thomas Sterling MS\*\*^ MS\*\* Young ES Worthing Westbury Westbury Kashmere HS Kashmere Lawson MS Madison HS Washington Washington Edison MS Austin North Forest North Forest Forest Brook North Forest HS HS Key MS Kashmere MS Worthing Worthing Wheatley HS Wheatley Madison HS Liberty HS Wisdom Madison HS Sharpstown Sharpstown Wisdom HS\* Wisdom НS Yates HS Yates TCAH^ Charter Sources: Achieve 180 Program Administrators, 2019–2020; Leadership and Development, 2020 Notes: Based on final 2018–2019 TEA Campus Accountability Ratings. Improvement Required (IR) campus. IR with a number means the minimum number of consecutive years campuses had been rated IR. FIR means formerly rated Improvement Required. No asterisk indicates a three-year Achieve 180 Program participant in 2017-2018 through 2019-2020. \*\*Indicates a two-year Achieve 180 Program participant in 2018–2019 and 2019–2020. \*Indicates a one-year Achieve 180 Program participant in 2019–2020. ^Indicates Non-TSL Grant participant. A one-year program participant in 2017–2018 only, Victory Preparatory South HS, closed and is not listed. Forty-three schools participated in three years of the program, from 2017–2018 to 2019–2020. Ten schools participated in two of the three years of the program, from 2018–2019 to 2019–2020. One 2019–2020 school (Wisdom HS) and one 2017–2018 school (Victory Preparatory South HS) participated in only one full year of the program. 56 43 Number of Schools 42 28 10 14 2 0 Three Years Two Years One Year Number of Years of Program Participation





#### School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings, Pre-Program to Post-Program

Based on a scale ranging from 1 (Ineffective) to 4 (Highly Effective):

- The mean School Leader Scorecard rating for three-year and two-year Achieve 180 Program schools increased significantly from pre-program (baseline) to post-program (the last year of the program).
- The Scorecard rating increase was greater for the group of 10 two-year schools (1.2 points from 2017–2018 (baseline) to 2019–2020 (Year 3)) than for the group of 42 three-year schools (a 0.9-point gain from 2016–2017 (baseline) to 2019–2020 (Year 3).
- The mean Scorecard rating for the one-year school decreased one point from 2018–2019 to 2019–2020.



Sources: 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 SAP Weekly Reports and TADS Tools

Note: ppt. or ppts. means percentage point(s). The increases were not statistically significant.



Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 Notes: ^One 2016–17 to 2017–18 and a different 2018–19 to 2019–20 school (pre to post). ppts. or pts. means percentage point(s). \*Indicates statistically significantly difference (p<0.05) between paired pre-program and post-program ratings.

#### Class of 2017 through Class of 2019 Four-Year Graduation Rates

- For the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program high and combined-level schools, the mean baseline (Class of 2017) four-year graduation rate increased 0.1 percentage point after the first year of the program (Class 2018).
- An overall increase of 1.5 percentage points was achieved by the end of the program's three-year schools' second year (Class of 2019). Post-program results for the Class of 2020 are pending.

Pre- to post-program results are presented for one one-year school, Victory Preparatory South HS (2017–2018 participant), showing a 25.9 percentage-point gain in the four-year graduation rate from the baseline rate (Class of 2017) to the post-program rate (Class of 2018).



### Class of 2017 through Class of 2019 Four-Year Graduation Rates, Achieve 180 Program Comparison

• While the three-year Achieve 180 Program schools' mean four-year graduation rate increased 1.5 percentage points, it decreased 0.1 percentage point at comparison non-Achieve 180 Program Title I, Part A schools, narrowing the gap by 9.7 percent from 16.5 at pre-program (Class of 2017) to 14.9 percentage points at post-program (Class of 2019).



#### Class of 2017 and Class of 2018 Five-Year Graduation Rates

- At baseline (Class of 2017), the mean five-year graduation rate for the 12 three-year schools in the Achieve 180 Program was 0.9 percentage point higher than the rate following the first year of the program (Class of 2018). Post-program results for the Class of 2020 are pending.
- Pre- to post-program results are presented for one one-year school, Victory Preparatory South HS (2017–2018 participant), showing a 7.3 percentage-point increase in the five-year graduation rate from its baseline rate (Class of 2017) to its post-program rate (Class of 2018).



Note: No two-year Achieve 180 Program schools had high school-graduate level students.

#### Class of 2017 through Class of 2019 Five-Year Graduation Rates, Achieve 180 Program Comparison

• At three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, the mean five-year graduation rate decreased from preprogram (Class of 2017) to the Class of 2018 in Year 2 of the program (-0.9 percentage point), while it increased at their matched comparison non-Achieve 180 Program Title I schools (0.3 percentage point), widening the gap by 9.5 percent from 12.6 to 13.8 percentage points.



Note: ppts. or pts. means percentage point(s).

#### Program Impacts on District-Level Assessments (DLA) in English Language Arts and Mathematics, Using Student Matching

- To assess the program's impact on student achievement, student matching was conducted to create similar student-groups for comparisons between students at Achieve 180 Program schools and students at non-Achieve 180 Title I, Part A schools from the Texas Education Agency's lists of comparison group schools.
- Matching students allowed for measurement of the effects of the intensive Achieve 180 Program intervention using District-Level Assessments (DLA), while controlling for students' 2019 STAAR English language arts (ELA) score, gender, and gifted/talented, disability, economic disadvantage, and at-risk status.
- The before-matching results include all students in the respective groups and after-matching results include only matched students. The difference between the groups' before-matching performance and after-matching performance provides an estimate of the program's impact on the Achieve 180 Program students' performance.



- DLA ELA performance comparisons between program students and non-program students showed a 4.2-point (89%) reduction in the initial 4.7-point gap between the Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program students' mean scores, after matching the students, which suggests performance benefits of the intensive Achieve 180 Program intervention for its students on DLA ELA exams.
- On DLA mathematics exams, Achieve 180 Program students' closed the 6.8-point achievement gap and exceeded their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' performance, with a 2.0 percentage-point higher mean score for Achieve 180 Program students than for non-Achieve 180 Program students (after matching), which is indicative of the program's benefits for its students.

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520

Notes: English version DLA results only. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

#### 2019–2020 (Year 3) Achieve 180 Program Implementation Fidelity Ratings

• By Achieve 180 Program Pillar, the Implementation Fidelity Ratings were determined by district, school, and program administrators. Mean fidelity ratings ranged from 2.4 - "Emerging example" (Pillar II Teacher Excellence) to 2.8 - "Strong example" (Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment), with only Pillar II's rating falling below the level of a "Strong example" of implementation fidelity.



Source: Achieve 180 Program Administrators, 2019–2020

Notes: Ratings by pillar were calculated using school-level ratings for each intervention component within each pillar. 2019–2020 ratings may reflect cumulative effects of multiple years of program intervention. Ratings are rounded to one decimal place. In previous reports, ratings were rounded to the nearest whole number and, therefore, may differ from ratings presented in this report.



Sources: 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 Effective School Leader Scorecard Ratings and TADS Tools (see Methods section for specific retrieval dates); District-Level Assessment Fall results, December 2019 retrieved on 5/27/2020; 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric Dashboard

#### HISD Achieve 180 Program School Accountability Ratings from Baseline to Year 3

 Due to the impact of COVID-19, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) labeled all campuses and districts in Texas "Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster for 2020" in the state accountability system. Campuses that received F ratings in 2019 will continue to engage in improvement activities during the 2020–2021 school year, as directed by TEA. To determine the escalation of future interventions based on multi-year F ratings, 2019 and 2021 will be considered consecutive years. HISD had 21 campuses rated F in 2019.

2019 HISD F-Rated Campuses				
Ashford ES	Isaacs ES	Robinson ES	Thomas MS** (T2)	
Deady MS** (T3)	Key MS** (Area)	Rucker ES	Wheatley HS (7yrs.)** (T3)	
Edison MS** (Area)	Martinez, C ES** (T2)	Seguin ES	Whidby ES	
E-STEM Central MS*	Northline ES	Smith ES	Williams MS** (T3)	
Fleming MS	Osborne ES	Sugar Grove MS (2ys.)** (T3)	Young ES** (Area)	
HS Ahead Ad. MS** (T3)				

Source: HISD 2020 TEA Accountability Ratings (Achieve 180 Program designations added)

Notes: \*Merged with E-STEM West MS for 2020–2021. \*\*Indicates Achieve 180 Program schools, with 2019–2020 program Tier (T) in parenthesis.

- Ten (48%) of the 21 F-rated HISD campuses in 2019 were among the 53 Achieve 180 Program campuses (19% of the program participants).
- Of the 10 F-rated Achieve 180 Program campuses in 2019, two had been rated NR-H or F-rated (or Improvement Required) in the year(s) prior to spring 2019 (Wheatley HS and Sugar Grove MS in Tier 3) and the other eight campuses were rated Met Standard/*A-D* in spring 2019.
- Each year that new accountability ratings have been given, the percentage of Achieve 180 Program schools that have met the accountability standard (or were rated A-D) increased each year, from 17 of 44 schools (39%) in 2017 (baseline year) to 43 of 53 schools (81%) in 2019 (Year 2).

Texas Education Agency (TEA) School Accountability Ratings, Achieve 180 Program 2017 through 2019							
School Year (EOY)	Total Program Campuses Rated	Improvement Required or <i>F</i> Rating		Not Rated: Harvey Pro-vision (NR-H)		Met Standard or A, B, C, or D Rating	
	N	Ν	%	N	%	N	%
2017	44*	27	61%	0	0%	17*	39%
2018	44*	1	2%	10	23%	33*	75%
2019	53*	10	19%	0	0%	43*	81%

Sources: Houston Independent School District, 2019 Preliminary TEA Accountability System Ratings; 2020 TEA Accountability Ratings

Note: TEA declared districts and schools Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster for 2020. **The 53 2018–2019 campuses started** as **19 Not Rated/Improvement Required and 34 Met Standard campuses.** \*Includes Bellfort ECC, a paired campus. Campuses received an A–F letter grade for the first time in the 2018–2019 school year. In prior school years, campuses were either labeled *Met* Standard or *Improvement Required*.

#### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations to further improve program implementation and outcomes were gleaned from the current or previous research reports and survey responses from 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program administrators whose work directly impacted Achieve 180 Program students, families, schools, and communities. Some survey responses have been summarized or extended. The department, team, or program that initiated the recommendation is identified at the end of each recommendation, including recommendations garnered through the research conducted for program evaluations since the onset of the program. Some recommendations may have been implemented. (Survey responses are provided in the 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part A, Appendix C, Table C-I, pp. 35–40.)

#### Pillar I – Leadership Excellence

Professional Development

- Provide Leadership Development (LD) team support and professional development for Achieve 180
  Program campuses that are not invited to participate in Achieve 180 Program Community of Practice
  (COP) visits or instructional rounds and include the LD team in discussions and follow-up of identified
  areas of need and next steps for campus leadership teams. (LD)
- Develop additional lines of communication regarding the support offered and provided for the school leaders to ensure that leadership supports are integrated and not duplicated. (LD)
- Provide Training of Trainers for Sheltered Instruction Coaches to deliver specific training to their campus teams. (LD)
- Support administrators to ensure all teachers of English Learners for all content areas embed sheltered instruction strategies. (Multilingual)
- Strengthen efforts to engage principals and school leaders in effective Leadership Development experiences designed in collaboration with departments and subject matter experts to cultivate and retain greater proportions of school leadership teams that earn Effective/Highly Effective School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings. (Research & Accountability)
- Further build school leadership team capacity to create and implement effective systems for differentiated learning experiences, as well as to evaluate and enhance effective strategies for schoolwide improvement. (Research & Accountability)

#### Other

 Because cost benefit analyses of the Achieve 180 Program will not be possible without comprehensive budgetary details, develop a comprehensive budget and expenditure report to include funding for all program costs, including some departmental budgets and expenditures used for Achieve 180 Program supports. (Research & Accountability)

#### Pillar II – Teacher Excellence

Staffing

- Ensure the number of Teacher Development Specialists (TDS) provided for the Early Childhood team is sufficient to meet its needs. This gives increased opportunity to assign the TDS fewer schools, so they may make greater positive impacts. (Elementary Curriculum and Development)
- Increase the number of teachers who get ESL-certified based on the number of waivers submitted by the campus. (Multilingual)
- In addition to providing Dedicated Associate Teachers, enhance efforts to better understand and counteract excessive teacher absence. (Research & Accountability)

#### Professional Development

- Ensure that the Achieve 180 Program is sustainable by considering a model in which Teacher Development Specialists (TDS) spend time with Tier 2 Leaders, observe classes together, review curricula for upcoming weeks, develop a shared plan for teacher support, and the Instructional Coach works to support the instructional leaders on campus. (Secondary Curriculum and Development)
- Ensure that principals have the time needed to intensively support their novice teachers by sharing New Teacher Coaches' expectations with school leaders and hosting one-on-one quarterly meetings with principals. (Teacher Career Development)
- Improve the impact of New Teacher Coaches (NTCs) by requiring the setting of clear expectations and deliverables of their work with novice teachers and frequently use progress monitoring. (Teacher Career Development)
- Bring the NTCs together more frequently to give them additional opportunities to learn with and from one another. (Teacher Career Development)
- Have NTCs use the Seeing is Believing Me (SIBME) video observation and feedback platform consistently, including using them systematically to observe, model, and reflect upon instructional practices to improve outcomes. (Teacher Career Development)
- Determine the extent to which the TADS summative appraisal rating is a valid measure of teacher effectiveness and is being used consistently as a reliable method to gauge Effective/Highly Effective teacher knowledge, skills, actions, and qualities. (Research & Accountability)

#### Pillar III – Instructional Excellence

#### Professional Development

- Address the lack of fidelity of implementation by providing follow-up protocols for implementation of professional development content and providing flow-charts that align the next steps for fidelity of implementation. (Elementary Curriculum and Development)
- Ensure customization of training topics and/or lead facilitator based on the unique needs of each campus, as opposed to a one-size-fits-all approach. (Elementary Curriculum and Development)
- Continue with Reading content training to Tier 2 school leaders and allow Tier 2 school leaders to train campus teachers. (Elementary Curriculum and Development)
- Ensure that all teachers are trained to use and have access to needed data tools. (Special Education)
- Monitor and support the completion and implementation of Gifted and Talented Professional Learning for administrators, counselors, and teachers to meet the individual needs of gifted and high performing learners. (Gifted and Talented)
- Provide additional coaching and modeling for designated supports and accommodations. (Interventions Office)
- Prior to the scheduled data dig activities, build the capacity of teachers and leaders by modeling how to lead effective Professional Learning Communities. (Student Assessment)
- Provide virtual trainings for Summative Assessments through the Test Materials Center to allow Campus Test Coordinators access to information at their convenience. (Student Assessment)
- Provide asynchronous trainings for formative assessments on the HISD HUB and in afterschool Justin-Time virtual, synchronous webinars focused on remote assessment and data needs, as well as give the Achieve 180 Schools Office autonomy over Lead4ward professional development dates and topics. (Student Assessment)
- Based on the differential outcomes for students who tested in Spanish versus students who tested in English on the Renaissance 360 Universal Screener and District-level Assessments, improve the identification and utilization of equitable and effective supports to further boost the learning and performance of high-need students, such as Achieve 180 Program students and their peers, especially those who test in English on Reading and Mathematics assessments. (Research & Accountability)

Improve efforts to increase student participation in Advanced Placement (AP) and College Readiness
and College Board examinations and improve student exam performance through heightened efforts
that the preparation of students is sufficient to address their specific academic needs for success on
the exams, and particularly, the unique needs of Achieve 180 Program students. (Research &
Accountability)

#### Other

- Enhance focus on Achieve 180 Program fiscal management to succeed in depleting available funding to address student learning and achievement gaps, particularly for students who perform at the lowest levels. (Research & Accountability)
- Provide more emphasis on the use of accommodations and designated supports during instruction and assessments. (Special Education)
- Monitor closely teachers' use of the Special Education Progress Monitoring tool. (Special Education)
- Group gifted learners in clusters of three or more gifted students so that high level students are working together. (Gifted and Talented)
- Include the following resources and strategies in lessons with gifted learners: Depth and Complexity, Renzulli Learning, Mentoring Minds, and High levels of Blooms Taxonomy. (Gifted and Talented)
- Explore factors that support Achieve 180 Program students remaining in their feeder pattern schools as well as factors that prohibit them from attending other schools, including possible remedies for potential inequities in access to school choice options for Achieve 180 Program students. (Research & Accountability)

#### Pillar IV – School Design

- Create and implement the Gifted Education Plans (GEP's) with fidelity for gifted learners to ensure differentiated instruction. (Gifted and Talented)
- Provide campuses with a common tool to capture designated supports and accommodations. (Interventions Office)
- Create a combined data request form for all offices, to improve data quality, with everyone in agreement with what is needed. (Student Assessment)
- Ensure the Test Materials Center personnel allow Campus Test Coordinators sufficient time to organize and apply the information needed. (Student Assessment)
- Include college and career readiness and post-secondary benchmarks (e.g., Advanced Placement scores, Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) application submissions, college enrollment, and CTE certification data in the final evaluation of college readiness outcomes). (College and Career Readiness)
- Implement additional supports to increase Achieve 180 Program student participation in coherent sequences of CTE courses, improve course completion rates among students who take courses in a coherent sequence of CTE courses, increase pass rates for Achieve 180 Program students who take CTE industry certification exams, and close CTE programming gaps that help produce variances between non-Achieve 180 students Achieve 180 Program student acquisition of industry certifications. (Research & Accountability)
- To better address students' attendance deficits as a priority of the program, further identify best practices within the district and the Achieve 180 Program, as well as within similar, high-need schools across the country effectively identity and address the underlying causes of student absenteeism, which is a core, long-standing problem that directly undermines all other Achieve 180 program efforts. (Research & Accountability)
- Given the pressing academic needs of Achieve 180 Program students, consider intensive efforts to decrease exclusionary actions or behavior management systems and effectively create school climates

that respect student voice and support reductions in suspensions and expulsions by employing more inclusive and effective disciplinary strategies that improve student learning and achievement. (Research & Accountability)

 Consider ways to impart heightened attention to the causes of grade retention and to 25–30 percent of the graduating classes being left behind and more effectively facilitate targeted solutions in these areas. (Research & Accountability)

#### Pillar V – Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Support

#### Professional Development

• Improve support systems for nurses by working more closely with them and continue to assign mentors for nurses. (Health and Medical Services)

#### Other

- Given the gaps between program funds and utilization of allocated funds, garner additional monetary support from Achieve 180 Program fiscal planners for students in need of SEL intervention to address chronic student learning and achievement gaps, particularly for students who perform at the lowest levels. (Research & Accountability)
- Encourage and support collaboration between HISD Wraparound Services and leaders of the Schools Office to improve communication and align expectations to address students' non-academic needs. (Wraparound Services)

#### Pillar VI – Family and Community Empowerment

- Identify effective strategies to (1) improve parent and guardian involvement in the evaluation of their experiences at and perceptions of their children's Title I schools, (2) improve the deficits identified by families in Achieve 180 Program school factors and school climate, (3) enhance support for students learning at home, and (4) remove barriers to parent/family participation and empowerment in schools to support further improvement in student learning and academic performance. (Research & Accountability)
- Continue advancements in linking Family Friendly Schools' foundational and related activities to student, parent, and family learning, as well as in increasing parent and family engagement in these activities. (Research & Accountability)

### Introduction

#### **Program Context**

A system of student assessment forms the foundation for the Texas public education system of accountability for Texas schools and school districts. The Texas Education Agency (TEA), Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and Texas educators developed a more rigorous system of student assessment in 2013 in accordance with educational requirements mandated by the 80th and 81st sessions of the Texas Legislature. The accountability system that resulted was in effect for the 2016–2017 and 2017– 2018 school years (when schools were given the TEA Accountability Ratings used to determine participation in the Achieve 180 Program initially). This accountability system rated schools and districts using a performance framework of four indexes, based on targets identified annually: (1) student achievement on state-mandated assessments, (2) student progress on state-mandated assessments, (3) performance gap reduction for the lowest performing student groups, and (4) postsecondary readiness, including graduation rates by type of diploma. Schools and districts within the state received a rating of "Met Standard," "Met Alternative Standard," "Improvement Required," or "Not Rated." At the end of the 2016–2017 (baseline) school year, the Houston Independent School District (HISD) received a "Met Standard" accountability rating with 251 of its 278 rated schools (90%) also receiving the "Met Standard" rating. The remaining 27 schools (10%) were rated "Improvement Required" (Houston Independent School District, 2017). At the end of the 2017-2018 (Year 1) school year, HISD received a "Not Rated: Harvey Provision" accountability rating with 252 of its 275 rated schools (92%) receiving the "Met Standard" rating, 17 schools (6%) receiving a "Not Rated: Harvey Provision" and six schools (2%) were rated "Improvement Required" (Houston Independent School District, 2018).

For the 2018–2019 school year, a new accountability system was created to rate schools and districts using a performance framework of three domains, based on targets identified annually. The domains were: (1) student achievement on general and alternate assessments, College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicators, and graduation rates; (2) school progress in the number of students that grew at least one year academically on state-mandated assessments (State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR)) and all students' achievement relative to other districts and schools with similar economic disadvantage percentages; and (3) closing the gaps based on disaggregated data to demonstrate differences among racial/ethnic groups, socioeconomic backgrounds, and other factors as aligned with the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). At the end of the 2018–2019 school year (Year 2), under the new system HISD received a "B" accountability rating with 250 of its 271 rated schools (92%) receiving a grade of D or higher and 21 schools (8%) were rated "F."

During the 2019–2020 school year, the immeasurable impacts of the Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic began for HISD in March 2020 and resulted in the cancellation of STAAR testing in spring 2020. All campuses and districts in Texas were labeled "Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster 2020" TEA's state accountability system. Campuses that received F ratings in 2019 (**Table 1**, p. 21) were directed by TEA to continue to engage in improvement activities during the following school year in 2020–2021, and to consider multi-year F ratings in 2019 and 2021 as consecutive years.

In 2019–2020, despite the devastating impacts associated with the international COVID-19 pandemic, the district again marshaled its extensive resources to focus on the district's most underserved and underachieving schools and students through the Achieve 180 Program. Except for 10 weeks (which were largely disrupted due to the pandemic) out of the 40 weeks (or 25%) of the 2019–2020 school year (from March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020, through June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020), HISD implemented the Achieve 180 Program at 54 schools while

maintaining its educational programs for students whose schools were not a part of the Achieve 180 Program, including implementing new virtual learning opportunities from mid-April through June 1st, 2020, for all students. Table 1 shows the 10 2019 Achieve 180 Program schools among the 21 district schools directed by TEA to retain F ratings (or 19% of program schools).

Table 1. 2019 HISD F-Rated Campuses				
Ashford ES	Isaacs ES	Robinson ES	Thomas MS** (T2)	
Deady MS** (T3)	Key MS** (Area)	Rucker ES	Wheatley HS (7yrs.)** (T3)	
Edison MS** (Area)	Martinez, C ES** (T2)	Seguin ES	Whidby ES	
E-STEM Central MS*	Northline ES	Smith ES	Williams MS** (T3)	
Fleming MS	Osborne ES	Sugar Grove MS (2ys.)** (T3)	Young ES** (Area)	
HS Ahead Ad. MS** (T3)				

Source: HISD Final Accountability Ratings Report, 2019 (Achieve 180 Program designations added) Notes: \*Merged with E-STEM West MS (2020–2021). \*\*Achieve 180 Program, with 2019–2020 program Tier (T).

#### **Program Description**

Initially planned for three years, the Achieve 180 Program was launched in 2017–2018 to provide centralized support to campuses that did not meet TEA accountability standards at the end of the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and/or 2018–2019 school years. The program was created to support, strengthen, and empower the district's most underserved and underperforming schools and their communities using best practices for successful school turnaround, including effective teachers, strong principal leadership, and school environments of high expectations for students and staff. The program's six pillars of school improvement are Leadership Excellence, Teaching Excellence, Instructional Excellence, School Design, Social and Emotional Learning Support, and Family and Community Empowerment. The pillars provide the framework to strategically transform educational processes at Achieve 180 Program schools as depicted in the Achieve 180 Program Objectives (Appendix A, Table A-1, p. 91), 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Logic Model (Appendix A, Figure A-3, p. 92), and Achieve 180 Program Rubric (Appendix A, Table A-2, pp. 93–99).

The Achieve 180 Program was centered upon a comprehensive action plan to increase student achievement at participating schools. In 2017–2018, the Achieve 180 program launched with 45 participating schools, including the 27 schools that received the TEA Campus Accountability rating of "Improvement Required" (IR) in 2016–2017 and 18 former IR schools that received the IR rating in 2015–2016, but received the "Met Standard" rating in 2016-2017. The 10 participating campuses with the greatest level of need were supported through the Superintendent's Schools Office and received Achieve 180 Program resources also. The remaining 35 campuses were supported through the Achieve 180 Schools office and received Achieve 180 Program resources also. In February 2018, one of the participating charter schools closed (Victory Preparatory K-8), leaving 44 2017-2018 Achieve 180 Program schools to participate throughout the academic year. Another charter school (Victory Preparatory South HS) did not reopen following the 2017-2018 school year, which left 43 Achieve 180 Program schools for program participation in 2018-2019. Based on preliminary and final 2017–2018 TEA ratings, HISD added another 10 schools to the 2018–2019 program to include five campuses that were Not Rated due to the 2017-2018 Not Rated: Harvey Provision and five campuses that received IR ratings at the end of the 2017–2018 academic year including one school. Shearn Elementary School, that received a preliminary rating of IR, won its appeal, and received a final rating of "Met Standard." In 2019–2020 (Year 3), based on the final 2018–2019 Accountability ratings and assessment of campus-based needs, HISD added one school (Wisdom HS) to the program, resulting in 54 participating schools with 45,691 students. The additional school had received an F rating in two of the three Domains (Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps) in 2017-2018 and showed improvement in each Domain in 2018-2019.

Five treatment groups (called "Tiers") were formed for the 54 Achieve 180 Program schools in 2019–2020 based on their final 2018–2019 accountability ratings, number of years with the ratings, the campus' level of support needed to turn the school around, and the specific HISD school office assigned to address the campus' needs. Achieve 180 Program intervention strategies, known as centralized support, are aligned with the program's six guiding pillars of school improvement (Houston Independent School District, 2020). Program interventions were differentiated and implemented based on each schools' specified Tier and individualized needs. The Achieve 180 Schools Office supported 33 schools with the greatest level of need in Tiers 3, 2, and 1. Other area schools offices supported 21 schools with the lowest levels of need in the Area Support and Light Support tiers. (See Appendix A, Figure A-1 and Figure A-2, pp. 89–90, for student enrollment and demographics by Achieve 180 Program affiliation.)

In addition to centralized support provided through the Achieve 180 Program, many participating schools were also supported by other federal and district initiatives. Among them, in 2016–2017 (baseline year) through 2019–2020 (Year 3), all Achieve 180 Program schools had also been designated as participants of the Improving Basic Programs effort in Title I, Part A (Title I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). All Achieve 180 Program schools had schoolwide Title I programs, which are available to all district campuses with 40 percent or more of students at the poverty level (i.e., qualifying for free or reduced lunch or other support for economic disadvantage) in an effort to improve schoolwide educational programs and raise the academic achievement of all students (Texas Education Agency, 2020). Additionally, in 2018–2019 (Year 2), 43 (81%) of the 53 Achieve 180 Program schools and, in 2019–2020 (Year 3), 44 (82%) of the 54 Achieve 180 Program schools were also supported through the district's Teacher and School Leader (TSL) Incentive Grant, a federally-supported grant focused on increasing the effectiveness of school leaders and teachers with the goal of improving student outcomes (Houston Independent School District, 2019a).

Of the 56 schools that participated in the Achieve 180 Program, one charter school (Victory Preparatory, K-8) closed during the 2017–2018 (Year 1) and is not included in any Achieve 180 Program evaluations. Another charter school (Victory Preparatory South, HS) which closed after the 2017–2018 (Year 1) academic year is included in the 2017–2018 (Year 1) and the 2019–2020 (Year 3) program evaluations. Of the 54 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program schools that completed at least one complete year of the program, 43 schools entered the program in 2017–2018 (Year 2) and continued their participation in 2019–2020 (Year 3), 10 schools entered the program in 2018–2019 (Year 2) and continued their participation in 2019–2020 (Year 3), and one school (Wisdom, HS) participated in only 2019–2020 (Year 3). Victory Preparatory South, HS is included in this longitudinal analysis as the 55<sup>th</sup> school that completed as least one complete year in the program.

#### **Program Funding**

Based on a post end-of-fiscal-year 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program budget and expenditure report provided by HISD's Budgeting and Financial Planning Department, \$29,075,404 (or 89%) of the allocated \$32,579,054 General Fund and Special Revenue for Federal Grants (Title I) funds were utilized. More than 99 percent of program expenditures were used to compensate school administrators and teachers. (See the chart in Highlights on p. 6 and budget details in Appendix A, **Table A-4** and Table **A-5** (pp. 103–108). It is important to note that complete funding information for the program has not been reflected in this report. Funding for Achieve 180 Program support to schools is intertwined with multiple other funding streams used for ongoing, general education services that are paid through some departmental budgets which support the work carried out by many district- and school-based teams, coordinated by Achieve 180 Program and Area School Office administrators. The multifaceted implementation activities supporting this massive program

have been detailed in Achieve 180 Program 2019–2020 reports published in Part A of this report, available on the Research and Accountability website <u>here</u>.

#### **Purpose of the Program Evaluation Report**

The purpose of the Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part A, 2019–2020 report released on January 15, 2021, was to summarize the Year 3 program implementation activities that supported this massive program, as detailed in Achieve 180 Program 2019 Fall and 2020 Spring reports collected from various HISD Departments in September 2020. Part A of this report includes those reports and provides fidelity of implementation findings for the 54 schools participating in the Achieve 180 Program in 2019–2020. The report may be found online <u>here</u>.

The purpose of this 2019–2020 (Year 3), Part B, Achieve 180 Program report is to assess (1) progress made toward program goals and objectives from 2016–2017 (baseline year) to 2019–2020 (Year 3), (2) performance differences in specified educator and student outcomes between (a) Achieve 180 Program schools of different school levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high) and between (b) Achieve 180 Program schools and non-Achieve 180 Program, Title I, Part A, TEA comparison group schools of similar demographics, (3) impacts of the Achieve 180 Program on student outcomes, and (4) associations between the Achieve 180 Program's level of implementation fidelity and specified educator and student outcomes.

### **Methods**

Detailed evaluation methods, including data collection and data limitations, are provided in Appendix A (pp. 109-117). Unless otherwise specified in this report, results are presented for the same 55 participating Achieve 180 Program schools, including 2016–2017 (Year 1 baseline), 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020, as applicable. Typically, findings are grouped by school level (i.e., elementary, middle, high, or combined-level) and the number of years of Achieve 180 Program participation for 3-year schools (n=43) that participated from 2017–2018 to 2019–2020, two-year schools (n=10) schools that participated from 2018–2019 to 2019–2020, and one-year schools (n=2) schools that participated in either 2017–2018 (n=1) or in 2019–2020 (n=1). Therefore, Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 results in this report will differ from results presented in prior reports for these groups. The primary focuses of this report are on the changes in performance and the differences or "gaps" between the performances of specified groups from pre-program to post-program (based on when campuses participated). Performance trends are based on annual school-level ratings or rates for all educators or students. Analyses of statistical significance of change in performance ratings and rates are based on paired samples at the school-, educator-, or student-level. Therefore, assessments of change (including statistical significance) may be based on a subsample of the population used in the associated trend analysis.

References in this report to the 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part A begin with "Part A" and are not in bold print. Tables in the Highlights and Appendices identify the newly participating Achieve 180 Program schools in 2018–2019 or in 2019–2020 with asterisks. Schools that were not a Teacher and School Leader (TSL) Grant participant in 2017–2018 through 2019–2020 are identified with a caret (^).

### **Results**

### **Progress and Differences Between Groups in Educator and Student Outcomes**

#### Effective Principals/School Leaders: School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings

#### Progress made toward accomplishing Achieve 180 Program goals and objectives

School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings (Scorecard) for school leaders are based on a scale ranging from 1 (Ineffective) to 4 (Highly Effective) and are calculated following the end of each school year. Annual Scorecard ratings for three-year, two-year, and one-year Achieve 180 Program schools with Scorecard data and the statistically significant changes made from pre- to post-program (see arrows and asterisks where applicable) for three-year and two-year participating schools are presented based on their years of program participation (**Figure 1**). Asterisks identify a post-program rating that is statistically significantly different from the associated pre-program rating. It was not possible to run this statistic for one school.

• The mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings for three-year and two-year Achieve 180 Program schools increased from pre-program (i.e., baseline) to post-program (i.e., last year of program participation) (Figure 1).

## Figure 1. Mean Achieve 180 Program School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings by the Number of Years of Schools' Program Participation, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020



Sources: 2016–2017 (10/23/2017), 2017–2018 (11/28/2018), 2018–2019 (11/12/2019), and 2019–2020 (11/16/2020) Effective School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings

Notes: This figure presents one of two components used in the School Leader Appraisal System (SLAS), excludes Coaching and Feedback rating, rounded to nearest tenth. Data were not available for Texas Connections Academy Houston (TCAH), a virtual, online school and three-year program participant or Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter school and one-year (2017–2018) program participant. Data were available for one oneyear school, Wisdom HS, but not sufficient to assess statistical significance. \*Indicates statistically significantly difference (p<0.05) between post-program ratings and pre-program ratings. Statistical significance was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: one three-year combined-level, four twoyear elementary, one two-year combined-level, and one one-year high school. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test effect size r: small effect <0.3, moderate effect 0.3 - <0.5, large effect >= 0.5.

- The Scorecard rating increase was greater for the group of 10 two-year schools (1.2 points from 2017–2018 (baseline) to 2019–2020 (Year 3)) than for the group of 42 three-year schools (0.9-point gain from 2016–2017 (baseline) to 2019–2020 (Year 3) (Figure 1, p. 24).
- The mean Scorecard rating for the one one-year school decreased one point from pre-program 2018–2019) to post-program (2019–2020) (Figure 1).
- Wilcoxon results showed the Scorecard rating gains from pre-program to post-program are statistically significant with a large program effect for both the three-year schools (z=4.824, p<0.01; effect size r=0.53) and two-year schools (z=2.762, p< 0.01; effect size r=0.62). (See Appendix B, Tables B-1 and B-2, pp. 118–120 for ratings by group and campus; Appendix B, Table B-3, p. 121 for statistical results by group).</li>
- Annual School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings from pre- to post-program for participating schools with Scorecard data are presented by school level for the Achieve 180 Program based on number of years of program participation (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Mean Achieve 180 Program School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings by the Number of Years of Schools' Program Participation and School Level, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020



Sources: 2016–2017 (10/23/2017), 2017–2018 (11/28/2018), 2018–2019 (11/12/2019), and 2019–2020 (11/16/2020) Effective School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings

- Notes: This figure presents one of two components used in the School Leader Appraisal System (SLAS), excludes Coaching and Feedback rating, rounded to nearest tenth. Data were not available for TCAH, a virtual, online school and three-year program participant or Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter school and one-year (2017–2018) program participant. Data were available for one one-year school, Wisdom HS, but not sufficient to assess statistical significance. \*Indicates statistically significantly difference (p<0.05) between post-program ratings and pre-program ratings. Statistical significance was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: one three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and one one-year high school. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test effect size r: small effect <0.3, moderate effect 0.3 - <0.5, large effect >= 0.5.
- The mean Achieve 180 Program Scorecard rating increased most for two-year elementary schools (1.7 points) from pre-program (2017–2018 baseline) to post-program (2019–2020), followed by a 1.1-points increase at three-year elementary schools (from the 2016–2017 baseline to 2019–2020 (Year 3)). In

addition, the mean Scorecard ratings at three-year high schools increased 0.6 point and increased 0.8 point at two-year middle schools increased (Figure 2, p. 25).

- The smallest groups of schools (one three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and one one-year high) were not of sufficient size to determine statistical significance of their change from pre- to post-program; although, the two-year elementary schools' gain (1.7 points) was the largest of the gains (Figure 2).
- Wilcoxon results showed, except three-year middle schools, all Achieve 180 Program groups of sufficient size to assess statistical significance of Scorecard rating increases from pre-program to post-program showed a significant result with a large program effect: three-year elementary (z=3.619, p<0.01; effect size r=0.55) and high schools (z=2.646, p<0.01; effect size r=0.56) from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020) and two-year middle schools (z=2.000, p<0.05; effect size r=0.53) from 2017–2018 to 2019–2020 (Figure 2; Appendix B, Table B-3, p. 121 for statistical results by group).</li>
- The mean Achieve 180 Program Scorecard rating decreased from baseline to post-program only for the one-year high school (1.0 percentage point) (Figure 2).
- School level (i.e., elementary, middle, high school) was found to influence the amount of change in Scorecard ratings from pre-program to post-program (*H*(2)=7.172, p<0.05) (Kruskal-Wallis *H* test). Elementary school leaders' level of change ranked highest, followed by middle school leaders', then, high school leaders' level of change, with a statistically significant difference between elementary and high schools (p<0.05). (See Appendix B, Table B-3 for statistical results by group).</li>

#### Differences between Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program comparison schools

Figure 3. Mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings for Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 Schools by the Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020



Sources: 2016–2017 (10/23/2017), 2017–2018 (11/28/2018), 2018–2019 (11/12/2019), 2019–2020 (11/16/2020) Effective School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings, and 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

Notes: This figure presents one of two components used in the School Leader Appraisal System (SLAS), excludes Coaching and Feedback rating, rounded to the nearest tenth. Data were not available for TCAH, a virtual, online school and three-year program participant or Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter school and oneyear (2017–2018) program participant. Data were available for one one-year school, Wisdom HS. All Non-Achieve 180 schools are TEA comparison group schools in HISD and Title I, Part A schools. No appropriate comparisons were listed for Bellfort ECC, Gregory-Lincoln PK-8, High School Ahead Academy MS, Liberty HS, Montgomery ES, TCAH, Victory Preparatory South HS, and Yates HS.

- The mean Scorecard ratings of school leaders increased more from pre-program to post-program at three-year and two-year Achieve 180 Program schools (0.9 percentage point and 1.2 percentage points, respectively) than at their comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools (0.6 percentage point and 0.7 percentage point, respectively) (**Figure 3**, p. 26).
- Comparative analyses showed the gap in mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings between three-year Achieve 180 Program schools and non-Achieve 180 Program schools narrowed 50 percent from a pre-program gap of 0.6 point (2.5 Achieve 180 Program vs 3.1 non-Achieve 180 Program) to a post-program gap of 0.3 point (3.4 Achieve 180 Program vs 3.7 non-Achieve 180 Program) (Figure 3).
- Additional comparative analyses between three-year Achieve 180 Program schools and Title I, Part A non-Achieve 180 Program elementary, middle, high, and combined-level schools (with matched comparison group schools) showed a gap reduction (elementary schools) and gap closures (middle and high schools). For high schools, the mean post-program Achieve 180 Program School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating exceeded the mean rating of their non-Achieve 180 Program comparison schools by 0.1 point in 2019–2020 (Appendix B, Table B-1, p. 118–119).
- For two-year Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison Title I, Part A non-Achieve 180 Program schools, the gap in mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings narrowed by 63 percent from a pre-program gap of 0.8 point (2.3 Achieve 180 Program vs 3.1 non-Achieve 180 Program) to a post-program gap of 0.3 point (3.5 Achieve 180 Program vs 3.8 non-Achieve 180 Program), a greater gap-reduction than achieved by three-year program participants (Figure 3).
- Additional comparative analyses between two-year Achieve 180 Program schools and Title I, Part A non-Achieve 180 Program elementary, middle, high, and combined-level schools (with matched comparison schools) showed a gap reduction at middle schools, a gap closure at elementary schools, and comparable ratings across the years at combined-level schools. For elementary schools, the mean post-program Achieve 180 Program School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating exceeded the mean rating of their non-Achieve 180 Program comparison schools by 0.1 point in 2019–2020 (Appendix B, Table B-2, p. 120).
- Both the one-year Achieve 180 Program high school and its Title I, Part A non-Achieve 180 Program comparisons showed a decline in mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings from pre- to post-program (from 3.0 to 2.0 points and 3.0 to 2.5 points, respectively, with no difference in their pre-program School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings in 2018–2019 and a post-program gap of 0.5 point in 2019–2020 (Figure 3) (Appendix B, Table B-2).

#### Effective Teachers: Teacher Appraisal and Development System Ratings

Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) ratings are based on a scale ranging from 1 (Ineffective) to 4 (Highly Effective). Based on cumulative, unduplicated numbers of full-time teachers who taught in HISD at any time during the school year, in 2016–2017, 10,921 (68.5%) out of 15,952 HISD full-time teachers had TADS summative ratings. The rate increased to 81.8 percent in 2017–2018 (11,047 out of 13,511) and to 82.3 percent in 2018–2019 (10,570 out of 12,840), then declined to 80.3 percent in 2019–2020 (10,237 out of 12,753). The 2019–2020 rate exceeded the 2016–2017 rate by 11.8 percentage points (17%).

#### Progress made toward accomplishing Achieve 180 Program goals and objectives

- Annual, combined percentages of teachers rated Highly Effective or Effective and percentage-point changes from pre- to post-program proportions of effective teachers (see arrows) for three-year, two-year, and one-year participating schools with TADS data are presented for Achieve 180 Program schools by the number of years of program participation from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020 (Figure 4). Asterisks identify a post-program rating that is statistically significantly different from the associated pre-program rating (i.e., the change is not likely to have occurred by chance).
- The percentage of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings for the group of 42 threeyear Achieve 180 Program schools increased 1.9 percentage points (from 81.0% in 2016–2017/preprogram baseline to 82.9% in 2019–2020/post-program in Year 3) (Figure 4).

#### Figure 4. Percentages of Achieve 180 Program Teachers with Highly Effective or Effective Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) Ratings by Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020



Sources: SAP Weekly Report 2016–2017 (8/15/2016 to 8/28/2017), 2017–2018 (8/14/2017 to 6/04/2018), 2018– 2019 (8/27/2018 to 6/03/2019), and 2019–2020 (8/12/2019 to 6/01/2020); TADS Tool 2016–2017 (10/23/2017), 2017–2018 (10/22/2018), 2018–2019 (12/04/2019), and 2019–2020 (11/06/2020); 2019– 2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

- Notes: Due to changes in the Student Performance component of TADS from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020, comparisons are made with caution. No teachers at TCAH, a virtual, online, three-year program participant, and Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter school and one-year program participant (2017–2018) had TADS ratings. Data were available for one one-year school, Wisdom HS. Statistical significance (p<0.05) was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: one three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and one one-year high school.
- Overall, the proportion of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings decreased both for the group of 10 two-year Achieve 180 Program schools (2.0 percentage points from 79.5% in 2017– 2018/pre-program baseline to 77.5% in 2019–2020/post-program, Year 3) and for the one one-year program school with TADS-rated teachers, Wisdom HS (0.3 percentage point from 94.7% in 2018– 2019/pre-program baseline to 94.4% in 2019–2020/post-program, Year 3) (Figure 4).
- Changes in the proportion of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings from pre-program to post-program were not statistically significant for either group. (See **Appendix C**, **Table C-1** and **C-**

**2**, pp. 122–125 for ratings by group and program campus; Appendix C, **Table C-3**, p. 126 for statistical results by group).

• By school level, annual rates of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings from pre- to post-program for participating schools with TADS-rated teachers are presented for the Achieve 180 Program based on number of years of program participation (**Figure 5**).





Sources: SAP Weekly Report 2016–2017 (8/15/2016 to 8/28/2017), 2017–2018 (8/14/2017 to 6/04/2018), 2018– 2019 (8/27/2018 to 6/03/2019), and 2019–2020 (8/12/2019 to 6/01/2020); TADS Tool 2016–2017 (10/23/2017), 2017–2018 (10/22/2018), 2018–2019 (12/04/2019), and 2019–2020 (11/06/2020)

- Notes: Due to changes in the Student Performance component of TADS from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020, comparisons are made with caution. No teachers at TCAH, a virtual, online, three-year program participant, and Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter school and one-year program participant (2017–2018) had TADS ratings. Data were available for one one-year school, Wisdom HS. Statistical significance (p<0.05) was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: one three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and one one-year high school.
  - The rate of Achieve 180 Program teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings increased most from pre-program (baseline) to post-program at combined-level schools (three-year participants by 7.7 percentage points and two-year participants by 3.8 percentage points), followed three-year elementary (2.3 percentage points) and three-year high (2.2 percentage points) and two-year elementary schools (0.7 percentage point) (Figure 5).
  - The rate of Achieve 180 Program teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings decreased at middle schools (three-year participants by 2.1 percentage points and two-year participants by 6.0 percentage points) and at the one-year high school (0.3 percentage point) from pre-program (baseline) to post-program (Figure 5).

- The gains in the rates of Achieve 180 teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings were not statistically significant for any participant group from pre-program (i.e., baseline) to post-program (i.e., last year of program participation) (Wilcoxon tests). (See Appendix C, Table C-3, p. 126, for statistical results by group).
- In addition, school level (i.e., elementary, middle, high school) was not found to influence the amount of change in the proportion of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings from pre-program to post-program (*H*(2)=0.558, p>0.05) (Kruskal-Wallis *H* test) (Appendix C, Table C-3).

Differences between Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program comparison schools

The proportion of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings increased more at three-year comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools (2.3 percentage points) than at three-year Achieve 180 Program schools (1.9 percentage points) from pre-program (2016–2017) to (2019–2020) post-program, expanding the gap (Figure 6).

#### Figure 6. Percentages of Teachers with Highly Effective or Effective Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) Ratings for Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 Schools by Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation, 2016– 2017 through 2019–2020



Sources: SAP Weekly Report 2016–2017 (8/15/2016 to 8/28/2017), 2017–2018 (8/14/2017 to 6/04/2018), 2018– 2019 (8/27/2018 to 6/03/2019), and 2019–2020 (8/12/2019 to 6/01/2020); TADS Tool 2016–2017 (10/23/2017), 2017–2018 (10/22/2018), 2018–2019 (12/04/2019), and 2019–2020 (11/06/2020); and 2019– 2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

- Notes: Due to changes in the Student Performance component of TADS from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020, comparisons are made with caution. No teachers at TCAH, a virtual, online, three-year program participant, and Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter school and one-year program participant (2017–2018) had TADS ratings. Data were available for one one-year school, Wisdom HS. No appropriate Title I school comparisons were listed for Bellfort ECC, Gregory-Lincoln PK-8, High School Ahead Academy MS, Liberty HS, Montgomery ES, TCAH, Victory Preparatory South HS, and Yates HS.
- The proportion of two-year teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings increased at non-Achieve 180 Program schools (0.3 percentage point) and decreased at Achieve 180 Program schools (2.0 percentage points) from pre-program (2017–2018) to (2019–2020) post-program, widening this gap by 24 percent (from a pre-program gap of 9.5 percentage points (79.5 Achieve 180 Program vs 89.0 non-Achieve 180 Program) to a post-program gap of 11.8 percentage points (89.3 percent Achieve 180 Program vs 77.5 percent non-Achieve 180 Program) (Figure 6).
- For three-year Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools, though both groups showed gains, the gap between them increased six percent in the proportion of

teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings from a pre-program gap of 6.3 percentage points (81.0 Achieve 180 Program vs 87.3 non-Achieve 180 Program) to a post-program gap of 6.7 percentage points (82.9 percent Achieve 180 Program vs 89.6 percent non-Achieve 180 Program) (Figure 6, p. 30).

- Additional comparative analyses of elementary, middle, high, and combined-level schools (with matched comparison schools) showed a gap reduction between Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison Title I, Part A non-Achieve 180 Program schools from pre-program to post-program proportions of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS rating at three-year elementary schools (3.4 percentage points from a pre-program gap of 11.8 to 8.4) and two-year combined-level school (3.8 percentage points from a pre-program gap of 10.0 to 6.2) and the one-year high school (1.6 percentage points from a pre-program gap of 2.1 to 0.5) (Appendix C, Table C-1 and C-2, pp. 122–125)
- The unfavorable trend of a widening gap between Achieve 180 Program and comparison schools in proportions of teachers with Highly Effective and Effective TADS ratings included (but was not limited to) three-year middle schools which had a pre-program rate that exceeded their comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools' rate by 0.8 percentage point in 2016–2017. Gap increases ranged from 1.8 percentage points (two-year elementary) to 9.6 percentage points (three-year middle schools and two-year middle schools) (Appendix C, Table C-1 and C-2).
- In 2016–2017 (pre-program), gaps between Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison schools in the proportions of teachers with Highly Effective and Effective TADS ratings ranged from 0.8 (three-year middle schools) to 11.8 (three-year elementary schools); by 2019–2020 (post-program), the gaps ranged from 0.5 (one-year high school) and 6.6 (three-year high schools) to 19.2 (two-year middle schools) (Appendix C, Table C-1 and C-2).

#### Student Attendance Rates, Chronic Absence Rates, and Graduation Rates

#### Progress made toward accomplishing Achieve 180 Program goals and objectives

Mean annual student attendance rates, chronic absence rates, graduation rates, and percentage-point changes from pre- to post-program rates (see arrows) are presented for three-year, two-year, and one-year Achieve 180 Program schools. Statistically significant changes (where applicable) for three-year and two-year participating schools (including by school and student group) are presented based on a sample of students with paired (i.e., a pre- and post-program) rates (**Figure 7**, p. 32). An asterisk identifies a statistically significant difference between paired pre-program and post-program ratings for the group. It was not possible to run this statistic for the two one-year schools that participated in different years.

#### Attendance Rates

- The average student attendance rate for the group of 43 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools increased 1.7 percentage points (from 93.8% in 2016–2017/pre-program baseline to 95.5% in 2019–2020/post-program in Year 3) (Figure 7).
- Overall, the mean student attendance rate increased for the group of 10 two-year Achieve 180 Program schools (1.6 percentage points from 94.7 percent in 2017–2018/pre-program baseline to 96.3 percent in 2019–2020/post-program, Year 3) (Figure 7).
- Each of the two one-year program school's student attendance rate also increased from pre-program to post-program: 1.3 percentage points from 90.3 percent in 2016–2017 pre-program baseline to 91.6 percent in 2017–2018 (post-program, Year 2) and 2.4 percentage points from 91.5 percent in 2018–2019 (pre-program baseline) to 93.9 percent in 2019–2020 (post-program, Year 3) (Figure 7).





Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019– 2020

- Notes: This figure is based on student-level data. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. // at the Y-axis indicates the numbers are truncated to begin at 90.0. Statistical significance (p<0.05) was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: two three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and two ^one-year high schools (one school with 2016–2017 to 2017–2018 rates, the other with 2018–2019 to 2019–2020 rates). \*Indicates statistically significant difference (p<0.05) between post-program ratings and pre-program ratings. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test effect size r: small effect <0.3, moderate effect 0.3 - <0.5, large effect >= 0.5.
- Wilcoxon results showed paired mean post-program student attendance rates were statistically significantly higher than pre-program rates, with a large program effect for both the 43 three-year schools (z=5.04, p<0.01; effect size r=0.54) and 10 two-year schools (z=2.807, p<0.01, effect size r=0.63). There were only two one-year schools, therefore, statistical significance of the change was not assessed. (See Appendix D, Table D-1 and Table D-2, pp. 127–129, for rates by group and program campus and Appendix D, Table D-3, p. 130, for statistical results by group.)</li>
- Annual student attendance rates from pre- to post-program are presented by school level for Achieve 180 Program schools based on their number of years of program participation in Figure 8 (p. 33). Each year, the mean attendance rate at Achieve 180 Program schools declined as the school level increased from elementary (mid-90's) to middle (low to mid-90's) to high school (high-80's to low-90's).
- Achieve 180 Program students' attendance rates increased most at three-year high schools from preprogram (baseline) to post-program (3.5 percentage points), followed by the one-year high school (Wisdom HS, 2.4 percentage points from 2018–2019 (pre-program baseline) to 2019–2020 (postprogram, Year 3)) and two-year middle schools (2.3 percentage points) (Figure 8).
- Achieve 180 Program three-year combined-level schools (0.3 percentage point) and two-year and threeyear elementary schools (0.8 percentage point and 0.7 percentage point, respectively) showed the smallest gains in student attendance rates from pre-program (baseline) to post-program when compared to students at middle or high schools (Figure 8).




Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019– 2020

- Notes: This figure is based on student-level data. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. // at the Y-axis indicates the numbers are truncated to begin at 88.0. Statistical significance (p<0.05) was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: two three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and two ^one-year high schools (one school with 2016–2017 to 2017–2018 rates, the other with 2018–2019 to 2019–2020 rates). \*Indicates statistically significantly difference (p<0.05) between post-program ratings and pre-program ratings for a paired student sample. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test effect size r: small effect <0.3, moderate effect 0.3 - <0.5, large effect >= 0.5.
- Among groups of sufficient size to asses statistical significance of student attendance rate increases from pre-program (baseline) to post-program (last year of program participation), statistically significant results were found for three-year elementary and high school students (z=3.784, p<0.01; effect size r=0.57 and z=2.934, p<0.01, effect size r=0.63, respectively) and two-year middle school students (z=2.032, p<0.05, effect size r=0.64), using paired samples (Figure 8; Appendix D, Table D-3, p. 130 for Wilcoxon statistical results by group).</li>
- In addition, school level (i.e., elementary, middle, high school) was found to significantly influence the amount of change made in student attendance rates from pre-program to post-program (*H*(2)=16.225, p<0.01) (Kruskal-Wallis *H* test). The higher the school level, the greater the gain in the attendance rate. Appendix D, Table D-3).
- The amount of change in student attendance from pre-program to post-program at high schools was
  ranked highest, followed by middle schools and elementary schools, with a statistically significant
  difference in the amount of change at Achieve 180 Program elementary schools versus high schools
  (p<0.01) (Appendix D, Table D-3).</li>

# Achieve 180 Program attendance rates by school and student group

• For the 43 three-year and 10 two-year schools, additional student-level analyses were conducted to determine the proportions of schools that had more students to show growth (Gains), more students to show no notable change (Ties), or more students to show declines (Losses) in their attendance rates during their school's three-year or two-year Achieve 180 Program participation. Analyses were

conducted for All Students, Race/Ethnicity, Economically Disadvantaged, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities (SWD) student groups.

For All Students, higher percentages of schools had more students with attendance rate gains by the end of their school's three-year (56%) or two-year (90%) Achieve 180 Program participation than the proportions of schools with more students whose rates either declined (42% and 10%, respectively) or remained constant (2% and none, respectively). For three-year schools, this represented only a six percentage-point difference in the proportions of schools that had more students to show attendance rate losses vs students to show gains (Figure 9) (Appendix D, Table D-4, p. 131).

Figure 9. Percentage of Achieve 180 Program Schools by the Type of Change that More Students Made in Their Attendance Rates and the Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation by Student Group



Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 Notes: This is based on student-level data. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Analyses were not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: two-year schools - Asian/Pacific Islanders; three- and two-year schools - Native Americans; and two-year schools - students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities.

- Except for Two or More Races/Ethnicities and White students at three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, across student subgroups and the number of years of school program participation, the largest proportions of schools had more students of each subgroup show gains in their attendance rates (than no change or losses) by the end of their school's three-year program participation (ranging from 56% of the schools of English Learners to 70% of the schools of Economically Disadvantaged students) (Figure 9) (Appendix D, Table D-4).
- For schools with two years of program participation, the proportions of schools with more students of each subgroup to show gains in their attendance rates (than no change or losses) ranged from English Learners at 70 percent of schools to 90 percent of the schools of Black/African American students, 90 percent of the schools of Economically Disadvantaged students, and 90 percent of the schools of Students with Disabilities (Figure 9) (Appendix D, Table D-4).
- For students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities at three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, the largest proportion (60%) of schools had more students show attendance rate losses (than gains or no change)

and the other 40 percent of their schools had more students show lower or stagnant attendance rates (20% each) at the end of their program participation (Figure 9, p. 34) (Appendix D, Table D-4, p. 131).

- For White students at three-year program schools, equal proportions of their schools (46%) had more White students show attendance rate gains (than no change or losses) and another 46 percent of their schools had more White students show losses (than gains or no change) in their attendance rates from pre-to post-program (Figure 9) (Appendix D, Table D-4).
- Aside from the All Students group with more attendance rate declines (than gains or no changes) at 42 percent of their three-year program schools and students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities with more attendance rate declines (than gains or no changes) at 60 percent of their three-year program schools, the next largest proportions of schools with more students to show attendance rate declines (vs no change or gains) by the end of three years of program participation were White students at 46 percent of their schools and English Learners at 40 percent of the schools they attended) (Figure 9) (Appendix D, Table D-4).
- The smallest groups of schools comprised schools with more Students with Disabilities (SWD) or more Economically Disadvantage students to show a decline in attendance rates (than no change or gains). This occurred at 26 percent of three-year schools with SWD and at 28 percent of three-year schools with Economically Disadvantaged students in addition to 10 percent of two-year schools with SWD and 10 percent of two-year schools with Economically Disadvantaged (Figure 9) (Appendix D, Table D-4).
- Furthermore, of the 31 three-year schools with statistically significant pre- to post-program changes in their attendance rates, Wilcoxon results showed 39 percent (n=12) had statistically significant gains and 58 percent (n=18) had statistically significant losses in attendance rates (Appendix D, **Table D-5**, p. 132).
- Additional results showed some pre- to post-program gains in student attendance rates at three-year Achieve 180 Program schools were statistically significant (p<0.05) among all the subgroups assessed except Asian/Pacific Islander students and students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities. Of the statistically significant changes in attendance rates, the gains ranged from 30 percent of Black/African American students' schools (n=6 of 20) and Students' with Disabilities schools (n=3 of 10) to 42 percent of the English Learners' schools (n=11 of 26) (Appendix D, Table D-5).
- Of the losses in student attendance rates at three-year schools, the proportions of schools with statistically significant losses ranged from 33 percent of schools for White students to 70 percent of schools for Students with Disabilities (Appendix D, Table D-5).
- Of the seven two-year schools with statistically significant pre- to post-program changes in their attendance rates, Wilcoxon results showed 14 percent (n=1) had statistically significant gains and 86 percent (n=6) had statistically significant losses in attendance rates (Appendix D, Table D-5).
- For two-year Achieve 180 Program schools that had statistically significant pre- to post-program changes in student attendance rates, the gains were statistically significant (p<0.05) only among Hispanic students at 33 percent of these schools (n=2 of 6) (Appendix D, Table D-5).
- The pre- to post-program losses in student attendance rates at some two-year Achieve 180 Program schools were statistically significant (p<0.05) among the subgroups assessed (except White students).</li>
   Of the schools with statistically significant changes, the proportions of schools with statistically significant

losses ranged from 67 percent of Hispanic students' schools (n=4 of 6) to 100 percent of Black/African American students' schools (n=4) Economically Disadvantaged students' schools (n=7), and Students' with Disabilities schools (n=6) with statistically significant rate changes from pre- to post-program (Appendix D, Table D-5).

- See Wilcoxon statistical results for changes in attendance rates by student group for three-year schools (Appendix D, **Table D-6** pp. 133–147) and two-year schools (Appendix D, **Table D-7** pp. 148–151).
- See Appendix D, **Table D-8**, p. 152 for Wilcoxon statistical results for changes in attendance rates by student group for one-year schools.

#### Differences between Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program comparison schools

• Student attendance rates increased more at three-year, two-year, and one-year Achieve 180 Program schools (1.7, 1.6 and 2.4 percentage points, respectively) than at their comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools (1.1, 0.7, and 1.8 percentage points, respectively) from pre-program to post-program, narrowing the attendance gaps (**Figure 10**).

# Figure 10. Student Attendance Rates for Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 Schools by Number of Years of Schools' Program Participation, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020



Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019– 2020

- Notes: This is based on student-level data. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. at the Yaxis indicates the numbers are truncated to begin at 90.0. Andicates two one-year high schools (one school with 2016–2017 to 2017–2018 rates, the other with 2018–2019 to 2019–2020 rates). No appropriate comparisons were listed for Bellfort ECC, Gregory-Lincoln PK-8, High School Ahead Academy MS, Liberty HS, Montgomery ES, TCAH, Victory Preparatory South HS, and Yates HS.
- Comparative analyses showed the gap in student attendance rates between three-year Achieve 180
  Program schools and comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools decreased 55 percent from a preprogram gap of 1.1 percentage points (93.8% vs 94.9%, respectively) to a post-program gap of 0.5
  percentage point (95.5% vs 96.0%, respectively) (Figure 10).

- Comparative analyses showed the gap in student attendance rates between two-year Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools decreased 64 percent from a preprogram gap of 1.4 percentage points (94.7% vs 96.1%, respectively) to a post-program gap of 0.5 percentage point (96.3% vs 96.8%, respectively) (Figure 10, p. 36).
- Comparative analyses showed the gap in student attendance rates between the one-year Achieve 180
  Program school and comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools decreased 60 percent from a preprogram gap of 1.0 percentage point (91.5% vs 92.5%, respectively) to a post-program gap of 0.4
  percentage point (94.3% vs 93.9%, respectively) (Figure 10).
- Additional comparative analyses of elementary, middle, high, and combined-level schools (with matched comparison schools) showed a gap closure (two-year combined schools) or reduction between Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison Title I, Part A non-Achieve 180 Program schools in student attendance rates from a pre-program to post-program for all school levels assessed at the three-year, two-year, and one-year schools. Gap reductions ranged from 0.1 percentage point (three-year elementary schools) to 1.3 percentage points (three-year high schools) (Appendix D, Table D-1 and D-2, pp. 127–129).

# Chronic Absence Rates

- The average annual chronic absence rate for the group of 43 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools decreased 6.5 percentage points (from 15.7 percent in 2016–2017 (pre-program baseline) to 9.2 percent in 2019–2020 (post-program in Year 3) (Figure 11) (Appendix D, Table D-9, pp. 153–154).
- Overall, the student chronic absence rate decreased for the group of 10 two-year Achieve 180 Program schools (5.6 percentage points from 11.6 percent in 2017–2018/pre-program baseline to 6.0 percent in 2019–2020 (post-program, Year 3) (Figure 11).



# Figure 11. Annual Chronic Absence Rates of Achieve 180 Program Students by Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019– 2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data. The chronic absence rate is the total number of students absent 10 percent or more of school days they are enrolled in the campus divided by the total number of students in membership in the campus 83% or more of the school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Statistical significance (p<0.05) was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: two three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and two ^one-year high schools (one school with 2016–2017 to 2017–2018 rates, the other with 2018–2019 to 2019–2020 rates). \*Indicates statistically significantly difference (p<0.05) between post-program ratings and pre-program ratings.

- Each of the two one-year program schools' chronic absence rates also decreased from pre-program to post-program: Victory Preparatory HS South (0.1 percentage point from 24.4% in 2016–2017 (pre-program baseline) to 24.3% in 2017–2018 (post-program, Year 2) and Wisdom HS (9.5 percentage points from 23.7% in 2018–2019 (pre-program baseline) to 14.2% in 2019–2020 (post-program, Year 3) (Figure 11, p. 37) (Appendix D, Table D-10, p. 155).
- Wilcoxon results showed the post-program chronic student absence rates were statistically significantly lower than pre-program rates, with a large program effect for both the three-year schools (z=-5.102, p<0.01; effect size r=0.55) and two-year schools (z=-2.803 p<0.01, effect size r=0.63). There were only two one-year schools, therefore, statistical significance of the change was not assessed. (See Appendix D, Table D-9, pp. 53–54, and Table D-10 for rates by group and program campus and Appendix D, Table D-3, p. 130, for statistical results by group.)</li>
- Annual chronic absence rates from pre- to post-program are presented by school level for Achieve 180 Program schools based on their number of years of program participation (**Figure 12**).

Figure 12. Annual Chronic Absence Rates of Achieve 180 Program Students by School Level and Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020



Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019– 2020

- Notes: This is based on student-level data. The chronic absence rate is the total number of students absent 10 percent or more of school days they are enrolled in the campus divided by the total number of students in membership in the campus 83% or more of the school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Statistical significance (p<0.05) was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: two three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and two ^one-year high schools (one school with 2016–2017 to 2017–2018 rates, the other with 2018–2019 to 2019–2020 rates). \*Indicates statistically significantly difference (p<0.05) between post-program ratings and pre-program ratings for a paired student sample.
  - Achieve 180 Program students' chronic absence rates decreased most at three-year high schools from pre-program (baseline) to post-program (13.5 percentage points), followed by the one-year high school (Wisdom HS, 9.5 percentage points from 2018–2019 to 2019–2020), two-year middle schools (8.5 percentage points) (Figure 12).

- Achieve 180 Program three-year elementary schools (2.9 percentage points), three-year combined-level schools (1.8 percentage points), and one-year high school (Victory Preparatory South HS, 0.1 percentage point from 2016–2017/pre-program, and 2017–2018/post-program) showed the smallest declines in chronic absence rates from pre-program (baseline) to post-program when compared to students at other program schools (Figure 12, p. 38).
- For groups of sufficient size to assess the statistical significance of chronic absence rate increases from pre-program (i.e., baseline) to post-program (i.e., last year of program participation), statistically significant results were found for three-year elementary and high school students (z=-4.059, p<0.01; effect size r=0.61 and z=-2.936, p<0.01, effect size r=0.63, respectively) and two-year middle school students (z=-2.023, p<0.05, effect size r=0.64) (Figure 12 and Appendix D, Table D-3, p. 130 for Wilcoxon statistical results by group).</li>
- In addition, school level (i.e., elementary, middle, high school) was found to significantly influence the amount of change made in student chronic absence rates from pre-program to post-program (*H*(2)=19.419, p<0.01) (Kruskal-Wallis *H* test) (Appendix D, Table D-3).
- The amount of change in chronic absence rates from pre-program to post-program at high schools was ranked highest, followed by middle schools and elementary schools, with statistically significant differences in the amount of change that occurred at Achieve 180 Program elementary versus high schools (p<0.01) and at Achieve 180 Program middle versus high schools (p<0.05). (See Appendix D, Table D-9 and Table D-10, pp. 153–155, for ratings by group and program campus and Appendix D, Table D-3 for statistical results).</li>

#### Differences between Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program comparison schools





Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 Notes: This is based on student-level data. The chronic absence rate is the total number of students absent 10 percent or more of school days they are enrolled in the campus divided by the total number of students in membership in the campus 83% or more of the school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. ATwo one-year high schools (one school with 2016–2017 to 2017–2018 rates, the other with 2018–2019 to 2019–2020 rates). No appropriate comparisons were listed for Bellfort ECC, Gregory-Lincoln PK-8, High School Ahead Academy MS, Liberty HS, Montgomery ES, TCAH, Victory Preparatory South HS (2017–2018 one-year school), and Yates HS.

- Students' chronic absence rates improved more at three-year, two-year, and one-year Achieve 180 Program schools (6.5, 5.6, and 9.5 percentage points, respectively) than at their comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools (3.4, 2.7, and 7.7 percentage points, respectively) from pre-program to post-program (**Figure 13**, p. 39).
- Achieve 180 Program gains narrowed the chronic absence gap between their three-year and their comparison schools by 55 percent (from 5.6 to 2.5 percentage points), between two-year schools and their comparison schools by 59 percent (from 4.9 to 2.0 percentage points), and between one one-year Achieve 180 Program school and its comparison non-Achieve 180 schools by 46 percent from 3.9 to 2.1 percentage points from pre-program in 2018–2019 to post-program in 2019–2020 (Figure 13).
- Additional comparative analyses of elementary, middle, high, and combined-level schools (with matched comparison schools) showed gap reductions in chronic absence rates between Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison Title I, Part A non-Achieve 180 Program schools from pre-program to post-program rates at the three-year, two-year, and one-year schools assessed. Gap reductions at three-year schools ranged from 1.3 percentage points (middle schools) to 4.9 percentage points (high schools), at two-year schools ranged from 1.4 percentage points (elementary schools) to 3.5 percentage points (middle schools) and showed a 1.8 percentage-point gap reduction at one-year high schools (Appendix D, Table D-9 and Table D-10, pp. 153–155).

#### Graduation Rates (Four-year and Five-year State Rates with Exclusions)

#### Progress made toward accomplishing Achieve 180 Program goals and objectives

Graduation rates are lagging indicators that become available a year following each cohort's graduation. For Achieve 180 Program graduates in high schools and combined-level schools, four-year graduation rates were available for the Class of 2017 (pre-program) through the Class of 2019 and five-year graduation data were available for the Class of 2017 (2016–2017) through the Class of 2018. Within these years, annual graduation rates and percentage-point changes (see arrows) are presented for 12 three-year and two one-year Achieve 180 Program schools. There were no two-year program schools with high school-level participants. Post-program results were available for one one-year 2017–2018 participant, but not for the one-year 2019–2020 school (i.e., Class of 2020 for four-year rate and Class of 2021 for five-year rates). An asterisk identifies a statistically significant change (where applicable) for three-year and two-year participating schools based on a sample of students with paired (i.e., a pre- and post-program) rates. It was not possible to run this statistic for the two one-year schools that participated in different years.

#### Four-Year Rates

- For the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program combined-level and high schools, the mean four-year graduation rate at baseline (Class of 2017) increased 0.1 percentage point after the first year of the program (Class 2018) and achieved an overall increase of 1.5 percentage points after the program's second year (Class of 2019) (**Figure 14**, p. 41). Post-program rates for the Class of 2020 are pending (**Appendix E, Table E-1**, p. 157).
- Results for a one-year school, Victory Preparatory South HS (2017–2018 participant), showed a 25.9 percentage-point gain in its four-year graduation rate from baseline rate (Class of 2017) to post-program (Class of 2018) (Figure 14) (Appendix E, Table E-1).



# Figure 14. Four-Year Grauation Rates of Achieve 180 Program Students by Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation, Class of 2017 through Class of 2019

Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 8/6/2018; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/6/2019; TEA, Confidential Class of 2019 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

- Notes: For state accountability four-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,310 was used for the HISD Class of 2017, a class size of 12,889 was used for the HISD Class of 2018, and a class size of 12,997 was used for the HISD Class of 2019. Data are presented for one one-year high school (Class of 2017 (pre) and Class of 2018 (post). Only the baseline four-year graduation rate (Class of 2019) was available for the other one-year 2019–2020 school (not presented).
- Chi-Square results showed the change in four-year graduation rates, while favorable for the three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, the post-program rate was not statistically significantly higher than the pre-program rates (chi square(1)=1.88, p>0.05). Post-program data are pending for these schools. (See Appendix E, **Table E-2**, p. 158–162 for rates by group and campus.)

#### Achieve 180 Program four-year graduation rates by student group Race/Ethnicity

- Four-year graduation rates increased for All Students and for each student group assessed from preprogram (Class of 2017) to the second year of the program (Class of 2019), except for Black/African American students who showed a 1.0 percentage point decline (**Figure 15**, p. 42).
- The gain in the four-year graduation rate was statistically significant (p<0.01) for White students from pre-program (Class of 2017) to the second year of the program (Class of 2019) (Figure 15).
- Four-year graduation rate increases for the assessed student groups ranged from students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities (0.3 percentage point) to Native American students (35.1 percentage points) (Figure 15).

# Economically Disadvantaged Students, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities

• Four-year graduation rates increased from pre-program (Class of 2017) to the second year of the program (Class of 2019) for the three student groups assessed here, most for English Learners and least for Students with Disabilities (SWD): Economically Disadvantaged students (1.2 percentage points), English Learners (1.6 percentage points), and SWD (0.8 percentage point) (Figure 15).



Figure 15. Achieve 180 Program Schools Four-Year Graduation Rates by Student Group

- Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 8/6/2018; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/6/2019; TEA, Confidential Class of 2019 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020
- Note: For state accountability four-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,310 was used for the HISD Class of 2017 completion and a class size of 12,997 was used for the HISD Class of 2019. Results are not reported for groups of fewer than five students.

#### Achieve 180 Program four-year graduation rates by school and student group

- Of the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, 33.3 percent of schools (n=4) showed an increase in the four-year graduation rate for All Students (Figure 16, p. 43). Additional results showed All Students' rate increases ranged from 0.8 percentage point to 10.6 percentage points, with statistically significant gains (p<0.05) at two schools. The remaining 66.7 percent of schools (n=8) showed a decline, ranging from 0.1 percentage point to 6.3 percentage points from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2, p. 158–162).
- Of the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools with Black/African American students, 41.7 percent of schools (n=5) showed an increase in the four-year graduation rate of these students, ranging from 1.3 percentage points to 15.8 percentage points (with statistically significant gains (p<0.05) at one school), while another 50.0 percent of schools (n=6) showed a decline, ranging from 4.1 percentage points to 18.0 percentage points, and one school's rate remained constant with no graduates, after two years of the program from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2).</li>
- At the one three-year Achieve 180 Program school with Native American students, there was a 22.5 percentage-point increase in the four-year graduation rate of these students, after two years of the program from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2).
- At the one three-year Achieve 180 Program school with students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities, there was a 1.0 percentage-point increase in these students' four-year graduation rate, after two years of the program from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2).





Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 8/6/2018; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/6/2019; TEA, Confidential Class of 2019 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

- Notes: For state accountability four-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,310 was used for the HISD Class of 2017 completion and a class size of 12,997 was used for the HISD Class of 2019. Results are not reported for groups of fewer than five students. Only one campus had at least five Native American students and one campus had at least five students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities; therefore, the results are reported in bullets immediately preceding this graph.
- Of the three three-year Achieve 180 Program schools with pre- and post-program rates for Asian/Pacific Islander students, 66.7 percent (n=2) showed an increase in these students' four-year graduation rate (4.4 percentage points and 10.0 percentage points, respectively) while the other school (33.3 percent) showed a 4.7 percentage-point decline, after two years of the program from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2, p. 158–162).
- Of the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools with Hispanic students, 50.0 percent (n=6) showed an increase in the four-year graduation rate of Hispanic students, ranging from 0.5 percentage point to 15.1 percentage points (with statistically significant gains (p<0.05) at one school), while the remaining 50.0 percent of the schools showed a decline, ranging from 0.2 percentage point to 16.6 percentage points, after two years of the program from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2).
- Of the three three-year Achieve 180 Program schools with pre- and post-program rates for White students, 66.7 percent of schools (n=2) showed an increase in White students' four-year graduation rate (statistically significant (p<0.05) 8.5 percentage points and 45.5 percentage points, respectively) while the other school (33.3 percent) showed a 24.4 percentage-point decline, after two years of the program from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2).

# Economically Disadvantage Students

After two years of the program, of the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, 41.7 percent of the schools (n=5) showed an increase in the four-year graduation rate of Economically Disadvantaged students, ranging from 0.9 percentage point to 14.3 percentage points (with statistically significant gains (p<0.05) at two schools). The remaining 58.3 percent of schools showed a decline in these students' four-year graduation, ranging from 0.4 percentage point to 5.1 percentage points from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2).</li>

#### **English Learners**

After two years of the program, of the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, 66.7 percent (n=8) showed an increase in the four-year graduation rate of English Learners, ranging from 2.6 percentage points to 38.9 percentage points. The remaining 33.3 percent of schools showed a decline in these students' four-year graduation, ranging from 0.2 percentage point to 9.1 percentage points from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2, p. 158–162).

#### Students with Disabilities (SWD)

After two years of the program, of the 11 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, 45.5 percent (n=5) showed an increase in the four-year graduation rate of SWD, ranging from 2.8 percentage points to 28.9 percentage points (with a statistically significant gain (p<0.05) at one school). The remaining 54.5 percent of schools showed a decline in these students' four-year graduation, ranging from 1.1 percentage points to 18.6 percentage points from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2019 (Appendix E, Table E-2).</li>

#### One-year Achieve 180 Program School by Student Group

At the one-year school with pre- and post-program data available, an increase in the four-year graduation rate was found for all groups with five or more students (All Students, 25.9 percentage points; Black/African American students, 22.1 percentage points; Hispanic students, 24.8 percentage points; Economically Disadvantaged students, 23.8 percentage points; and English Learners, 51.4 percentage points), with statistically significant increases (p<0.05) found for all groups except the English Learners from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2018 (Appendix E, Table E-3, p. 163).</li>

#### Differences between Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program comparison schools

• While the mean four-year graduation rate increased 1.5 percentage points for three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, it decreased 0.1 percentage point at their comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools, narrowing the gap by 9.7 percent from 16.5 to 14.9 percentage points, from pre-program (Class of 2017) to post-program (Class of 2019) (**Figure 17**) (Appendix E, Table E-1, p. 157).



# Figure 17. Annual Four-Year Graduation Rates for Three-year Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 Schools, Class of 2017 through Class of 2019

- Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 8/6/2018; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/6/2019; TEA, Confidential Class of 2019 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020
- Notes: For state accountability four-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,310 was used for the HISD Class of 2017, a class size of 12,889 was used for the HISD Class of 2018, and a class size of 12,997 was used for the HISD Class of 2019. No appropriate comparisons were listed for Liberty HS, TCAH, Victory Preparatory South HS, and Yates HS. Only the baseline four-year graduation rate of 62.3 (Class of 2019) was available for the other one-year 2019–2020 program school and its comparisons' rate of 87.0 (not presented in graph).

• Results are not presented for the one-year 2017–2018 Achieve 180 Program school which had no comparison group schools or for the 2019–2020 program participant because its post-program four-year graduation rates are pending for the Class of 2020.

#### Five-Year Rates

- At baseline (Class of 2017), the mean five-year graduation rate for the 12 three-year schools in the Achieve 180 Program was 0.9 percentage point higher than the rate following the first year of the program (Class of 2018) (Figure 18). Additional results are pending. (For school-level results, see Appendix E, Table E-4, p. 164.)
- Five-year graduation results were available only for the two one-year school, Victory Preparatory South HS (2017–2018 participant), showing a 7.3 percentage-point increase in the five-year graduation rate from its baseline rate (Class of 2017) to its post-program rate (Class of 2018) (Figure 18).

# Figure 18. Five-Year Grauation Rates of Achieve 180 Program Students by Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation, Class of 2017 and Class of 2018



Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, updated on 6/6/2019; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

Notes: For state accountability five-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,204 was used for HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,789 was used for HISD Class of 2018.

#### Achieve 180 Program five-year graduation rates by student group

• The five-year graduation rates decreased from pre-program (Class of 2017) to one year after the program began (Class of 2018) for all race/ethnic groups assessed, except for Asian/Pacific Islander (5.1 p-point gain) and White (1.0 p-point gain) students (**Figure 19**, p. 46).

#### Race/Ethnicity

• Decreases in five-year graduation rates from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2018 ranged from 0.9 percentage point (All Students) and 1.1 percentage points (Hispanic students) to 10.4 percentage points (students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities) (Figure 19).

#### Economically Disadvantaged Students, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities

• Five-year graduation rates increased for Economically Disadvantaged students (0.1 p-point gain) from pre-program (Class of 2017) to after the first year of the program (Class of 2018), while rates decreased for English Learners (1.3 percentage points) and SWD (1.7 percentage points) (Figure 19).





Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, updated on 6/6/2019; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

Note: For state accountability five-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,204 was used for HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,789 was used for HISD Class of 2018. Results are not reported for groups of fewer than five students.

Achieve 180 Program five-year graduation rates by school and student group

- Of the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, the increase in the five-year graduation rate was statistically significant (p<0.05) for Economically Disadvantaged students at one school from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2018 (Appendix E, **Table E-5**, p. 165–169).
- Of the 12 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, the increase in the five-year graduation rate was statistically significant (p<0.05) for Students with Disabilities at two schools from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2018 (Appendix E, Table E-5).

# One-year Achieve 180 Program School by Student Group

- At the one-year school with pre- and post-program data available, an increase in the five-year graduation rate was found for all groups with five or more students (All Students, 7.3 percentage points; Black/African American students, 0.6 percentage point; Hispanic students, 7.0 percentage points; Economically Disadvantaged students, 12.3 percentage points; and English Learners, 11.4 percentage points), with the only statistically significant increase (p<0.05) found for Economically Disadvantaged students of 2017 to the Class of 2018 (Appendix E, Table E-6, p. 170).</li>
- Appendix E Table E-5 and Table E-6 provide Achieve 180 Program school-level five-year graduation Chi-Square results by school and student group.

#### Differences between Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program comparison schools.

• At three-year Achieve 180 Program schools, the mean five-year graduation rate decreased 0.9 percentage point from pre-program (Class of 2017) to the Class of 2018 in Year 2, while it increased 0.3

percentage point at their comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools and widened the gap by 9.5 percent from 12.6 to 13.8 percentage points (**Figure 20**).

• No comparison school data were available for one one-year Achieve 180 Program schools (Figure 20).

#### Figure 20. Annual Five-Year Rates for Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 Schools by Number of Years of Their Schools' Program Participation, Class of 2017 and Class of 2018



Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, updated on 6/6/2019; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

Note: For state accountability five-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,204 was used for HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,789 was used for HISD Class of 2018. No appropriate comparisons were listed for Liberty HS, TCAH, Victory Preparatory South HS, and Yates HS.

# Achieve 180 Program Impact on Student Outcomes (DLA)

# What was the impact of the Achieve 180 Program on Achieve 180 Program students' achievement in 2019–2020?

#### Treatment effects on student achievement – Student Matching

To measure the impact of the Achieve 180 Program's students' performance on 2019–2020 District-level Assessments (DLA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics, Achieve 180 Program (treatment) students were matched with non-Achieve 180 Program (control) students of similar background characteristics from TEA comparison group schools that were also Title I, Part A schools (Appendix A, Table A-3, pp. 100–102). The student characteristics used to create the similar groups included 2019 State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) performance, gender, gifted/talented, disability, economic disadvantage, and at-risk status. Students were matched to increase the likelihood that the groups were comparable (aside from program participation status). This allowed for measurement of the program's effects at Achieve 180 Program schools. The (baseline) before-matching results include all students in the respective groups. After-matching results include only the matched students. The difference between the groups' (treatment vs control) before matching performance vs after matching performance provides an estimate of the program's impact on the treated group's performance.

The levels of balance between the Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program groups' background characteristics were assessed before and after matching, with more balance found for four (67%) of the six background factors after matching than before matching students for analyses of program impact on their ELA and mathematics scores (Figure 21, p. 48, Figure 22, p. 49, and Figure 23, p. 50) (Appendix F, Table F-1, p. 171).

 For the ELA analyses (Figure 21), smaller differences in the background characteristics between the Achieve 180 Program (treatment) and non-Achieve 180 Program (control) groups were apparent after matching than before matching the students on gender (0.1 percentage point after vs 1.1 percentage points before), Students with Disabilities (0.6 percentage point after vs 1.4 percentage points before), and at risk (0.3 percentage point after vs 0.7 percentage point before).

# Figure 21. Student Matching Results for Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 School Students by Background Characteristic for DLA English Language Arts Analyses



Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; TEA-ETS summary report, January 2021, TEA-ETS 2020 Student Data Files Note: Propensity score matching with replacement was used to match students on the identified background characteristics, including their prior State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) performance in the related subject area for students in grades 3–8 and STAAR EOC exams for high school students (excludes STAAR Alt. 2 Tests).

- For ELA analyses, differences increased between the treatment and control groups after matching vs before matching for Gifted/Talented status (2.0 percentage points vs 1.8 percentage points before matching) and Economically Disadvantaged status (0.7 percentage point after matching vs 0.2 percentage point before matching) (Figure 21).
- After matching for ELA analyses, the greatest differences between the Achieve 180 Program (treatment) and non-Achieve 180 Program (control) groups' background characteristics were in the proportions of Gifted/Talented students (2.0 percentage points greater for non-Achieve 180 Program students) and Economically Disadvantaged students (0.7 percentage point greater for non-Achieve 180 Program students) (Figure 21).
- For the mathematics analyses (Figure 22, p. 49), smaller differences in background characteristics between the Achieve 180 Program (treatment) and non-Achieve 180 Program (control) groups were apparent after matching students than before matching the students on gender (no difference after vs 1.0 percentage point before), Gifted/Talented status (1.0 percentage point after vs 1.8 percentage points before), disability status (1.1 percentage points after vs 1.4 percentage points before, and at risk status (0.5 percentage point after vs 0.7 percentage point before).

• For the mathematics analyses, the difference in background characteristics between the Achieve 180 Program (treatment) and non-Achieve 180 Program (control) groups in the proportions of Economically Disadvantaged students increased (1.0 percentage point after matching vs 0.2 percentage point before matching) (Figure 22).

# Figure 22. Student Matching Results for Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 School Students by Background Characteristic for 2019–2020 DLA Mathematics Analyses



# After Matching



Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; TEA-ETS summary report, January 2021, TEA-ETS 2020 Student Data Files Note: Propensity score matching with replacement was used to match students on the identified background characteristics, including their prior State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) performance in the related subject area for students in grades 3–8 and STAAR EOC exams for high school students (excludes STAAR Alt. 2 Tests).

- Matching students on their prior 2019 STAAR ELA test scores resulted in a smaller difference between the Achieve 180 Program (treatment) and non-Achieve 180 Program (control) groups' ELA scores after matching than before matching (1.0 point after vs 129 points before) (Figure 23, p. 50).
- Matching students on their prior 2019 STAAR mathematics scores (Figure 23) resulted in a persistent seven-point gap difference between the Achieve 180 Program (treatment) and non-Achieve 180 Program (control) groups' mathematics scores. However, the difference that had been in favor of Achieve 180 Program students, before matching, was in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students, after matching the students.



# Figure 23. 2019 STAAR Student Matching Results for Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 School Students by Background Characteristic

Source: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; TEA-ETS summary report, January 2021, TEA-ETS 2020 Student Data Files Note: Propensity score matching with replacement was used to match students on the identified background characteristics, including their prior State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) performance in the related subject area for students in grades 3–8 and STAAR EOC exams for high school students (excludes STAAR Alt. 2 Tests).

#### Treatment effects on student achievement – District-Level Assessments (DLA), 2019–2020

# Program-wide, English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics, English Version Results Only

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, TEA waived the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) testing requirement for 2019–2020. Therefore, student achievement scores presented here are based on District-level assessments (DLA) which are State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR)-like curriculum-based assessments. It is important to note that students' DLA test participation was impacted largely by the immeasurable challenges facing schools, families, and students due to the pandemic and district policy which allows campuses to determine student participation in the DLA. Given these limitations, students' mean DLA scores for the percentage of test items answered correctly are presented here with caution.

To provide measurements of program effects on student academic performance at the targeted schools, DLA results are used in this analysis for Achieve 180 Program students and non-Achieve 180 Program students who were matched on their background characteristics to produce similar groups for comparisons (treatment and control, respectively). The before-matching results (used as a baseline) include all students in the respective groups and after-matching results (used as post-program results) include only matched students. The difference between the groups' (treatment vs control) before-matching performance and after-matching performance provides an estimate of the program's impact on the treated group's performance.

- Before and after matching the students, the percentages of correct items on DLA in Language Arts (ELA) on average were about 52–54 percent for Achieve 180 Program students and about 55–57 percent for non-Achieve 180 Program students, overall, with lower average percentages of correct items on DLA in mathematics for the groups (44–45% and 43–51%, respectively) (Figure 24, p. 51).
- Achieve 180 Program students' performance on DLA in English language Arts (ELA) was 4.7 points lower than their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' performance before matching (M=52.2, S.D.=20.297 vs M=56.9, S.D.=21.166, respectively) and 0.5 points lower than them after matching (M=54.2, S.D.=19.755 vs M=54.7, S.D.=20.380, respectively) (Figure 24 and Appendix F, Table F-2, p. 172).

- Favorably, the after matching results show there was a 4.2-point (89%) reduction in the initial 4.7-point gap between the Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program students' mean DLA ELA scores, which suggests performance benefits of the Achieve 180 Program for its students' performance on DLA ELA exams (Figure 24).
- The difference between the groups on DLA ELA exams was found to be statistically significant before matching (*t*(41,911)=24.280, p<.01) and after matching (*t*(29,166)=-2.152, p<0.05) (Figure 24 and Appendix F, Table F-2).





Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520 Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching Results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

- On DLA in mathematics before matching, Achieve 180 Program students' mean score was 6.8 points lower than their matched non-Achieve 180 Program peers' mean score (M=43.9, S.D.=20.287 vs M=50.7, S.D.=22.779, respectively), with a statistically significant difference between the groups (*t*(35,135)= 31.315, p<.01) (Figure 24 and Appendix F, Table F-2).</li>
- After matching students, an 8.8-point change in the initial 6.8-point performance gap between the groups was evident, with Achieve 180 Program students' mean mathematics DLA score exceeding their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' mean score by two points (M=44.8, S.D.=19.952 vs M=42.8, S.D.=20.386, respectively) (Figure 24 and Appendix F, Table F-2).
- The initial (before matching) achievement gap in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students was closed (after matching) and the new performance gap in favor of Achieve 180 Program students was found to be of statistical significance (*t*(2,2718)=7.504, p<.01), which suggests program benefits for Achieve 180 Program students who took DLA mathematics exams (Figure 24 and Appendix F, Table F-2).

# *Tier-level, DLA English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics, English Version Results Tier 3*

Tier 3 Achieve 180 Program students' performance on DLA in ELA was lower than their matched non-Achieve 180 Program peers' performance before matching (M=51.2, S.D.=19.959 vs M=54.3, S.D.=20.985, respectively) and after matching (M=52.9, S.D.=19.706 vs M=54.3, S.D.=20.360,

respectively). Each difference between the groups was statistically significant before (t(7862)=7.788, p<.01) and after matching (t(6266)=-2.856, p<.01) (**Figure 25** and Appendix F, **Table F-3**, p. 173).



### Figure 25. Results of Treatment Effects Analyses on 2019–2020 DLA ELA and Mathematics Performance Using Student Matching Results by Achieve 180 Program Tier 3

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520 Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching Results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

- Favorably, after-matching results between Tier 3 students with non-program students, showed a 1.7-point (55%) reduction in the initial 3.1-point performance gap in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students, resulting in a smaller gap of 1.4 points, which suggests the Achieve 180 Program seemed to have benefits for Tier 3 students who took DLA in ELA (Figure 25).
- For Tier 3's DLA Mathematics performance, the before-matching 3.2-point performance gap in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students vs Achieve 180 Program students (M=42.7, S.D.=19.704 vs M=39.5, S.D.=18.084, respectively) was closed after matching program students with non-program students. Indicative of favorable program effects, after matching, a 5.7-point change in the gap resulted in a 2.5-point higher mean score for Achieve 180 students than for non-Achieve 180 Program students (M=40.3, S.D.=18.128 vs M=37.8, S.D.=16.613, respectively) (Figure 25 and Appendix F, Table F-4, p. 174).
- Analysis of Tier 3's DLA Mathematics performance, also showed the difference between the groups was statistically significant before matching (*t*(6628)=8.103, p<.01) in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students and after matching (*t*(5214)=5.362, p<.01) in favor of Achieve 180 Program students, which further highlights the program's benefits (Figure 25 and Appendix F, Table F-4).</li>

# Tier 3 School-level Results

- At five (62.5%) of the eight Tier 3 schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap reduction (n=4) or gap closure (n=1) between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA ELA performance (Appendix F, **Table F-5**, pp. 175–179).
- At four (50.0%) of the eight Tier 3 schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap closure between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA mathematics performance (Appendix F, **Table F-6**, pp. 180–184).

# Tier 2

 Before matching Tier 2 Achieve 180 Program students with their non-Achieve 180 peers for comparison, the program's students' performance on DLA in ELA was lower than their peers' performance (M=48.3, S.D.=20.973 vs M=53.9, S.D.=20.755, respectively) and remained lower after matching (M=50.5, S.D.=20.392 vs M=51.2, S.D.=20.512, respectively). However, a statistically significant difference between the groups was found only before matching (t(6890)=13.552, p<.01) and not after matching the students (t(5090)=-1.257, p>.05) (**Figure 26** and Appendix F, Table F-3, p. 173).



#### Figure 26. Results of Treatment Effects Analyses on 2019–2020 DLA ELA and Mathematics Performance Using Student Matching Results by Achieve 180 Program Tier 2

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520

Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching Results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

- Favorably, after matching program Tier 2 students with non-program students for DLA ELA analyses, there was a 4.9-point (88%) gap reduction in the initial 5.6-point difference, leaving a 0.7-point gap between the Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program students' mean scores, which suggests a positive impact of the Achieve 180 Program on its students' DLA ELA performance (Figure 26).
- Showing a positive program impact for Tier 2 students' DLA Mathematics performance, the initial 3.3-point performance gap in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students vs Achieve 180 Program students (M=47.5, S.D.=22.646 vs M=44.2, S.D.=20.833, respectively) was closed after matching, resulting a 0.9 point higher mean score for Achieve 180 students compared to their non-Achieve 180 Program peers (M=46.1, S.D.=20.439 vs M=45.2, S.D.=22.961, respectively) (Figure 26 and Table F-4, p. 174).
- There was a statistically significant difference between the groups' DLA Mathematics performances before matching, when non-Achieve 180 Program students' mean score was higher Tier 2's Achieve 180 Program students (*t*(5560)=6.661, p<.01), but the difference between the groups was not statistically significant after matching the students (*t*(3626)=1.191, p>.05), when Achieve 180 Program students' mean score exceeded than their non-program peers' (Figure 26 and Table F-4).

# Tier 2 School-level Results

- At seven (63.6%) of the 11 Tier 2 schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap reduction (n=3) or gap closure (n=4) between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA ELA performance (Appendix F, Table F-5, pp. 175–179).
- At four (36.4%) of the 11 Tier 2 schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap closure between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA mathematics performance (Appendix F, Table F-5, pp. 175–179).

# Tier 1

- For Tier 1's DLA in ELA, the initial 1.5-point performance gap in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students vs Achieve 180 Program students (M=57.2, S.D.=21.384 vs M=55.7, S.D.=19.325, respectively) was closed after matching program students with non-program students. Favorably, this resulted in a 1.3 point higher mean score for Achieve 180 students than for non-Achieve 180 Program students after matching (M=57.0, S.D.=18.930 vs M=55.7, S.D.=20.648, respectively) (Figure 27 and Appendix F, Table F-3, p. 173).
- Highlighting the positive effect of the program on Tier 1 students' DLA ELA scores, the difference between the groups was not only found to be of statistical significance before matching when non-Achieve 180 Program students' performance exceeded Achieve 180 Program students (*t*(8581)=4.312, p<.01) but was also statistically significant after matching when Achieve 180 Program students' scores exceeded their non-Achieve 180 Program peers (*t*(7348)=2.827, p<.01) (Figure 27 and Appendix F, Table F-3).</li>
- For Tier 1's DLA in mathematics, the initial 3.3-point performance gap in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students vs Achieve 180 Program students (M=49.3, S.D.=22.275 vs M=46.0, S.D.=20.177 respectively) was closed after matching program students with non-program students, resulting a 7.1point change in the gap. Favorably, this resulted in a 3.8 point higher mean DLA mathematics score for Achieve 180 students than for non-Achieve 180 Program students after matching (M=46.3, S.D.=19.896 vs M=42.5, S.D.=20.165, respectively) (Figure 27 and Appendix F, Table F-4, p. 174).

#### Figure 27. Results of Treatment Effects Analyses on 2019–2020 DLA ELA and Mathematics Performance Using Student Matching Results by Achieve 180 Program Tier 1



Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520 Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching Results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

Highlighting the statistical significance of the positive effect of the program on Tier 1 students' DLA mathematics scores, the difference between the groups was found to be of statistical significance before matching, when non-Achieve 180 Program students' performance exceeded Achieve 180 Program students (*t*(7639)=9.025, p<.01), as well as after matching when Achieve 180 Program students' scores exceeded their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' (*t*(6542)=7.693, p<.01) (Figure 27 and Appendix F, Table F-4).</li>

# Tier 1 School-level Results

• At six (54.5%) of the 11 Tier 1 schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap reduction (n=1) or gap closure (n=5) between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA ELA performance (Appendix F, Table F-5, pp. 175–179).

• At seven (63.6%) of the 11 Tier 1 schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap closure between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA mathematics performance (Appendix F, Table F-6, pp. 180–184).

#### Area Support Tier

The Area Support students' performance on DLA in ELA was lower than their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' performance before matching (M=49.7, S.D.=20.693 vs M=57.9, S.D.=21.373, respectively) as well as after matching (M=52.4, S.D.=20.221 vs M=55.2, S.D.=20.303, respectively) (Figure 28 and Table F-5).

#### Figure 28. Results of Treatment Effects Analyses on 2019–2020 DLA ELA and Mathematics Performance Using Student Matching Results by Achieve 180 Program Area Support Tier



Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520

Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching Results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

- Showing favorable program effects, after matching Area Support students with their non-program peers for DLA ELA analyses, there was a 5.4-point (66%) gap reduction in the initial 8.2-point difference between the groups' mean scores, resulting in a mean score for Achieve 180 students that was 2.8 points lower vs 8.2 points lower than their non-program peers' score after matching. However, the difference between the groups was statistically significant before matching (*t*(5857)=20.179, p<.01) as well as after matching (*t*(4886)=-4.745, p<.01) (Figure 28 and Appendix F, Table F-3, p. 173).</li>
- For DLA in mathematics, before matching and after matching Area Support students with their non-Achieve 180 peers, Achieve 180 Program students' performance was lower than their peers' performance (M=41.7, S.D.=20.289 vs M=52.5, S.D.=23.481, respectively) and (M=43.4, S.D.=20.014 vs M=45.1, S.D.=21.242, respectively). Each difference between the groups was found to be statistically significant before matching (t(5526)=25.204, p<.01) as well as after matching (t(4180)=-2.5814, p<0.05) (Figure 28 and Appendix F, Table F-4, p. 174).</li>
- As an indication of benefits of the Achieve 180 Program intervention for Area Support students' DLA mathematics performance, there was a 9.1-point (84%) gap reduction in the initial 10.8-point difference between the Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 Program students' mean scores, resulting in a mean score that was 1.7 points lower for Achieve 180 students than their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' score after matching (Figure 28, p. 55).

### Area Support School-level Results

- At six (60.0%) of the 10 Area Support schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap reduction (n=3) or gap closure (n=3) between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA ELA performance (Appendix F, Table F-5, pp. 175–179).
- At four (40.0%) of the 10 Area Support schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap closure between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA mathematics performance (Appendix F, Table F-6, pp. 180–184).

# Light Support Tier

For Light Support students' DLA performance in ELA, the initial 0.8-point performance gap in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students vs Achieve 180 Program students (M=56.0, S.D.=20.697 vs M=55.2, S.D.=19.615, respectively) was closed after matching, with a 1.2-point difference in the gap. As a favorable indication of benefits of the program, this resulted in a 0.4 point higher mean score for Achieve 180 students than for non-Achieve 180 Program students (M=57.2, S.D.=18.953 vs M=56.8, S.D.=19572, respectively) (Figure 29 and Appendix F, Table F-3, p. 173).

### Figure 29. Results of Treatment Effects Analyses on 2019–2020 DLA ELA and Mathematics Performance Using Student Matching Results by Achieve 180 Program Light Support Tier



Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520

Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching Results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

- Though a statistically significant difference between the Light Support students and non-program students was found on DLA ELA exam scores before matching when the non-Achieve 180 Program students' score exceeded Achieve 180 Program students' score (*t*(6682)=2.195, p<0.05), a statistical significance between the groups was not evident after matching the students, indicative of benefits for Achieve 180 Program students (*t*(5568)=0.650, p>.05) (Figure 29 and Appendix F, Table F-3).
- For Light Support students' scores on DLA in mathematics, the initial 2.6-point performance gap in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students vs Achieve 180 Program students (M=51.3, S.D.=22.966 vs M=48.7, S.D.=21.218, respectively) was closed after matching, showing a 6.1-point difference in the gap (Figure 29 and Appendix F, Table F-4, p. 174).
- Favorably, there was a 3.5 point higher mean DLA mathematics score for Achieve 180 students than for non-Achieve 180 Program students after matching (M=49.2, S.D.=20.766 vs M=45.7, S.D.=20.643, respectively), signaling positive program effects for Light Support students (Figure 29, p. 56 and Appendix F, Table F-4, p. 174).

Highlighting the positive effect of the program on Light Support students' DLA mathematics scores, the difference between the groups was not only found to be of statistical significance before matching, when non-Achieve 180 Program students' performance exceeded Achieve 180 Program students (*t*(3781)=4.972, p<.01), but also after matching, when Achieve 180 Program students' performance exceeded their non-program peers (*t*(3148)=4.733, p<.01) (Figure 29 and Appendix F, Table F-4).</li>

#### Light Support School-level Results

- At five (71.4%) of the seven Light Support schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap reduction (n=2) or gap closure (n=3) between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA ELA performance (Appendix F, Table F-5, pp. 175–179).
- At four (57.1%) of the seven Light Support schools matched with comparison-schools, there was a gap closure between Achieve 180 Program students' and their non-Achieve 180 Program peers' DLA mathematics performance (Appendix F, Table F-6, pp. 180–184).

#### All Tiers

- Before and after matching program students with comparable non-program peers, both groups' percentages of correct items on DLA in Language Arts (ELA) on average were highest for Tier 1 (about 56–57%) and the Light Support (about 55–56%) students (Figures F-25 through F-29, pp. 52–56 and Appendix F, Table F-3, 173).
- Similarly, before and after matching program students with comparable non-program peers, both groups' percentages of correct items on DLA in mathematics on average were highest for Tier 1 (about 56–57%) and Light Support (about 56–57%) students (Figures F-25 through F-29 and Appendix F, Table F-4).

# Association Between Ratings of Program Implementation Fidelity and Educator and Student Outcomes

# **Program Implementation and Fidelity Ratings**

#### Foundations of implementation

The Theory of Action for the Achieve 180 Program states: "If HISD provides a package of essential leadership, instructional, social and emotional, and community supports for our historically underserved and underperforming feeder patterns and school communities, then our schools will be equipped to accelerate preparation of our students to fulfill the qualities and characteristics of the HISD Global Graduate Profile (Houston Independent School District, 2018)." As depicted in the program's Logic Models, the Achieve 180 Program was guided by six pillars of school improvement which included Leadership Excellence, Teaching Excellence, Instructional Excellence, School Design, Social and Emotional Learning Support, and Family and Community Empowerment (Houston Independent School District, 2018, 2019, and 2020; Appendix A, Figure A-3, p. 92 of this report).

The program's pillars have provided the framework for school turnaround strategies expected to transform educational processes at Achieve 180 Program schools. Extensive research, including the studies cited in the following summary, support the focus areas and objectives of the Achieve 180 Program pillars as being important elements of school reform.

Pillar I, Leadership Excellence - Effective leadership as a critical part of school change and turnaround (Flock, 2015; Player & Katz, 2016).

- Pillar II, Teaching Excellence Identifying, attracting, hiring, and retaining an excellent community of educators to successfully improve the educational outcomes of students at lowperforming schools (Duke & Jacobson, 2011).
- Pillar III, Instructional Excellence Consistent and sustained focus on improving the instructional program (Leithwood, Harris, & Strauss, 2010) by making needed changes to curriculum and instruction (Schmoker, 2011) determine the success of transforming lowperforming schools.
- Pillar IV, School Design When professional development and school systems across grade levels or schools help to create collaborative and collegial learning environments through a community of practice, a critical mass arises to transform instructional practice schoolwide (Knapp, 2003).
- Pillar V, Social and Emotional Learning Support Students in urban or other areas that are under-resourced and contain stressors that make learning difficult for them are more capable of seeking help, managing their own emotions, and problem-solving in difficult situations when they are afforded social-emotional learning opportunities and supports (Romasz, Kantor, & Elias, 2004).
- Pillar VI, Family and Community Empowerment Students perform better when their families are engaged in the students' learning, support them at home, and are connected to their schools (Mapp & Kuttner, 2013). However, historically, evidence reveals that schools serving large populations of students of color and students living in poverty have been the least successful at parent and community engagement (Olivos, 2012).

The program's objectives, as articulated in Year 1 (Houston Independent School District, 2018), were maintained throughout its three years of implementation from 2017–2018 through 2019–2020 as reflected in each year's Logic Model and centralized interventions (i.e., supports or program components). In 2019–2020, 31 differentiated Centralized Supports were provided through the six pillars, as defined by each campus' level of need (as indicated by program Tier) and campus characteristics.

# Fidelity of Implementation Ratings

To guarantee that students have received research-based interventions implemented with high levels of fidelity it is important to assess the effectiveness of the program intervention (Austin, Vaughn, & McClelland, 2017). Fidelity of program implementation "...is defined as the determination of how well an intervention is implemented in comparison with the original program design during an efficacy and/or effectiveness study" (O'Donnell, 2008, p. 33). Implementation fidelity addresses the extent to which an intervention adheres to its design and intended function based on the components of the intervention (Caroll et al., 2007). For each Achieve 180 Program intervention enacted, examples of best practices at three levels of program implementation fidelity were delineated in the Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric (Appendix A, Table A-2, p. 93). In alignment with the Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric, the 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Implementation Rubric Dashboard (**Appendix G**, **Table G-1**, pp. 186–187) was used to present the fidelity of implementation ratings for each school by the program pillar and the component of the centralized support.

Based on the Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric, the Achieve 180 Program Implementation rating scale ranged from 1 to 3: "1.0–1.4" (Non-example), "1.5–2.4" (Emerging example), "2.5–3.0" (Strong example). For each 2019–2020 Centralized Support provided (n=31), a rating for the level at which it was implemented with fidelity (i.e., in line with its designated intention) at each program school was determined. Further, for each Centralized Support, an average rating of implementation fidelity across the participating schools was also calculated (Support Average). In addition, an average rating to include every Centralized

Support provided at each program school in 2019–2020 (School Average) was also calculated. It must be acknowledged that the 2019–2020 ratings presented here were assessed for each school by district and school administrators after the end of the 2019–2020 school year and are likely to reflect the cumulative effects of program interventions for schools with multiple years of program participation (excluding Wisdom HS, a 2019–2020 participant). **Figure 30** shows the overall mean implementation fidelity rating for each program pillar to include ratings across pillar components employed at Achieve 180 Program schools.

The 2019–2020 overall Pillar-level implementation fidelity ratings ranged from 2.4 – an "Emerging example" (Pillar II Teacher Excellence) to 2.8 – a "Strong example" (Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment), with only Pillar II Teacher Excellence falling below the level of a "Strong example" of implementation fidelity (Figure 30).

#### Figure 30. Mean Pillar Ratings of Program Implementation Fidelity, 2019–2020



Source: Achieve 180 Program Administrators, 2019–2020

- Notes: Average ratings by pillar were calculated using school-level ratings for each intervention component within each pillar. 2019–2020 ratings may reflect cumulative effects of multiple years of program intervention. Ratings are rounded to one decimal place. In previous reports, ratings were rounded to the nearest whole number and, therefore, may differ from ratings presented in this report.
- For each intervention component or resource provided within each program pillar, **Figure 31**, p. 60 shows the mean implementation fidelity rating for the component across Achieve 180 Program schools that received the support, including the following ratings:
  - > The highest rating of 2.9 ("Strong example")
    - Pillar III Instructional Excellence-Data Driven Instructional Coaching
    - Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment-Family/Community Events
  - > All pillar components were rated a "Strong example" of implementation fidelity:
    - Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Supports
    - Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment
  - A "Strong example" of implementation fidelity was achieved for at least 50 percent of the program components within the remaining four pillars:
    - Pillar I Leadership Excellence (67%)
    - Pillar II Teacher Excellence (50%)
    - Pillar III Instructional Excellence (75%)

• Pillar IV School Design (67%)

 $\triangleright$ 

- The lowest rating of 2.2 ("Emerging example"):
  - o Pillar II Teacher Excellence-Teacher Effectiveness Data
- o Pillar II Teacher Excellence- Model Classrooms

(School-level results are provided in Appendix G, Table G-1, pp. 186–187).

# Figure 31. Implementation Fidelity Rating by Program Pillar and Component of Support, 2019–2020



Source: Achieve 180 Program Administrators, 2019–2020

Notes: Ratings by pillar were calculated using school-level ratings for each intervention component within each pillar. 2019–2020 ratings may reflect cumulative effects of multiple years of program intervention. Ratings are rounded to one decimal place. In previous reports, ratings were rounded to the nearest whole number and, therefore, may differ from ratings presented in this report.

# Implementation Fidelity and Educator and Student Outcomes (Overall)

# What program components were related to 2019–2020 educator ratings and student performance?

To determine program components that were implemented in ways that associate them with higher educator and student results, correlation analyses were conducted to identify noteworthy associations or relationships. Results presented here highlight relationships that were found to be of weak, moderate, or strong intensity or strength or of statistical significance. "Positive" relationships were expected as indicated by an increase in rate, rating, or score paired with an increase in the implementation fidelity rating. Asterisks identify statistically significantly relationships (p<0.05). "Negative" relationships (shown with a "-" preceding the number) indicate a decrease in rate, rating, or score paired with an increase in the implementation fidelity rating or visa versa. Positive and negative correlation results to assess the strength or intensity of associations or relationships are categorized as: <0.1 (Very Weak); 0.1 - <0.3 (Weak); 0.3 - <0.5 (Moderate); 0.5 - 1.0 (Strong). Below, lists in the text for educator or student outcomes are presented in pillar order and, within each pillar, by strength of the relationship - from stronger to weaker intensity.

Provided in **Figure 32**, p. 63 are results of correlation analyses of the relationships (associations) between each Achieve 180 Program pillar's average implementation fidelity rating and key educator and student outcomes. The outcomes assessed include mean school leader Appraisal Scorecard rating, percentage of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings, and student scores (i.e., percentage of correct items) on District-Level Assessments (DLA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics (English and Spanish language version results presented separately).

- A positive relationship between greater implementation fidelity for the identified pillar (based on its average rating) and higher ratings of educator effectiveness or higher levels of student performance on DLA assessments was found for 31 (86%) of the 36 relationships assessed (Figure 32).
- The intensity of the 31 positive relationships between implementation fidelity and educator and student outcomes included very weak or <0.1 (n=5 or 16%), weak or 0.1 <0.3 (n=1 or 48%), moderate or 0.3 <0.5 (n=10 or 32%), and strong or 0.5–1.0 (n=1 or 3%) associations (Figure 32).
- More **positive relationships of greater intensity** were found for associations between program implementation fidelity ratings and scores on DLA taken in Spanish, followed by associations between program implementation fidelity ratings and Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) ratings, than were found for the other associations (Figure 32).
- Positive relationships of moderate or strong intensity and/or relationships of statistical significance (as indicated by an asterisk (\*) are listed here by outcome measure (Figure 32):
  - School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Rating (None)
  - TADS Ratings
    - Pillar I Leadership Excellence (weak)\*
    - Pillar II Teacher Excellence (weak)\*
    - Pillar III Instructional Excellence (moderate)\*
    - o Pillar VI Parent and Family Empowerment (moderate)\*
  - DLA ELA English
    - Pillar II Teacher Excellence (moderate)\*
  - DLA ELA Spanish
    - o Pillar I Leadership Excellence (moderate)
    - Pillar II Teacher Excellence (moderate)
    - Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support (strong)\*

- o Pillar VI Parent and Family Empowerment (moderate)
- DLA Math English
  - Pillar II Teacher Excellence (moderate)\*
  - Pillar III Instructional Excellence (moderate)\*
  - Pillar IV School Design (weak)\*
  - Pillar VI Parent and Family Empowerment (weak)\*
- DLA Math Spanish
  - o Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support (moderate)
  - Pillar VI Parent and Family Empowerment (moderate)\*

# Figure 32. Correlation Results for Mean Implementation Fidelity Ratings for Program Pillars of Support and Educator or Student Outcomes for Achieve 180 Program Schools, 2019–2020



Sources: 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 Effective School Leader Scorecard Ratings and TADS Tools (see Methods section for specific retrieval dates); District-Level Assessment Fall results, December 2019 retrieved on 5/27/2020; 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric Dashboard

HISD Research and Accountability

- All **negative associations or relationships** (indicated by a decrease in either the fidelity rating or the outcome paired with an increase in the associated rating or outcome) are very weak or weak and are not of statistical significance: (Figure 32, p. 63):
  - School Leader Appraisal Scorecard
    - Pillar I (very weak)
    - Pillar III (weak)
    - Pillar IV (weak)
    - o Pillar V (very weak)
  - DLA ELA English
    - o Pillar V (very weak)

# Implementation Fidelity and School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings

- A relationship between greater implementation fidelity and higher Scorecard ratings (positive relationship) was found for 13 (42%) of the 31 Achieve 180 Program centralized support components provided. Of the 13, the following four associations (31%) are at least of weak intensity or strength, but are not of statistical significance (Table 2, p. 65); (Appendix G, Table G-2, p. 189):
  - Pillar I Leadership Excellence
    - o Demonstration Principal (Lead) (weak)
  - > Pillar II Teacher Excellence
    - Model Classrooms (weak)
    - Dedicated Associate Teachers (weak)
  - > Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support
    - Schoolwide Behavior Support System (weak)
- An increase in implementation fidelity was paired with a decrease in Scorecard ratings (or visa versa) in 18 (58%) of the 31 relationships regarding the program supports provided, with three (17%) of them of at least weak intensity. Of the 18 negative associations, the following three (17%) are of statistical significance (\*) and are of either moderate or weak intensity (Table 2):
  - > Pillar III Instructional Excellence
    - Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist (moderate)\*
    - Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar (weak)\*
  - Pillar IV School Design
    - Imagine Math (weak)\*
- Further research on the counter-intuitive results may be warranted (Table 2).

Table 2. Correlation Coefficient Between Mean Implementation Fidelity Rating and Mean SchoolLeader Appraisal Scorecard Rating by Program Pillar and Component of CentralizedSupport for Achieve 180 Program Schools, 2019–2020			
Pillar	Resource/Component of Centralized Support	Correlation Coefficient (See Key Below)	
Pillar I Leadership Excellence	Leadership Team Structure	-0.0912	
	Professional Learning Communities	0.0552	
	Demonstration Principal (Lead)	0.1055	
	Campus Culture	0.0066	
	Community of Practice Visits	-0.091	
	Data Driven Instructional Specialist	-0.0225	
Pillar II Teacher Excellence	Teacher Effectiveness Data	0.0705	
	Dedicated Associate Teachers	0.1366	
	Model Classrooms	0.1581	
	Teacher Leaders	-0.1742	
	Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery	-0.0449	
Pillar III	Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar	-0.2716*	
Instructional Excellence	Data Analysis	-0.1023	
	Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist	-0.3361*	
	Reading Specialist	0.0262	
	Renaissance 360	0.0817	
	Intervention and Extension System for All Students	-0.0232	
	Data Driven Instructional Coaching	0.0744	
Pillar IV	Wednesday Extended Day PD	-0.0855	
School Design	Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs	-0.097	
	Imagine Learning	-0.0751	
	Imagine Math	-0.2497*	
	IAT Manager	0.054	
	College and Career Readiness (High Schools)	-0.325	
Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support	Schoolwide Behavior Support System	0.1542	
	Wraparound Resource Specialist/Community in Schools	-0.1396	
	Essential Position: Nurse	-0.0531	
	Essential Position: Counselor	-0.0615	
Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment	FACE Specialist	-0.0105	
	Parent Communication	0.0924	
	Family/Community Events	0.0278	
Correlation Coefficient Key Strength of Relationship/Association (Positive or Negative):		Very Weak <0.1	
		Weak 0.1 - <0.3	
		Moderate 0.3 – <0.5	
Strong 0.5–1.0 Source: 2016–2017 2017–2018 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 Effective School Leader Scorecard Batings (see Method			

Source: 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 Effective School Leader Scorecard Ratings (see Methods section for specific retrieval dates); 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric Dashboard Notes: Correlation coefficients by component based on 2019–2020 school-level implementation fidelity ratings for components within each pillar –Indicates a decrease in one rating paired with an increase in the other rating. \*Indicates statistically significant at p-value <= 0.1 is used in this analysis given the sample size.

# Implementation Fidelity and Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) Ratings

- A relationship between greater implementation fidelity and higher TADS ratings (positive relationship) was found for 28 (90%) of the 31 Achieve 180 Program centralized support components provided. Of the 28 positive associations, 23 (82%) were of at least weak strength or intensity: moderate (n=8 or 35%) or weak (n=15 or 65%) as follows (**Table 3**, p. 67); (Appendix G, Table G-2, p. 189):
  - Pillar I Leadership Excellence
    - Professional Learning Communities (weak)\*
    - Community of Practice Visits (weak)\*
    - Leadership Team Structure (weak)\*
    - Demonstration Principal (Lead) (weak)
    - Campus Culture (weak)
  - > Pillar II Teacher Excellence
    - Model Classrooms (weak)\*
    - o Teacher Effectiveness Data (weak)
    - Teacher Leaders (weak)
  - > Pillar III Instructional Excellence
    - Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist (moderate)\*
    - Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery (moderate)\*
    - Renaissance 360 (moderate)\*
    - Data Driven Instructional Coaching (moderate)\*
    - Reading Specialist (weak)
    - Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar (weak)
    - o Data Analysis (weak)
  - Pillar IV School Design
    - Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs (moderate)\*
    - o Wednesday Extended Day Professional Development (weak)
    - College and Career Readiness (High Schools) (weak)
  - > Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support
    - Schoolwide Behavior Support System (moderate)\*
    - Essential Position: Counselor (weak)\*
  - > Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment
    - Family/Community Events (moderate)\*
    - Parent Communication (moderate)\*
    - FACE Specialist (weak)\*
- Fourteen (45%) of the 31 associations assessed, overall, are positive relationships of statistical significance as indicated below by an asterisk (\*) (Table 3).
- All eight of the positive relationships with program implementation fidelity of moderate strength are statistically significant and constitute 38 percent of all 21 centralized supports provided as components of Pillar III Instructional Excellence (n=4), Pillar IV School Design (n=1), Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support (n=1), and Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment (n=2) (Table 3).
- No negative relationship of at least weak intensity nor of statistical significance was found between TADS ratings and program supports (Table 3).

Table 3. Correlation Coefficient Between Mean Implementation Fidelity Rating and Percentageof Effective and Highly Effective Teacher Development and Appraisal (TADS) Ratingsby Program Pillar and Component of Support for Achieve 180 Program Schools, 2019–2020

2020		
Pillar	Resource/Component of Centralized Support	Correlation Coefficient (See Key Below)
Pillar I Leadership Excellence	Leadership Team Structure	0.2533*
	Professional Learning Communities	0.2669*
	Demonstration Principal (Lead)	0.1525
	Campus Culture	0.1220
	Community of Practice Visits	0.2635*
	Data Driven Instructional Specialist	0.0353
Pillar II Teacher Excellence	Teacher Effectiveness Data	0.1862
	Dedicated Associate Teachers	0.0167
	Model Classrooms	0.2873*
	Teacher Leaders	0.1689
Pillar III Instructional Excellence	Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery	0.4265*
	Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar	0.2118
	Data Analysis	0.1911
	Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist	0.4969*
	Reading Specialist	0.2213
	Renaissance 360	0.3584*
	Intervention and Extension System for All Students	0.0698
	Data Driven Instructional Coaching	0.3408*
Pillar IV School Design	Wednesday Extended Day PD	0.2572
	Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs	0.3859*
	Imagine Learning	0.0095
	Imagine Math	-0.0457
	IAT Manager	-0.0837
	College and Career Readiness (High Schools)	0.1209
	Schoolwide Behavior Support System	0.3934*
Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support	Wraparound Resource Specialist/Community in	
	Schools	0.0999
	Essential Position: Nurse	-0.0570
	Essential Position: Counselor	0.2475*
Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment	FACE Specialist	0.2391*
	Parent Communication	0.3061*
	Family/Community Events	0.3426*
Correlation Coefficient Key: Strength of Relationship/Association (Positive or Negative)		Very Weak <0.1
		Weak 0.1 - <0.3
		Moderate 0.3 – <0.5
		Strong 0.5–1.0

Source: 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 TADS Tools (see Methods section for specific retrieval dates); 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric Dashboard

Notes: Correlation coefficients by component based on 2019–2020 school-level implementation fidelity ratings for components within each pillar –Indicates a decrease in one rating paired with an increase in the other rating. \*Indicates statistically significant at p-value <= 0.1 is used in this analysis given the sample size.

# **Implementation Fidelity and Student Achievement (DLA)** *District-Level Assessment (DLA) - English Language Arts (ELA)*

- As listed below, a relationship between greater implementation fidelity and higher student scores on ELA exams taken in the English language (positive relationship) was found for 23 (74%) of the 31 Achieve 180 Program centralized support components provided. Of the 23 positive associations, 20 (87%) are of at least weak strength or intensity (Table 4, p. 69) (Appendix G, Table G-2, p. 189).
- As listed below, a relationship between greater implementation fidelity and higher student scores on ELA exams taken in the Spanish language (positive relationship) was found for 25 (77%) of the 30 Achieve 180 Program centralized support components provided. Of the 25 positive associations, 21 (84%) are of at least weak strength or intensity (Table 4).
- On ELA exams taken in English, of the 31 associations assessed, overall, four positive relationships (13%) are of statistical significance as indicated below by an asterisk (\*) (Table 4).
- On ELA exams taken in Spanish, of the 30 associations assessed, overall, five positive relationships (17%) are of statistical significance as indicated below by an asterisk (\*) (Table 4).
- For ELA exams taken in English, the intensity of the following 20 positive relationships with program implementation fidelity was moderate (n=5 or 25%) or weak (n=15 or 75%) (Table 4):
  - > Pillar I Leadership Excellence
    - Data Driven Instructional Specialist (moderate)\*
    - Demonstration Principal (Lead) (moderate)
    - o Community of Practice Visits (weak)
    - Professional Learning Communities (weak)
    - Leadership Team Structure (weak)
  - Pillar II Teacher Excellence
    - Model Classrooms (moderate)\*
    - Teacher Effectiveness Data (moderate)\*
    - o Teacher Leaders (weak)
    - o Dedicated Associate Teachers (weak)
  - > Pillar III Instructional Excellence
    - o Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery (moderate)\*
    - o Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist (weak)
    - o Data Analysis (weak)
    - o Data Driven Instructional Coaching (weak)
    - Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar (weak)
  - Pillar IV School Design
    - o Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs (weak)
    - o Imagine Math (weak)
  - Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support
  - Schoolwide Behavior Support System (weak)
  - Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment
    - Family/Community Events (weak)
    - o Parent Communication (weak)
    - o FACE Specialist (weak)
Table 4. Correlation Coefficient Between Mean Implementation Fidelity Rating and Mean District-<br/>Level Assessment Scores in English Language Arts (ELA) by Program Pillar, Component<br/>of Support for Achieve 180 Program Schools, and Language Version of Assessment,<br/>2019–2020

Pillar	Resource/Component of Centralized	Correlation Coefficient (See Key Below)		
	Support	English	Spanish	
	Leadership Team Structure	0.1119	0.4664*	
	Professional Learning Communities	0.1679	0.7137*	
Pillar I	Demonstration Principal (Lead)	0.3064	0.3514	
Leadership Excellence	Campus Culture	-0.0212	0.3560	
	Community of Practice Visits	0.2009	0.1121	
	Data Driven Instructional Specialist	0.3973*	-0.2817	
	Teacher Effectiveness Data	0.3002*	0.0838	
Pillar II	Dedicated Associate Teachers	0.1542	0.1622	
Teacher Excellence	Model Classrooms	0.3535*	0.3193	
	Teacher Leaders	0.2084	0.3562	
	Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery	0.3498*	0.0615	
	Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar	0.1058	0.1567	
	Data Analysis	0.1381	0.0217	
Pillar III	Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist	0.1771	0.3787	
Instructional Excellence	Reading Specialist	-0.0552	-0.4404	
	Renaissance 360	-0.0347	-0.0670	
	Intervention and Extension System for All Students	0.0795	0.1792	
	Data Driven Instructional Coaching	0.1270	-0.4757*	
	Wednesday Extended Day PD	0.0076	-0.4490	
	Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs	0.1602	0.0256	
Pillar IV	Imagine Learning	0.0532	0.3442	
School Design	Imagine Math	0.1196	0.3017	
Ŭ	IAT Manager	-0.0394	0.1072	
	College and Career Readiness (High Schools)	-0.0083	-	
	Schoolwide Behavior Support System	0.1250	0.6997*	
Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning	Wraparound Resource Specialist/CIS	-0.2223	0.679*	
Social and Emotional Learning Support	Essential Position: Nurse	-0.0952	0.3485	
	Essential Position: Counselor	-0.0094	0.2707	
Pillar VI	FACE Specialist	0.1200	0.1335	
Family and Community	Parent Communication	0.1781	0.5782	
Empowerment	Family/Community Events	0.1943	0.7492*	
	Very We	eak <0.1		
	Weak 0.	1 - <0.3		
	Moderate	0.3 - <0.5		

Sources: District-Level Assessment Fall results, December 2019 retrieved on 5/27/2020; 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric Dashboard

Notes: Correlation coefficients by component based on 2019–2020 school-level implementation fidelity ratings for components within each pillar –Indicates a decrease in one rating paired with an increase in the other rating. \*Indicates statistically significant at p-value <= 0.1 is used in this analysis given the sample size. Spanish language results were not available for Pillar IV component of College and Career Readiness implemented.

- On ELA exams taken in English, as listed above on page#, four of the five positive relationships of moderate strength are statistically significant and constitute 22 percent of all 18 centralized supports provided as components of the associated pillars (Pillars I – III) (Table 4, p. 69).
- An increase in implementation fidelity was paired with a decrease in ELA scores (or visa versa) in eight (26%) of the 31 relationships regarding program supports provided for students who tested in the English language, with two (25%) of the eight of weak strength which is the highest intensity among them. None of these eight negative associations are of statistical significance (\*) (Table 4).
- For ELA exams taken in Spanish, the intensity of the following 21 positive relationships with program implementation fidelity was strong (n=5 or 24%), (moderate (n=9 or 43%), or weak (n=7 or 33%) strength (Table 4):
  - > Pillar I Leadership Excellence
    - Professional Learning Communities (strong)\*
    - Leadership Team Structure (moderate)\*
    - Campus Culture (moderate)
    - Demonstration Principal (Lead) (moderate)
    - Community of Practice Visits (weak)
  - > Pillar II Teacher Excellence
    - o Teacher Leaders (moderate)
    - o Model Classrooms (moderate)
    - Dedicated Associate Teachers (weak)
  - > Pillar III Instructional Excellence
    - o Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist (moderate)
    - o Intervention and Extension System for All Students (weak)
    - Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar (weak)
  - Pillar IV School Design
    - Imagine Learning (moderate)
    - Imagine Math (moderate)
    - o IT Manager (weak)
  - > Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support
    - Schoolwide Behavior Support System (strong)\*
    - Wraparound Resource Specialist/Communities in Schools (strong)\*
    - Essential Position: Nurse (moderate)
    - Essential Position: Counselor (weak)
  - > Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment
    - Family/Community Events (strong)\*
    - Parent Communication (strong)
    - FACE Specialist (weak)
- On ELA exams taken in Spanish, as listed above, all four (100%) of the positive relationships of strong intensity are of statistical significance and constitute eight percent of all 13 centralized supports provided as components of the associated pillars (Pillars I, V, and VI) (Table 4).
- In addition, as listed above, on ELA exams taken in Spanish, one (13%) of the eight positive relationships of moderate intensity are statistically significant and constituted four percent of all 28 centralized supports provided as components of the associated pillars (Pillars I – V) (Table 4).

• An increase in implementation fidelity was paired with a decrease in ELA scores (or visa versa) in five (17%) of the 30 relationships regarding the program supports provided for students who tested in the Spanish language, with three (60%) of the five of moderate strength which is the highest intensity among them. Of these five negative associations, one (20%) is of statistical significance (\*) and of moderate strength (Pillar III Instructional Excellence - Data Driven Instructional Coaching) (Appendix G, Table G-2, p. 189).

# District-Level Assessment (DLA) - Mathematics

- As listed below, a relationship between greater implementation fidelity and higher student scores on Mathematics exams taken in the English language (positive relationship) was found for 27 (87%) of the 31 Achieve 180 Program centralized support components provided. Of the 27 positive associations, 23 (85%) are of at least weak strength or intensity (Table 5, p. 72) (Appendix G, Table G-2).
- As listed below, a relationship between greater implementation fidelity and higher student scores on Mathematics exams taken in the Spanish language (positive relationship) was found for 24 (80%) of the 30 Achieve 180 Program centralized support components provided. Of the 25 positive associations, 21 (84%) are of at least weak strength or intensity (Table 5) (Appendix G, Table G-2).
- On mathematics exams taken in English, of the 31 associations assessed, 14 positive relationships (45%) are of statistical significance as indicated below by an asterisk (\*) (Table 5).
- On mathematics exams taken in Spanish, of the 31 associations assessed, five positive relationships (16%) are of statistical significance as indicated below by an asterisk (\*) (Table 5).
- For mathematics exams taken in English, the intensity of the following 23 positive relationships with program implementation fidelity was moderate (n=6 or 26%) or weak (n=17 or 74%) (Table 5):
  - Pillar I Leadership Excellence
    - Data Driven Instructional Specialist (moderate)\*
    - Community of Practice Visits (weak)\*
    - Professional Learning Communities (weak)
    - Leadership Team Structure (weak)
  - > Pillar II Teacher Excellence
    - Teacher Effectiveness Data (moderate)\*
    - Teacher Leaders (weak)\*
    - Model Classrooms (weak)\*
  - Pillar III Instructional Excellence
    - Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist (moderate)\*
    - Data Analysis (moderate)\*
    - Reading Specialist (weak)\*
    - Data Driven Instructional Coaching (weak)\*
    - o Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery (weak)\*
    - Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar (weak)\*
    - Intervention and Extension System for All Students (weak)\*

(Continued on page 73)

Table 5. Correlation Coefficient Between Mean Implementation Fidelity Rating and Mean District-<br/>Level Assessment Scores in Mathematics by Program Pillar, Component of Support for<br/>Achieve 180 Program Schools, and Language Version of Assessment, 2019–2020

Pillar	Resource/Component of Centralized	Correlation Coefficient (See Key Below)		
	cuppert implementation racing racing	English	Spanish	
	Leadership Team Structure	0.1915	0.1576	
	Professional Learning Communities	0.2002	0.3939	
Pillar I	Demonstration Principal (Lead)	0.0071	0.0977	
Leadership Excellence	Campus Culture	-0.0356	0.2937	
	Community of Practice Visits	0.2864*	0.0038	
	Data Driven Instructional Specialist	0.3725*	-0.1856	
	Teacher Effectiveness Data	0.4057*	0.1903	
Pillar II	Dedicated Associate Teachers	0.0793	0.3107	
Teacher Excellence	Model Classrooms	0.2538*	0.2338	
	Teacher Leaders	0.2686*	0.1166	
	Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery	0.2398*	-0.1375	
	Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar	0.2327*	-0.0603	
	Data Analysis	0.3306*	0.1853	
Pillar III	Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist	0.4346*	0.5376	
Instructional Excellence	Reading Specialist	0.2968*	-0.3508	
	Renaissance 360	-0.0740	-0.0206	
	Intervention and Extension System for All Students	0.2002	0.2581	
	Data Driven Instructional Coaching	0.268*	-0.2767	
	Wednesday Extended Day PD	0.2327	-0.2079	
	Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs	0.2809*	0.0974	
	Imagine Learning	0.0536	0.2551	
School Design	Imagine Math	0.2095	0.1233	
5	IAT Manager	0.1531	0.3325	
	College and Career Readiness (High Schools)	0.1596	0.6590	
	Schoolwide Behavior Support System	0.4412*	0.7544*	
Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning	Wraparound Resource Specialist/CIS	0.0520	0.5698*	
Support	Essential Position: Nurse	-0.0966	0.1066	
	Essential Position: Counselor	-0.0175	0.1209	
Pillar VI	FACE Specialist	0.1879	0.3076*	
Family and Community	Parent Communication	0.2710	0.6403*	
Empowerment	Family/Community Events	0.329*	0.862*	
	Very We	eak <0.1		
	Weak 0.	1 – <0.3		
	Moderate Strong	0.3 – <0.5 0.5–1.0		

Sources: District-Level Assessment Fall results, December 2019 retrieved on 5/27/2020; 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric Dashboard

Notes: Correlation coefficients by component based on 2019–2020 school-level implementation fidelity ratings for components within each pillar –Indicates a decrease in one rating paired with an increase in the other rating. \*Indicates statistically significant at p-value <= 0.1 is used in this analysis given the sample size.

(Continued from page 71)

- Pillar IV School Design
  - Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs (weak)\*
  - o Wednesday Extended Day Professional Development (weak)
  - Imagine Math (weak)
  - College and Career Readiness (High Schools) (weak)
  - IT Manager (weak)
- > Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support
  - Schoolwide Behavior Support System (moderate)\*
- > Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment
  - Family/Community Events (moderate)\*
  - o Parent Communication (weak)
  - FACE Specialist (weak)
- On mathematics exams taken in English, all (100%) of the six positive relationships of moderate strength are statistically significant and constitute 24 percent of all 25 centralized supports provided as components of the associated pillars (Pillars I III, V, and VI) (Table 5, p. 72).
- An increase in implementation fidelity was paired with a decrease in mathematics scores (or visa versa) in four (13%) of the 31 relationships regarding program supports provided for students who tested in the English language. None of these four negative associations are at least of weak intensity nor of statistical significance (\*) (Table 5).
- For mathematics exams taken in Spanish, the intensity of the following 21 positive relationships with program implementation fidelity was strong (n=6 or 29%), (moderate (n=4 or 19%), or weak (n=11 or 52%) (Table 5):
  - > Pillar I Leadership Excellence
    - Professional Learning Communities (moderate)
    - Campus Culture (weak)
    - Leadership Team Structure (weak)
  - > Pillar II Teacher Excellence
    - Dedicated Associate Teachers (moderate)
    - Model Classrooms (weak)
    - o Teacher Effectiveness Data (weak)
    - Teacher Leaders (weak)
  - > Pillar III Instructional Excellence
    - o Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist (strong)
    - o Intervention and Extension System for All Students (weak)
    - Data Analysis (weak)
  - Pillar IV School Design
    - o College and Career Readiness (High Schools) (strong)
    - o IT Manager (moderate)
    - Imagine Learning (weak)
    - Imagine Math (weak)
  - > Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support
    - Schoolwide Behavior Support System (strong)\*
    - Wraparound Resource Specialist/Communities in Schools (strong)\*
    - Essential Position: Counselor (weak)

- Essential Position: Nurse (weak)
- > Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment
  - Family/Community Events (strong)\*
  - Parent Communication (strong)\*
  - FACE Specialist (moderate)\*
- On mathematics exams taken in Spanish, four (67%) of the six positive relationships of strong intensity are of statistical significance and constitute 57 percent of all seven centralized supports provided as components of the associated pillars (Pillars I–II, IV, and VI) (Table 5, p. 72).
- In addition, on mathematics exams taken in Spanish, one (25%) of the four positive relationships of moderate intensity is of statistical significance and constitute five percent of all 19 centralized supports provided as components of the associated pillars (Pillars I–II, IV, and VI) (Table 5).
- An increase in implementation fidelity was paired with a decrease in mathematics scores (or visa versa) in seven (23%) of the 31 relationships regarding the program supports provided for students who tested in the Spanish language. Of these seven negative associations, one is of moderate strength (Pillar III Instructional Excellence–Reading Specialist), but none is of statistical significance (\*), (Table 5).

# **TEA Accountability System Ratings**

Due to the pandemic, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) labeled all campuses and districts in Texas "Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster for 2020" in the state accountability system. New annual district and campus ratings were not calculated for the 2019–2020 school year (Year 3). Campuses that received F ratings in 2019 for the 2019–2020 school year were directed by TEA to continue to engage in improvement activities during the 2020–2021 school year. For determining future interventions based on multi-year F ratings, 2019 and 2021 will be considered consecutive years.

- Since the onset of the Achieve 180 Program in 2018 (Year 1), each year that newly calculated annual ratings have been given, the total number of HISD campuses that have received TEA School Accountability Ratings of Improvement Required (IR), *F*, or NR-H ratings has decreased; dropping from 27 (9.7%) of 278 schools in 2017 (baseline year) to 23 (8.4%) of 275 schools in 2018 (Year 1), to 21 (7.8%) of 271 schools in 2019 (Year 2); totaling a 22 percent reduction in the number of failing schools overall (See Table 1, p. 21 in the Program Context section of this report).
- Of the 21 F-rated in 2019, 10 (48%) were Achieve 180 Program schools. Of the Achieve 180 Program campuses in 2018–2019, only two of them had been rated NR-H or IR/*F* in the year(s) prior to spring 2019 when ratings were last calculated (Wheatley HS and Sugar Grove MS in Tier 3) and the other eight campuses were rated Met Standard/*A-D* in spring 2019 when ratings were last calculated (Table 6, p. 75).
- Table 6 shows each year that newly calculated annual ratings have been given, the percentage of Achieve 180 Program schools that have met the accountability standard (or were rated A-D) increased, from 17 of 44 schools (39%) in 2017 (baseline year) to 43 of 53 schools (81%) in 2019 (Year 2).

Table 6. Texas Education Agency (TEA) School Accountability Ratings, Achieve 180 Program, 2017 through 2019							
School Year (EOY)	Total Program Campuses Rated	Improvement Required or <i>F</i> Rating	Improvement Required or <i>F</i> Rating	Not Rated: Harvey Pro- vision (NR-H)	Not Rated: Harvey Pro- vision (NR-H)	Met Standard or A, B, C, or D Rating	Met Standard or A, B, C, or D Rating
	Ν	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
2017	44*	27	61%	0	0%	17*	39%
2018	44*	1	2%	10	23%	33*	75%
2019	53*	10	19%	0	0%	43*	81%

Source: Houston Independent School District, 2019 Preliminary TEA Accountability System Ratings; 2020 TEA Accountability Ratings

Notes: TEA declared districts and schools Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster for 2020. **The 53 2018–2019 campuses** started as 19 Not Rated/Improvement Required and 34 Met Standard campuses. \*Includes Bellfort ECC, a paired campus. Campuses received an A–F letter grade for the first time in the 2018–2019 school year. In prior school years, campuses were either labeled *Met* Standard or *Improvement Required*. End of School Year (EOY) ratings based on results made available following the appeals process. \*Includes See the HISD source reports for changes in the framework and terminology for the ratings.

# **Discussion**

The following discussion of the changes in school, educator, and student performance since the program's onset is presented with an understanding that performance results acquired during the pandemic, including all 2019–2020 findings, must be considered with great caution, particularly in relation to previous and subsequent results. Nonetheless, the results represent best efforts to depict trends in phenomena that have been impacted in immeasurable ways. Aside from both the overt and the insidious impacts of the pandemic on our society, communities, educational system, and HISD constituents, the educator and student outcomes summarized in this report are expected to be (at least to some degree) indicative of the effects of developing more effective systems for teaching and learning to improve students' academic achievement through the implementation of the Achieve 180 Program. The centralized and school-based supports geared toward school and student success have been multi-faceted, massive, and energized by the heart-felt dedication of HISD's district and school leaders, teachers, teacher-leaders and other educators, students, and district and school support personnel to achieve great change in the lives of our high-need students.

As New Jersey's Education Commissioner, Christopher Cerf, stated at the 2018–2019 Houston Independent School District, State of the Schools Luncheon, "The role of education is to create pathways for young people to have an opportunity to achieve any goal they desire, regardless of who their parents are or where they were born . . . A student's circumstances should not limit their future. That should always be the ideal function of school districts" (Houston Independent School District, 2020e). To intensify the district's efforts to fulfill this vital role of education for its students of greatest need, a three-year Achieve 180 Program was implemented in 2017–2018 to address the long-term deficits in the educational systems of the district's most under-served and under-performing schools. For three years, targeted, centralized program supports have been offered to better develop each school's leaders, educators, learning structures and processes, as well as to better provide familial and community resources needed to help each student excel. School, educator, and student outcomes have been impacted by (but not limited to) the Achieve 180 Program inputs. As intended, program development has been an iterative process, changing each year, along with its

participants. Regarding the following discussion of program inputs and outcomes, please refer to the recommendations made to further improve program implementation and associated outcomes, which were gleaned from the current or previous research reports and survey responses from 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program administrators whose work directly impacted Achieve 180 Program students, families, schools, and communities (pp. 16–19).

Initially, the Achieve 180 Program targeted students and educators who lead or taught at HISD's schools with the lowest Texas Education Agency's (TEA's) Campus Accountability Rating of Improvement Required (IR) or "F" or were Not Rated prior to and during the program's years of implementation. Some participating schools had received such ratings for as many as four to eight years. In Year 2, district leaders began to include schools in danger of receiving an IR or F rating. In short, the Achieve 180 Program sought to improve connections within the schools' communities and instructional environments; better build, support, and utilize effective school leaders and teacher-leaders; increase teacher capacity and effectiveness; improve instructional practice; and elevate students' learning supports, experiences, outcomes, and levels of achievement. Thereby, equipping schools to effectively prepare high-need students to graduate from high school with the characteristics needed for global success. Improvements in all Achieve 180 Program schools' TEA Accountability Ratings were anticipated, particularly those that had received an IR rating or were Not Rated prior to and during the program's years of implementation. This report has presented outcomes that were expected to be associated with the identified program supports. Fifty-five of the 56 participating Achieve 180 Program schools completed at least one complete year of the program. The bulk of them, 43 schools, entered the program in 2017–2018 (Year 1) and remained through 2019–2020 (Year 3), 10 schools entered the program in 2018-2019 (Year 2) and participated through 2019-2020 (Year 3), while two schools participated one full year only (Victory Preparatory South HS in 2017-2018 (Year 1) and Wisdom, HS in 2019-2020 (Year 3)). In this report, pre-program (baseline) to post-program results were presented in a way that accounts for the number of years of program participation for each school or group.

In more than monetary terms, the scale of the investment to implement the Achieve 180 Program has been enormous and beyond measure. Based on budget and expenditure reports that included Title I grants, 86 percent of the reported \$23.0 million 2017–2018 Achieve 180 Program budget was utilized (\$19.8 million), while in 2018–2019 slightly more than 81 percent of the reported \$32.6 million Achieve 180 Program budget was utilized (\$26.6 million), and in 2019-2020, slightly more than 89 percent of the reported \$32.6 million Achieve 180 Program budget was utilized (\$29.1 million). In all years, program funds were primarily used to employ, support, or develop instructional and administrative staff at these high-need schools (nearly 93% in 2017-2018 and about 99% in 2018-2019 and 2019-2020). The remaining funds were used for consultation, contract services, educational materials and technology, general supplies, operating costs, or other miscellaneous expenses. The percentage of unutilized Achieve 180 Program funds fluctuated from 14 percent in 2017–2018, increased to nearly 19 percent in 2018–2019, and showed improvement at more than 11 percent in 2019-2020, which are sizeable amounts given the scale of the budgets. From approximately 11 percent (\$3.5 million) to 19 percent (\$6 million) of roughly \$20-29 million budgets was left unspent while educators' and students' needs remained unaddressed. This seems problematic. Improved focus on Achieve 180 Program fiscal management may have succeeded in confirming the appropriate allocation of funds and in depleting available funding to enhance program supports and heighten student learning and achievement on these campuses. In addition, it is important to highlight the fact that the total cost for the three-year Achieve 180 Program was not determined. Costs that were paid through some departmental budgets were not included in the post end-of-fiscal-year Achieve 180 Program budget and expenditure reports analyzed for these reports which included both General Funds and Federal grants (Title I). A comprehensive budget and expenditure report for the program would have to be compiled for the important task of a meaningful cost-benefit analysis to be conducted.

### Achieve 180 Program Implementation Fidelity

The Achieve 180 Implementation Rubric Dashboard was used each year by district and school administrators after the end of the school year to rate each school on the level of fidelity achieved in implementing each of the centralized supports provided on the campus. The rating scale was "1.0-1.4" (Nonexample), "1.5-2.4" (Emerging example), "2.5-3.0" (Strong example). Though 2019-2020 fidelity ratings were used for this analysis, it must be acknowledged the 2019-2020 ratings are likely to reflect cumulative effects of program interventions for schools with multiple years of program participation. 2019–2020 Program implementation fidelity ratings for the six Pillars ranged from the lowest of 2.4 - an "Emerging example" of program fidelity for Pillar II Teacher Excellence to 2.8 – a "Strong example" of program fidelity for Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment. While it is guite admirable for all other pillars to have been rated at the highest level of implementation fidelity, it is of great concern that Pillar II Teacher Excellence would be rated the lowest among the pillar ratings for program fidelity. Given that teachers play the most important role identified in improving outcomes for schools and students (Obiakor, Banks, Rotatori, & Utley, 2017), this finding warrants careful attention to discern its meaning and identify associated remedies. This result is associated with key program supports involving teacher staffing and retention, teacher development and effectiveness, New Teacher Coaches, Teacher Development Specialists, Dedicated Associate Teachers, Teacher Leaders, model classrooms, and teacher stipends and incentives designed to improve instructional practice. This finding may help explain some elements that undergird stubborn gaps in student performance.

For the intervention components or resources provided within each program pillar, the highest rating of 2.9 ("Strong example") was found for Pillar III Instructional Excellence-Data Driven Instructional Coaching and Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment-Family/Community Events. All pillar components of Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Supports and Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment were rated a "Strong example" of implementation fidelity. Further, a "Strong example" of implementation fidelity was achieved for at least 50 percent of the program support components (interventions) within each of these four pillars: Pillar I Leadership Excellence (67%), Pillar II Teacher Excellence (50%), Pillar III Instructional Excellence (75%), and Pillar IV School Design (67%). However, further highlighting the concern stated above, Pillar II Teacher Excellence-Teacher Effectiveness Data and Model Classrooms received the lowest rating of 2.2 ("Emerging example").

### Leadership Excellence: Effective School Leadership

Principals are primary agents in school improvement efforts focused on strong learning climates and support of teacher leadership regarding schoolwide goals of student achievement (Allensworth and Hart, 2018). Staffing priorities and incentives to secure and retain effective and highly effective principals and school leaders at Achieve 180 Program schools, heightened emphasis on principal/school leader involvement in HISD school leadership development programs, leadership professional learning communities, communities of practice visits, and job-embedded professional development for campus leadership were implemented through specialized program efforts designed to respond to the unique leadership demands and challenges of leadership at each Achieve 180 Program campus. The overall mean implementation fidelity rating for Pillar I Leadership Excellence was 2.5 out of 3.0, which is on the low end of ratings that fall within the "Strong example" category of implementing the associated program supports as expected. Therefore, continued attention to program refinements are warranted in this key component of successful school transformation (Obiakor, Banks, Rotatori, & Utley, 2017).

HISD's system for developing and measuring the effectiveness of school leadership (including principals, assistant principals, and deans) utilizes the district's school leader appraisal ratings. The School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating is one of two components in the appraisal rating and ranges from 1 (Ineffective) to 4 (Highly Effective). Determined at the end of each academic year, the Scorecard rating summarizes

performance indicators for student performance, school performance, and teacher effectiveness. Favorable results showed the mean Achieve 180 Program School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating increased from pre-program (i.e., baseline) to post-program (i.e., last year of program participation) by 1.2 points for the two-year group of 10 schools from a 2.3 rating in 2017–2018 (baseline) to a 3.5 rating in 2019–2020 (Year 3) and increased 0.9 point for the three-year group of 42 schools from a 2.5 rating in 2016–2017 (baseline) to a 3.4 rating in 2019–2020 (Year 3). The gain for both groups was found to be statistically significant. Furthermore, the gap in mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings between three-year Achieve 180 Program schools and non-Achieve 180 Program schools narrowed 50 percent from a pre-program gap of 0.6 point to a post-program gap of 0.3 point. For two-year Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison Title I, Part A non-Achieve 180 Program schools, there was a greater gap-reduction than achieved by three-year program participants. The gap in the two-year participants' and their comparisons' mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating narrowed 63 percent from a pre-program gap of 0.8 point to a post-program gap of 0.3 point.

Further, a positive relationship between greater Achieve 180 Program implementation fidelity and higher School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings was found for 13 (42%) of the 31 Achieve 180 Program centralized supports provided for participating schools. Of the 13, the four strongest associations (which were only of weak intensity) were between Scorecard ratings and program implementation fidelity ratings for: Pillar I Leadership Excellence - Demonstration Principal; Pillar II Teacher Excellence - Model Classrooms and Dedicated Associate Teachers; and Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support - Schoolwide Behavior Support System. I may be of great benefit to explore how the positive connections between these program supports that targeted school leadership development, educator classroom and instructional support, and student support systems may correlate with greater school leader effectiveness.

# Teacher Excellence: Effective Teachers

Research shows that long-term outcomes for students can be heightened under the instruction of highly effective teachers (Chetty et al., 2011; Chetty, Friedman, & Rockoff, 2014). Therefore, securing and retaining effective and highly effective teachers was a staffing priority that was enacted through centralized supports, including hiring events, teacher stipends and/or incentives, and professional development opportunities designed to respond to the specific needs of the Achieve 180 Program campuses. Based on HISD Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) summative ratings from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020, the percentage of Effective and Highly Effective teachers employed on Achieve 180 Program campuses that participated for three years increased from 81.0 percent to 82.9 percent (1.9 percentage points), while the percentage of Effective and Highly Effective teachers on Achieve 180 Program campuses that participated for two years decreased from 79.5 percent to 77.5 percent (2.0 percentage points). In addition, the percentage of Effective and Highly Effective teachers on Achieve 180 Program campuses that participated for the one on-year program participant with TADS data also decreased, from 94.7 percent to 94.4 percent (0.3 percentage point). None of these changes were statistically significant.

Very unfavorably for program schools, for three-year schools, comparisons of the average proportion of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings between Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools showed the gap increased from a pre-program gap of 6.3 percentage points to a post-program gap of 6.7 percentage points. At two-year schools, the proportion of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings increased at non-Achieve 180 Program schools (0.3 percentage point) while it decreased at Achieve 180 Program schools (2.0 percentage points) from pre-program (2017–2018) to post-program (2019–2020), also widening this gap from a pre-program gap of 9.5 percentage points to a post-program gap of 11.8 percentage points. The findings are consistent with other district studies, including results that showed the proportion of teachers rated "Highly Effective" at campuses

that received a TEA accountability rating of "A" was more than six times greater than the proportion of teachers rated "Highly Effective" at campuses that received a TEA accountability rating of "F" (Houston Independent School District, 2020c, p. 45–46). Clearly the equitable placement of highly effective teachers in the district warrants careful consideration and severe action to ensure high-quality instruction for the most-underserved students at schools where they are needed.

As stated previously, the lowest of the overall mean implementation fidelity ratings was found for Pillar II Teacher Excellence (2.4 out of 3.0). Of great interest, a positive relationship between greater Achieve 180 Program implementation fidelity and higher TADS ratings was found for 28 (90%) of the 31 Achieve 180 Program centralized supports provided for participating schools. Of the 28 associations, 23 (82%) were notable, with 15 of them (65%) being of weak intensity or strength (including six of statistical significance) and eight (35%) of moderate strength and statistically significant. The significant, positive, and moderate relationships between higher TADS ratings and greater program implementation fidelity of eight program components were identified within four program Pillars: Pillar III Instructional Excellence (n=4), Pillar IV School Design (n=1), Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support (n=1), and Pillar VI Family and Community Empowerment (n=2) (See p. 66 for additional details.) It may be beneficial to explore the implications of the positive connections between these program supports and greater proportions of effective teachers. Also of importance, implementation fidelity of Pillar II Teacher Excellence was associated with higher scores on English and Spanish language DLA ELA exams and higher scores on English language DLA Mathematics exams. Supported by research (Leithwood, Harris, & Strauss, 2010; Schmoker, 2011; Romasz, Kantor, & Elias, 2004; Mapp & Kuttner, 2013), these outcomes suggest the need to carefully consider ways to elevate program implementation fidelity for Pillar II Teacher Excellence components as a direct investment in heightening student performance.

It may also prove more prudent to ensure that, primarily, only teachers of high quality (as measured by TADS ratings of Effective or Highly Effective) are targeted for hiring, receive Achieve 180 Program stipends and incentives, and retained on Achieve 180 Program campuses. In addition, because TADS is being employed as a high-stakes measure that impacts schools, teachers, and students, it may be important to ascertain if the TADS measure is both a valid measure of teacher effectiveness and is being used consistently as a reliable method to gauge effective/highly effective teacher content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, qualities, and actions. These questions echo queries raised in other district reports (Houston Independent School District, 2020c; Kraft and Gilmour, 2017; Weisberg, et al., 2009).

### Student Attendance

Student attendance rates for 2019–2020 may be inflated due to effects of the pandemic, including changes in instructional modalities and differences in how attendance was gauged across the years assessed. Nevertheless, the average student attendance rate for the group of 43 three-year Achieve 180 Program schools increased 1.7 percentage points from 93.8% in 2016–2017 to 95.5% in 2019–2020. For the group of 10 two-year Achieve 180 Program schools, the student attendance rate also increased (1.6 percentage points from 94.7% in 2017–2018 to 96.3% in 2019–2020). Further analyses found student attendance rate changes from pre- to post-program to be statistically significant, with large program effects for both groups.

However, each year, the mean attendance rate for three-year and two-year Achieve 180 Program participants declined as the school level increased from elementary (mid-90's) to middle (low to mid-90's) to high school (high-80's to low-90's). This points to an urgent need to identity and address the underlying causes of student absenteeism, which is a core problem that undermines all educational efforts to develop and nurture well-rounded youths, improve student achievement, and produce Global Graduates of high caliber. Favorably, from pre-program to post-program, Achieve 180 Program students' attendance rates

increased most at three-year high schools (3.5 percentage points), followed by the one-year high school (2.4 percentage points) and two-year middle schools (2.3 percentage points), while three-year combined-level (0.3 percentage point) and two-year and three-year elementary schools had smaller gains in student attendance rates (0.8 percentage point and 0.7 percentage point, respectively). In addition, the student attendance rate increases from pre-program to post-program were statistically significant with large program effect sizes for students at three-year elementary and high schools and two-year middle schools.

Unfortunately, Achieve 180 Program student attendance rates (approximately 94%–96%) were from about 0.5 percentage points to 1.5 percentage points lower than non-Achieve 180 student attendance rates (approximately 95%–96%), from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020, depending on the school year and number of years of program participation. Favorably, there was a 55 percent decrease in the gap between attendance rates at three-year Achieve 180 Program and comparison non-A180 Program schools from a pre-program gap of 1.1 percentage points (93.8% vs 94.9%, respectively) to a post-program gap of 0.5 percentage point (95.5% vs 96.0%, respectively). Also, between two-year Achieve 180 Program schools and comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools, the gap in student attendance rates decreased 64 percent from a pre-program gap of 1.4 percentage points (94.7%vs 96.1%, respectively) to a post-program gap of 0.5 percentage point (96.3% vs 96.8%, respectively). Chronic absence rates decreased at Achieve 180 Program schools at rates that were statistically significant where possible to assess, regardless of the number of years of program participation.

Favorably for the program, when disaggregated by students' demographic characteristics, across student subgroups and the number of years of school program participation; except for students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities and White students, the largest proportions of schools had more students of each subgroup to show gains in their attendance rates than to show no change or losses by the end of their school's participation in the program. At three-year schools, this ranged from 56 percent of the schools of English Learners to 70 percent of the schools of Economically Disadvantaged students. At two-year schools, this ranged from 70 percent of the schools of English Learners to 90 percent of the schools of Black/African American students, 90 percent of the schools of Economically Disadvantaged students, and 90 percent of the schools of Students with Disabilities. Unfavorably, students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities had a greater proportion of schools where their student group had decreases (losses) in their attendance rates (60%) than gains (20%) or no change (20%). White students had equal proportions of schools (46%) where their student group made more gains in attendance rate as schools where they had more losses in their attendance rates.

Achieve 180 Program's Pillar IV Social and Emotional Learning Support was designed to provide students with non-academic supports to facilitate their capacity for academic successes. Related efforts were supplied through schoolwide behavior support systems to better address disciplinary concerns and resources such as wrapround services and enhanced access to nursing and counselor supports. The mean overall implementation fidelity rating for Pillar IV was 2.7 out of 3.0, indicating this pillar's interventions collectively provided a "Strong example" of what was expected. However, this mean rating and some student attendance findings show there remains an urgent need identity and address the core causes of student absenteeism as a hinderance to increased improvements in student achievement, particularly at higher school levels. Still, it is very reasonable to expect that the program's Pillar IV interventions may have been successful in helping to achieve important gains in student attendance. It may prove helpful to augment them at program schools as well as replicate them at other high-need schools across the district.

## District-Level Assessments (DLA)

Program benefits appeared to be consistently evident using student-matching and 2019–2020 DLA to measure program impacts on the performance of students at schools targeted by the extensive Achieve 180 Program supports. The effects of the multi-faced program interventions led to mostly comparable or higher performance of Achieve 180 Program students.

# English Language Arts (ELA)

Signaling positive program effects for its students' academic achievement in English language arts (ELA) was a 4.2 percentage-point performance-gap reduction at the program level, which resulted in a half-point gap vs the initial 4.7-gap in favor of the non-program students. At the level of the program's tiers, indications of the program's benefits for program students who took DLA ELA exams included performance-gap reductions ranging from 55 percent (Tier 3) to 88 percent (Tier 2). In addition, performance-gap closures on the DLA ELA exams resulted in Tier 1 and Light Support Achieve 180 Program students' mean score exceeding their non-program peers' mean score, by 1.3 points and 0.4 point, respectively, with Tier 1 showing a statistically significant higher score than their non-program peers.

### Mathematics

Analysis of program impacts on program students' DLA mathematics performance at the program level showed an 8.8-point change in the initial performance-gap that was in favor of non-Achieve 180 Program students. The change resulted in Achieve 180 Program students' score being two points higher score than their non-program peers' score, a difference that was statistically significant (p<0.01), as was the initial gap, which was in favor of their peers (p<0.05). At the tier level of the program, indications of the program's benefits for its students' DLA mathematics performance included gap closures where program students' performance exceeded their peers' in four (80%) of the five tiers (Tier 3, Tier 2, Tier 1, and Light Support), with the difference in favor of Achieve 180 Program students being of statistical significance (p<0.01) for three of the four tiers (Tier 3, Tier 1, and Light Support). For the Area Support students, a 9.1-point (88%) performance-gap reduction between them and non-program peers suggested program benefits for Achieve 180 Program students.

### **Graduation Rates**

For the 12 three-year schools in the Achieve 180 Program, four-year state graduation rates with exclusions in 2017, 2018, and 2019 (66.3%, 66.4%, and 67.8%, respectively) were about 15 to 17 percentage points lower than non-Achieve 180 rates each year (82.8%, 81.8%, and 82.7%, respectively). Favorably for Achieve 180 Program schools, the mean four-year graduation rate increased 1.5 percentage points from pre-program (Class of 2017) to post-program (Class of 2019), while it decreased 0.1 percentage point at their comparison non-Achieve 180 Program schools, narrowing the gap by 9.7 percent from 16.5 to 14.9 percentage points. There were no two-year program schools with high school graduate-level students.

Somewhat favorable for the program, overall, when disaggregated by students' demographic characteristics (race/ethnicity, economic disadvantage, English learner, and disability) four-year graduation rates increased for All Students and for each student group assessed from pre-program (Class of 2017) to the second year of the program (Class of 2019), except for Black/African American students who comprised 34 to 35 percent of the Class of 2017 and of the Class of 2019 and showed a 1.0 percentage point decline. The gains ranged from 0.3 percentage point (students of Two or More Races/Ethnicities) to 35.1 percentage points (Native American students). The gain was statistically significant for White students.

Unfortunately, the gap in five-year state graduation rates widened between Achieve 180 Program participants and comparison schools. After one program year, the baseline (Class of 2018) Achieve 180

Program's five-year graduation rate was 0.9 percentage point lower than the rate had been prior to the onset of the program (Class of 2017), while the rate at comparison schools increased 0.3 percentage point, widening the gap by 9.5 percent from 12.6 to 13.8 percentage points. Additional results are pending. Complete five-year graduation pre- to post-program results were available for one one-year school (Victory Preparatory South HS, a 2017–2018 participant) and showed a 7.3 percentage-point gain in the mean five-year graduation rate from its baseline rate (Class of 2017) to the post-program rate (Class of 2018).

By student group overall, unfortunately, five-year graduation rates decreased from pre-program (Class of 2017) to one year after the program began (Class of 2018) for all race/ethnic groups assessed, except for Asian/Pacific Islander (5.1 p-point gain) and White (1.0 p-point gain) students who together comprised only 14 to 15 percent of the Class of 2017 and of the Class of 2019. Five-year graduation rates increased slightly for Economically Disadvantaged students (0.1 p-point gain) from pre-program (Class of 2017) to after the first year of the program (Class of 2018) but, decreased for English Learners (1.3 percentage points) and SWD (1.7 percentage points).

It must be stated that even after three years of the extensive supports provided through the Achieve 180 Program, four-year graduation rates at the 12 participating schools continue to reveal that more than 30 percent of students in these high-need schools are not graduating after four years of high school, and furthermore, more than 25 percent of students at Achieve 180 Program schools are not graduating after five years of high school. Results by student group reveal this problem is amplified among Black/African American students, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged students, and SWD who showed a decline in the four-year graduation rate at nearly half or more (45.5 percent to 58.3 percent) of the schools they attended. This problem was enhanced among these groups at the one-year program school and among English Learners there, where they showed a 51.4 percentage-point decline in the four-year graduation rate from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2018. A closer review of district, school, and Achieve 180 Program supports at each grade level may be necessary to insure that effective and differentiated foundational supports are available to all students each year of school, and particularly to the identified sub-groups of students in high-need schools. Resolution of this problem and its underlying agents are essential if we are to fulfill our role of ensuring that every student is able to attain one of the most basic levels of success, graduating from high school within four or five years after entering.

#### Program Associations with Student Achievement (District-Level Assessments)

More positive relationships of greater intensity were found for associations between program implementation fidelity ratings and student scores on DLA taken in the Spanish language than were found for DLA taken in the English language or for associations between program implementation fidelity and the educator outcomes assessed for this report (School Leader Appraisal Scorecard and TADS ratings). Moderate or strong relationships (some of statistical significance, p<.01) were identified between program implementation fidelity of Pillar I Leadership Excellence and scores on Spanish English language arts (ELA) exams; implementation fidelity of Pillar II Teacher Excellence and scores on English and Spanish language ELA exams and scores on English language mathematics exams; implementation fidelity of Pillar V Social and Emotional Learning Support and scores on Spanish ELA and Spanish Math; and implementation fidelity of Pillar VI Parent and Family Empowerment and sores on Spanish ELA and Spanish Math exams.

#### Accountability Ratings

Since the onset of the Achieve 180 Program in 2017–2018 (Year 1), each year that newly calculated annual ratings have been given, the total number of HISD campuses that have received TEA School Accountability Ratings of Improvement Required (IR), *F*, or NR-H ratings has decreased; dropping from 27 of 278 schools

in 2016–2017 (baseline year) to 23 of 275 schools in 2017–2018 (Year 1), to 21 of 271 schools in 2018–2019 (Year 2); totaling a 22 percent reduction in failing schools overall. Each year that newly calculated annual ratings have been given, the percentage of Achieve 180 Program schools that have met the accountability standard (or were rated A-D) increased, from 17 of 44 schools (39%) in 2017 (baseline year) to 43 of 53 schools (81%) in 2019 (Year 2).

Due to the pandemic, new annual district and campus ratings were not calculated for the 2019–2020 school year (Year 3); therefore, 21 HISD schools retained their previous 2018–2019 (Year 2) TEA School Accountability Ratings of Improvement Required (IR), *F*, or NR-H in 2019–2020. Ten of the 54 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program campuses (19%) ended the school rated IR/*F* and 44 (81%) were rated Met Standard/*A-D*. Of the 10 IR/*F* Achieve 180 Program campuses, only two of them had been rated NR-H or IR/*F* in the year(s) prior to spring 2019 (Wheatley HS and Sugar Grove MS in Tier 3). The other eight campuses were rated Met Standard/*A-D* in spring 2019 when ratings were last calculated.

### Conclusion

It is crucial for stakeholders who are interested in the current and future student outcomes of underserved and underperforming Achieve 180 Program scholars and their peers on similar campuses in similar communities to remain clear that the historical underpinnings of our society and communities transmit the political, socioeconomic, cultural, and race/ethnic-based inequities that are very clearly and consistently made manifest through our students' academic outcomes (Coleman, 1966). Carnoy and Garcia (2017) studied the academic performance of disenfranchised groups in this country and found some persistent gaps between students of higher vs lower income groups, African American/Black and Hispanic students (regardless of economic status) were much more likely to be in high-poverty schools than were their Asian/Pacific Islander or White peers, and English Learners were increasingly falling behind non-EL White students in reading and mathematics. Roughly 15 percent of the variation in low student performance can be explained by differences in students' demographic, socio-economic, and educational backgrounds (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2016). It is understood by most that students' demographic and socio-economic background characteristics do not determine students' levels of academic achievement. However, these factors create conditions that are known to influence student success in the school system (OECD, 2016). Research-based (Austin, Vaughn, & McClelland, 2017), early intervention to support student success is the key to mitigating these risk factors (Carnoy & Garcie, 2017).

These political, socioeconomic, cultural, and race/ethnic-based "core causes" have continued to help shape the long-term, deeply entrenched challenges that our educators and students at the Achieve 180 Program schools must face. In fact, the initial "core causes" of students' academic failure at Achieve 180 Program schools were articulated by school administrators in the initial planning phases of the program. The identified "core causes" delineated societal, community, and school conditions, systems, climates, attitudes, and practices as the primary contributors to the perpetuation of academic failure among their students. To some extent, the Achieve 180 Program's funding and other in-kind district support have provided some help for socio-political inequities in funding and other resources that have long impacted Achieve 180 Program students, families, communities, and schools. But, by design, the Achieve 180 Program's supports have been limited and short-lived in comparison to the societal realities they confront and seek to mediate.

Despite longstanding inequities that effect learning outcomes, particularly for students of color and lowincome students, through the Achieve 180 Program, HISD has sought to implement differentiated, researchbased interventions focused on educator and student success that aligned with recommendations for school and district turnaround that include "finding strong leaders, focusing on data and monitoring, establishing a safe, orderly climate, and establishing a culture of high expectations" (Trujillo and Rénee, 2015, p. 17). Turnaround studies for schools suggest focusing on strategies to bolster test scores, such as curriculum alignment, test preparation, and test-based achievement goals for students (Trujillo, 2013). Along with these strategies, some studies have suggested implementing additional supports such as teacher recruitment and intensive professional development (Sparks, 2012). In addition to increasing federal and state funding for public education, researchers propose the following to promote turnaround processes that are equitable and democratic: (1) improving the quality of teaching and learning, (2) engaging teachers, students, parents, and community organizations in developing and implementing turnaround efforts, (3) tailoring strategies to each school and district, (4) utilizing multiple indicators of effectiveness that reflect school objectives, and (5) encouraging research, evaluation, and dissemination to examine each aspect of the school and district turnaround process (Trujillo and Rénee, 2015). The HISD Achieve 180 Program was based upon research, including studies on campus and district turnaround.

A common understanding among informed HISD stakeholders is that it is no small feat to successfully turn around high-need schools, such as Achieve A180 Program schools, or to make clear and sustained progress toward that end, particularly within short-term programming (like the three-year timeframe initially set for the program). The positive findings associated with the Achieve 180 Program exist within the context of long-standing deficits. Both the positive results and the challenges point us towards areas that necessitate sustained, favorable change, if the Achieve 180 Program students and communities are to be successful in the longer term. Persistent gaps in school leader and educator effectiveness continue to translate into long-standing student performance gaps that represent our historical failure to effectively equip our high-need schools to satisfy the paramount role of education, which is to provide each of our progeny with viable and equitable opportunities to *achieve* (i.e., to triumph) regardless of their social circumstances. Sustained funding and school turnaround enhancements are important and necessary to remedy the school leadership, educator effectiveness, student learning and achievement, and family and community empowerment deficits experienced by students at high-need schools (NEPC, 2012).

The Achieve 180 Program had been enacted in the spirit the district's responsibility to our students that aligns with Commissioner Cerf's address at our 2018–2019 State of the Schools fundraiser (as summarized above), consistent with the Improving Basic Programs effort in Title I, Part A (Title I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), as well as with the Mission, Vision, Beliefs, Theory of Action, Goals, and Constraints of HISD's Board of Education. Also, compatible with the district's stated Mission, Vision, and Beliefs regarding equity, the Achieve 180 Program sought to support, strengthen, and empower students who attend HISD's most underserved and underperforming schools through developing and supporting campus leaders and educators, engaging and empowering students and their families, and developing alliances within school communities to enhance student learning and increase student achievement. In light of these important endeavors, have the district, community, and state stakeholders paid adequate attention to the social, political, and cultural drivers of Achieve 180 Program schools and schooling (Welner, 2001)?

The gains made by program providers and participants have been palpable. Yet, consistent with other district reports such as those on TADS, SWD interventions, Title I, Part A student outcomes, Gifted and Talented, and literacy interventions, the findings of this report reveal varied and persistent performance deficits among the educators and students in high-need Achieve 180 Program schools, with notable gaps remaining between their performance and the performance of their peers at non-Achieve 180 Program schools. Tremendous efforts such as those enacted through Achieve 180 Program may be more effective and sustainable when grounded within a broader context of collaborative supports that simultaneously address the social, political, and cultural realities of these schools and the old underlying structures that must be remedied to effectively educate our progeny. As suggested by one leader in education research, we must

"ensure that educational resources are distributed equitably." Perhaps, to "... undo the racialized system we inherited from our predecessors ... a coalition of cross-sector leaders and community stakeholders [is needed] ... to dismantle the system of racialized zoning that continues to harm our students .... The work of the coalition is grounded in local data and research ... " (Turley, 2021).

# References

- Allensworth, E.M., & Hart, H. (2018). How do principals influence student achievement? Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Consortium on School Research. Retrieved November 7, 2018 from https://consortium.uchicago.edu/publications/how-do-principals-influence-student-achievement
- Austin, C. R., Vaughn, S., & McClelland, A. M. (2017). Intensive reading interventions for inadequate responders in grades K–3: A synthesis. Learning Disability Quarterly, 40(4), 191-210. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1156538.pdf
- Austin, P. C. (2011). An introduction to propensity score methods for reducing the effects of confounding in observational studies. Multivariate Behavioral Research 46, 399–424. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3144483/.
- Carroll, C., Patterson, M., Wood, S., Booth, A., Rick, J., & Balain, S. (2007). A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity. *Implementation Science*, *2*(1), 40.
- Carnoy, M., & Garcia, E. (2017). Five Key Trends in US Student Performance: Progress by Blacks and Hispanics, the Takeoff of Asians, the Stall of NonEnglish Speakers, the Persistence of Socioeconomic Gaps, and the Damaging Effect of Highly Segregated Schools. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved on May 12, 2021 from https://files.epi.org/pdf/113217.pdf
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., Hilger, N., Saez, E., Schanzenbach, D. W., & Yagan, D. (2011). How does your kindergarten classroom affect your earnings? Evidence from Project STAR. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *126*(4), 1593-1660.
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2014). Measuring the impacts of teachers II: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood. *American Economic Review*, *104*(9), 2633-79.
- Cochan, W. G. & Rubin, D. B. (1973). Controlling bias in observational studies: A review. *The Indian Journal of Statistics*, Series A. *35*, 417–466.
- Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity* (Report No. OE-3800). Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Duke, D. L., & Jacobson, M. (2011). Tackling the toughest turnaround—Low-performing high schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 92(5), 34-38.
- Flock, K.C. Le. (2015). Supporting school turnaround: Lessons for Texas policymakers. Retrieved from http://28blxv18mmp92p7we7rk1ga1.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wpcontent/uploads/2015/09/Turnaround\_ResearchReport.pdf

Frechtling, J. (2010). The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, Division of Education and Human Resources. Retrieved November 17, 2017 from https://nsfagep.org/evaluation-

resources/#:~:text=The%202010%20UserFriendly%20Handbook%20for%20Project%20Evaluation%2 0Developed,The%202010%20UserFriendly%20Handbook%20for%20Project%20Evaluation%20%28P DF%29.

- Houston Independent School District. (2018). Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part A, 2017–2018. Retrieved November 5, 2020 from https://www.houstonisd.org/cms/lib2/TX01001591/Centricity/ domain/8269/pe\_districtprograms/2018%20Achieve%20180%20Program%20Evaluation\_Part%2 0A\_full.pdf
- Houston Independent School District. (2019a). Teacher and School Leader (TSL) Incentive Program -Project Leaders Leveraging Effective Academics Districtwide for Equity and Resources for Students. Retrieved August 22, 2019 from https://blogs.houstonisd.org/employeenews/wp-content/uploads/sites/ 3/2019/04/J132119\_TSL\_Booklet\_Final\_012919.pdf
- Houston Independent School District. (2019b). Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part A, 2018–2019. Retrieved November 10, 2019 from https://www.houstonisd.org/cms/lib2/TX01001591/Centricity/domain/8269/pe\_districtprograms/Ac hieve%20180%20Evaluation\_PartA\_092019.pdf
- Houston Independent School District. (2019c). 2019 preliminary *TEA accountability system ratings*. Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District. Retrieved September 14, 2019 from https://www.houstonisd.org/cms/lib2/TX01001591/Centricity/domain/8269/accountabilityreports/tearati ngs/2019%20Preliminary%20TEA%20Accountability%20System%20Ratings.pdf
- Houston Independent School District. (2020a). *Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part A,* Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District. Retrieved January 18, 2021 from https://www.houstonisd.org/cms/lib2/TX01001591/Centricity/domain/8269/pe\_districtprograms/1920Ac hieve%2080%20Evaluation\_PartA\_All.docx01062021.pdf
- Houston Independent School District. (2020b). 2020 TEA accountability ratings. Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District. Retrieved October 16, 2020 from https://www.houstonisd.org/cms/lib2/TX01001591/Centricity/domain/8269/accountabilityreports/tearati ngs/2020%20HISD%20Accountability%20Ratings-Memo.pdf
- Houston Independent School District. (2020c). Teacher appraisal and development system: end of year report, 2018–2019. Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District. Retrieved June 16, 2021 from https://www.houstonisd.org/cms/lib2/TX01001591/Centricity/domain/8269/pe\_effective%20teachers/18 -19%20TADS%20EOY%20Report\_09212020%20with%20CoverPages%20.pdf
- Houston Independent School District. (2020d). HISD News. State of Schools event focuses on achieving excellence. Retrieved March 9, 2020 from https://blogs.houstonisd.org/news/2020/03/06/hisd-foundations-state-of-the-schools-event-focuses-on-achieving-excellence-with-one-voice-one-vision/
- Institute for Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse. (2017). What Works Clearinghouse procedure handbook, Version 4.0, 7/14/2017 Draft. Washington, DC.: U.S. Department of Education.

Retrieved from https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/ReferenceResources /wwc\_procedures\_handbook\_v4\_draft.pdf.

- Kraft, M.A. & Gilmour, A.F. (2017). Revisiting the Widget Effect: Teacher evaluation reforms and the distribution of teacher effectiveness. Educational Researcher, 46(5), 234-249. July 20, 2021 from https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/mkraft/files/kraft\_gilmour\_2017\_widget\_effect\_er.pdf
- Knapp, M. S. (2003). "Professional Development as Policy Pathway." Review of Research in Education, 27(1), 109–157.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Strauss, T. (2010). Leading school turnaround: How successful leaders transform low-performing schools. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mapp, K. L., & Kuttner, P. J. (2013.) Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved on August 28, 21017 from http://www.sedl.org/pubs/framework/
- National Education Policy Center (NEPC). (2012, October). *Democratic School Turnarounds. Pursuing Equity and Learning from Evidence*. Retrieved June 30, 2021 from https://nepc.info/sites/default/files/pb-turnaroundequity\_0.pdf
- Obiakor, F. E., Banks, T. I., Rotatori, A. F., & Utley, C. (2017). Leadership matters in the education of students with special needs in the 21st century. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing. Retrieved on April 1, 2020 from https://www.infoagepub.com/products/Leadership-Matters-in-the-Education-of-Students-with-Special-Needs-in-the-21st-Century
- O'Donnell, C. L. (2008). Defining, conceptualizing, and measuring fidelity of implementation and its relationship to outcomes in K-12 curriculum intervention research. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 33–84.
- Olivos, E. 2012. "Authentic Engagement with Bicultural Parents and Communities: The Role of School Leaders," pp. 98–114. In School Leadership for Authentic Family and Community Partnerships, edited by S. Auerbach. New York: Routledge
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2016). Low-Performing Students: Why They Fall Behind and How to Help Them Succeed. OECD Publishing. Retrieved on July 28, 2021, from https://www.oecd.org/education/low-performing-students-9789264250246-en.htm
- Player, D., & Katz, V. (2016). Assessing school turnaround: Evidence from Ohio. The Elementary School Journal, 116(4), 675-698.
- Romasz, T. E., Kantor, J. H., & Elias, M. (2004). Implementation and evaluation of urban school-based social-emotional learning programs. Evaluation and Program Planning, 27, 89–103.

Schmoker, M. (2011). Turnaround: A tale of two schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 93(2), 70.

- Sparks, S. (2012, September 18). New studies dissect school turnarounds. Education Week. Retrieved on July 18, 2020 from https://www.edweek.org/leadership/new-studies-dissect-school-turnarounds/2012/09
- Stuart E. A. (2010). Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. Statistical science: a review. Journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 25(1), 1–21.
- Texas Education Agency. (2019). *General Information about Schoolwide Programs*. Retrieved June 4, 2019 https://tea.texas.gov/Finance\_and\_Grants/Grants/Federal\_Flexibility\_Initiative/ Schoolwide\_Programs/General\_Information\_about\_Schoolwide\_Programs/
- Texas Education Agency. (2020a). Title I, Part A Improving Basic Programs. *Program Guide*. Retrieved June 4, 2020 from https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/T1AProgramGuide.pdf
- Texas Education Agency. (2020b). Texas ACE Afterschool Centers on Education. Retrieved July 1, 2020 from https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/TexasACE%20Blueprint%202021%20Final\_0.pdf
- Thoemmes, F. (2012) Propensity score matching in SPSS. arXiv:1201.6385 [stat.AP] v1. Retrieved on November 20, 2020 from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=thoemmes+f.+(2012).+propensity+score+matching+in+spss&hl= en&as\_sdt=0&as\_vis=1&oi=scholart
- Turley, R. L. (2021). Opinion: Packing poverty into schools is costing America and we know how to fix it Houston Chronicle, June 13, 2021. Retrieved on June 15, 2021 from https://www.houstonchronicle.com/opinion/outlook/article/Opinion-Packing-poverty-into-schools-iscosting-16243737.php
- Trujillo, T. (2013). The reincarnation of the effective schools research: Rethinking the literature on district effectiveness. Journal of Educational Administration, 51(4), 426–452. Retrieved from https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/09578231311325640/full/html
- Trujillo, T. & Rénee, M. (2015, June). Irrational exuberance for market-based reform: How federal turnaround policies thwart democratic schooling. Teachers College Record, 117(6). Retrieved February 1, 2021 from https://www.academia.edu/6596452/Trujillo\_T\_and\_Renee\_M\_2015\_Irrational\_Exuberance\_for\_Mark et\_based\_Reform\_How\_Federal\_Turnaround\_Policies\_Thwart\_Democratic\_Schooling\_Teachers\_Coll ege Record 117 6
- Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., Keeling, D., Schunck, J., Palcisco, A., & Morgan, K. (2009). The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness (2nd ed.). New York, NY: New Teacher Project. Retrieved on August 2, 2021 from https://tntp.org/assets/documents/TheWidgetEffect\_execsummary\_2nd\_ed.pdf
- Welner, K. G. (2001). Legal rights, local wrongs: When community control collides with educational equity. Albany: State University of New York Press. Retrieved on February 8, 2021 from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED457294



# **Appendices Appendix A: Student Characteristics**

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2018 and Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0

Note: In 2018–2019 (Year 2), 53 schools participated and in 2019–2020 (Year 3), 54 schools participated.

8.5%

#### 2018-2019 N=44,501 2019-2020 N=45,691 Student Characteristics & Race/Ethnicity Grade Instructional Program 2018-2019 6,381 2019-2020 6,385 Tier 3 Schools Total Enrollmen EE, African American 41.5% 95.5% 3.4% Economically Disadvantaged American Indian 0.2% 96.4% 0.4% 27.3% Asian/Pacific Islander 15.4% 14.1% English Learners (EL) Hispanic/Latino 56.4% 32.0% 14 10.7% 9.5% 15.6% 77.3% Two or More 0.3% At-Risk White 1.1% 83.6% 12 EE,PK,KG Special Education to African American 40.5% 13.4% 1.9% 2.1% 1.7% 2.0% 1.8% Students with Disabilities (SWD) 12.6% American Indian 0.2% Asian/Pacific Islander 0.6% 4.6% Gifted and Talented 4.5% 57.1% Hispanic/Latino Two or More 0.3% 36.2% Career and Technology White 1.3% 36.9% 2018-2019 8,502 2019-2020 8,354 Tier 2 Schools Total Enrollment EE.PK.KG 11.2% 5.2% 4.8% 5.0% 4.7% 4.5% 4.2% 55.0% 96.3% African American Economically Disadvantaged American Indian 0.1% 96.6% 25.5% Asian/Pacific Islander 1.6% English Learners (EL) 4.2% 1.0% 4.3% 27.4% 41.0% Hispanic/Latino 78.2% Two or More 0.5% 16.3% 13. 11.8% 11.0% At-Risk 1.8% 84.5% White EE,PK,KG 53.4% Special Education to 11.1% African American 5.1% 4.8% .4% .5% 4.6% Students with Disabilities (SWD) American Indian 0.1% an/Pacific Islander 📕 1.5% 3.0% Gifted and Talented 42.7% 3.1% Hispanic/Latino 3% 43.0% Two or More 0.6% 17.9% 10 Career and Technology 11.0% White 1.7% 47.4% 2018-2019 8,454 2019-2020 8,692 Tier 1 Schools Total Enrollment EE,PK,KG 9.3% 91.6% 42.0% African American Economically Disadvantaged 94.3% American Indian 0.2% 6.3% 5.7% n/Pacific Islander 0.7% 30.7% 13.8% 13.2% 12.6% English Learners (EL) Hispanic/Latino 55.6% 33.8% 76.5% Two or More 0.4% 4.7% 4.6% 4.6% At-Risk 11 12 EE,PK,KG White 1.1% 82 7% Special Education to African American 40.5% 10.6% 6.1% Students with Disabilities (SWD) 10.8% American Indian 0.2% 6.1% Asian/Pacific Islander 0.7% 6.6% Gifted and Talented 6.7% Hispanic/Latino 57.1% 13.7% 13.4% Two or More 0.4% 21.4% Career and Technology 10 11 12 4 3% White 1.0% 24.0% 2018-2019 13,435 2019-2020 14,245 Area Support Schools Total Enrollment EE,PK,KG 6.8% 72.3% African American 23.5% Economically 5.0% 5.0% American Indian 0.3% Disadvantaged 71.6% 6.6% n/Pacific Islander 📒 2.4% 23.6% English Learners (EL) 24.5% 50.5% Hispanic/Latino 8.5% Two or More 2.4% 62.4% .6% 10.1% At-Risk 21.0% 67.7% White 11 12 EE,PK,KG Special Education to 7.3% African American 23.0% 4.5% Students with Disabilities (SWD) 8.0% American Indian 0.3% 6.1% Asian/Pacific Islander 2.7% 3.1% Gifted and Talented Hispanic/Latino 49.6% 27% Two or More 2.5% 23.1% Career and Technology 10 10.3% 22.4% 22.0% White 2018-2019 7,729 2019-2020 8,015 Light Support Schools Total Enrollment 10.0% 94.9% African American 24.0% Economically American Indian 0.2% Disadvantaged 92.9% Asian/Pacific Islander 1.0% 33.3% English Learners (EL) 1.6% 1.4% 1.6% 36.8% Hispanic/Latino 73.0% 17.4% Two or More 0.4% 74.1% 11.8% At-Risk White 1.4% 79.7% 11 12 EE,PK,KG 11.0% Special Education to 8.5% African American 23.7% Students with Disabilities (SWD) 8.5% American Indian 0.1% Asian/Pacific Islander 0.8% 9.8% Gifted and Talented 1.5% 1.4% 1.3% 9.4% Hispanic/Latino 73.6% 16.5% 14.5% 13.7% Two or More 0.4% 50.4% 10 Career and Technology White 1.4% 50.0%

#### Figure A-2. Achieve 180 Program Student Characteristics by 2018–2019 Treatment Group, 2018–2019 and 2019–2020

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2018 and Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0 Note: 2018–2019 (Year 2) and 2019–2020 (Year 3) results are shown for the 54 schools participating in 2019–2020.

Table A-1. Ac	thieve 180 Program Objectives by Pillar	and Focus Areas, 2017–2018
Pillar	Focus Areas	Objectives
l Leadership Excellence	Essential Staffing Compensation Principal Effectiveness Collaborative School Support	<ul> <li>Fill essential staff positions and retain essential staff.</li> <li>Essential staff connects students to resources.</li> <li>Mentor, coach, and provide differentiated support to instructional leaders and teachers.</li> </ul>
ll Teacher Excellence	Priority Teacher Staffing and Retention Teacher Effectiveness Compensation	<ul> <li>Identify, attract, hire, and retain high- quality educators.</li> <li>Provide incentives, differentiated professional development, and support to educators.</li> </ul>
III Instructional Excellence	Literacy Curriculum Implementation and Instructional Delivery Formative Assessment and Data Protocols Cognitive Demand High Quality Professional Development Curriculum Alignment between Grade-level Standards and Student Needs	<ul> <li>Provide real-time and personalized support in curriculum and instruction to ensure effective, aligned, differentiated, and rigorous lessons in every classroom</li> </ul>
IV School Design	Extended Work Day for Teachers Master Schedule Structured Instructional Time Intervention (Academic and Behavioral) Blended Learning Cultural Competence Differentiated and Personalized Instruction Meeting Needs of Overage Students Global Graduate and College/Career Readiness Opportunities	<ul> <li>Provide a school day and school environment designed for student progress and achievement.</li> <li>Enable students to become critical thinkers, problem-solvers, and meaning makers</li> </ul>
V Social and Emotional Learning Support	Teaching the Whole Child Wraparound Services Feeder Pattern Connections	<ul> <li>Provide a menu of social and emotional supports tailored to each campus and community.</li> <li>Remove non-academic barriers to student engagement in instruction and learning.</li> <li>Employ a systemic approach to provide learning supports (i.e., intervention assistance teams, resources, and analysis of behavioral, physical, and mental health data) and to connect student learning supports to academic achievement and growth.</li> </ul>
VI Family and Community Engagement	Family Friendly Schools Two-Way Communication Feeder Pattern Connections	<ul> <li>Engage and empower family and community members as partners in education.</li> <li>Encourage two-way communication between home and school.</li> <li>Increase parent involvement and engagement.</li> </ul>
http://ww	ww.houstonisd.org/Page/166319; Pilar 3 - <u>http://www.houstonisd.org/Page/166319;</u> Pilar 3 - <u>http:// ww.houstonisd.org/Page/166338</u> ; Pilar 5 - <u>http://</u>	/www.houstonisd.org/Page/166337; Pillar 4 - /www.houstonisd.org/Page/166339; Pillar 4 -

# Appendix A: Achieve 180 Program Objectives

Note: Program objectives included in the table are extracted from text describing [intermediate] program goals and aims, which support the three explicit and overarching Board and Achieve 180 Program goals.

# Appendix A: Achieve 180 Program Logic Model

# Figure A-3. Achieve 180 Program Logic Model, 2019–2020



Source: Achieve 180 Program Administrators, 2019-2020

\_\_\_\_

Table A-2. Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric by Pillar of School Improvement, 2019–2020						
Pillar I – Leadership Excellence						
RESOURCE	STRONG EXAMPLE	EMERGING EXAMPLE	NON-EXAMPLE			
Leadership Team Structures	The leadership team has leaders with clearly defined goals and each administrator oversees a content area or program. The teams have a system of tracking progress of their goals.	The leadership team has leaders with clearly defined goal that meet the needs of students in most of the content areas. Some of the leaders on the team lack the capacity to lead a content area.	The campus does not have a leadership team with a clear vision or instructional goal.			
Professional Learning Communities	The campus holds PLCs regularly and the meetings have clear expectations with an instructional focus. The PLC evaluates data to determine next steps and practices high yield instructional strategies before going live in the classroom with students.	The campus holds PLCs regularly and the meetings have clear expectations with an instructional focus.	The campus does not have professional learning communities			
Demonstration Principal	An authentic collaboration has formed between the A180 principal and demo principal. The school leaders are actively involved in exchanging ideas and have implemented change due to the pair with the demonstration principal. The classroom instruction at the A180 school has improved due to the collaboration with the demo principal.	Dutiful exchanges between leaders have occurred. There is a gap between the level of classroom instruction in the paired schools. Leaders can articulate when/where meetings have occurred but are not connecting these to changes in practice.	No exchanges have occurred, or leaders report that this experience is not helpful/not desired.			
Campus Culture	The campus has a vision that all students can learn. Students, teachers, and the community are excited to be a part of the school. There is a positive student to teacher relationship. The school community collaborates to make the campus a place where everyone is welcome and learning goals are being met.	The campus has a vision that all students can learn and students, teachers, and the community are excited to be a part of the school community. There is a positive student to teacher relationship.	The campus has a vision that all students can learn, but students, teachers, and the community do not feel welcome or want to visit the campus.			
Community of Practice Visits	Classroom instructional practices in almost every classroom reflect stated campus instructional priorities and areas of focus which are the subject of Instructional Rounds.	Classroom instructional practices include a few strong examples of stated campus instructional priorities and areas of focus which are the subject of Instructional Rounds, but these are the exception and not the norm.	Classroom instructional practices do not reflect attention to stated campus instructional priorities and areas of focus which are the subject of Instructional Rounds.			
Data Specialists	Specialists are integrated into the administrative team and are utilized to their full potential. Leadership teams can speak to the value and impact of the specialist. Teachers can articulate goals, areas of growth, and instructional changes because of the relationship with the data specialist.	The specialists are running reports and are the keeper of campus data knowledge. The campus has not taken full ownership of data creation and analysis.	There is a disconnect between specialist's strengths and campus needs.			

# Appendix A: Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric

Table A-2. Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric, 2019–2020 (Continued)				
Pillar II –	Teacher Excellence			
RESOURCE	STRONG EXAMPLE	EMERGING EXAMPLE	NON-EXAMPLE	
Teacher Effectiveness Data	According to the TADS rubric and student progress data, the teacher is an exemplar model for effective instructional practices and leads colleagues as needed to drive student learning forward.	According to the TADS rubric and student progress data, the teacher consistently improves in their instructional practices and is receptive to coaching and feedback.	According to the TADS rubric and student progress data, a teacher's instructional practices are ineffective.	
Dedicated Associate Teachers	Associate Teachers display evidence of literacy, content knowledge, and classroom culture training that has been provided uniquely to Achieve 180 Associate Teachers. Associate Teachers have excellent attendance. Fill rates are at or above the district average.	Associate Teachers have good attendance and are filling the vacancies but are not sustaining classroom expectations or district priorities regarding literacy, content and classroom culture.	Associate Teachers are not yet hired, have poor attendance, or are demonstrating difficulty carrying out teachers' classroom plans and/or maintaining good rapport with students.	
Model Classrooms	All classrooms are models of implementation of Literacy by 3, Literacy in the Middle or Literacy Empowered.	Many/most classrooms are going through the motions of Literacy by 3, Literacy in the Middle or Literacy Empowered, but need work on implementation quality.	Many/most classrooms are not reflective of Literacy by 3, Literacy in the Middle or Literacy Empowered initiatives.	
New Teacher Coaches (Tier 3 campuses)	Coaches are visible in the classroom. Goals based on observations are developed. There is a coaching relationship evident (not a supervisory one). Teachers can articulate goals, areas of growth, and instructional changes because of the relationship with the new teacher coach.	The practices of the coach are of an observer or supervisory nature, not yet fully developed into a meaningful coaching relationship. Teachers are unsure of the role and/or impact of the coach.	The new teacher coach is not yet in place or teachers report that this is not helpful or undesired.	
Teacher Development Specialist	Specialists are visible in the classroom and during Wednesday PD. Goals based on observations are developed. There is a coaching relationship evident (not a supervisory one). Teachers can speak to the value and impact of the TDS. Teachers can articulate goals, areas of growth, and instructional changes because of the relationship with the TDS. The TDS is willing to do whatever it takes to support campus goals.	The practices of the TDS are not yet fully developed into a meaningful coaching relationship. Teachers are unsure of the role and/or impact of the TDS.	There is a disconnect between the TDS' strengths and teacher needs. It is unclear if evidence exists showing impact of TDS support. TDS is generally passive and inflexible in regard to campus support requests.	

Table A-2. Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric, 2019–2020 (Continued)				
Pillar III -	- Instructional Excellence			
RESOURCE	STRONG EXAMPLE	EMERGING EXAMPLE	NON-EXAMPLE	
Curriculum Assessment, Planning, and Delivery	Classroom instruction is aligned to the rigor and content assessed on formative assessments. There is evidence of appropriate differentiation and scaffolds in place as needed, in every classroom that takes an assessment.	Classroom instruction is aligned to the rigor and content assessed on formative assessments, with appropriate differentiation and scaffolds in place as needed, in some classrooms that take assessment; OR, classroom instruction is aligned to the rigor and content, but it does not include appropriate differentiation and scaffolding per student needs.	Classroom instruction is not aligned to the rigor and content of formative assessments.	
Pacing and Formative Assessment Calendar	The campus has a pacing and formative assessment calendar which includes the dates of all assessments to be given this year as well as PLC dates to review the data from each assessment. The campus has also included a calendar which addresses the content that needs to be spiraled back into the classrooms after the assessments.	The campus has a pacing and formative assessment calendar which includes the dates of all assessments to be given this year.	The campus does not have a pacing and formative assessment calendar.	
Data Analysis	Data walls and binders are current. There is evidence that instruction and interventions are aligned to the data. There is evidence of student data tracking and students are knowledgeable of their personal goals and data progress.	Data walls and binders are current. There is no clear alignment of instruction and intervention. Some students are knowledgeable of their goals and data.	Data walls and binders are not present or current.	
Essential Position (Librarian)	There is a librarian on campus. There is clear evidence that students are welcome, aware of, and using the library. The presence of the position is making a proactive impact on the campus - e.g., the library is offering opportunities like book clubs, UIL, Name That Book, etc.	Position is staffed. The traditional role of this position is being carried out. Students are visiting the library and checking out books, but evidence of turnaround level impact is not yet present. The librarian is typically in the library and waits for students to approach them.	Position not yet staffed.	
Reading Specialist	There is a coaching relationship evident (not a supervisory one). Teachers can speak to the value and impact of the reading specialist. Teachers can articulate goals, areas of growth, and instructional changes because of the relationship with the reading specialist. Teacher improvements are evident in relation to the TADS Rubric.	The practices of the reading specialist are of an observer or supervisory nature, not yet fully developed into a meaningful coaching relationship. Teachers are unsure of the role and/or impact of the coach.	There is a disconnect between the reading specialist's strengths and teacher needs.	
Renaissance 360	100% of students are taking Renaissance 360 for math and reading. Students are invested in the screener and have been educated, in a grade-appropriate manner, about why they are taking it and how they can grow as readers and mathematicians. Growth is evident at the campus.	100% of students are taking Renaissance 360 for math and reading. Growth is not evident.	Fewer than 100% of students are taking Renaissance 360 for math and reading.	

Table A-2. Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric, 2019–2020 (Continued)			
Pillar III -	<ul> <li>Instructional Excellence - con</li> </ul>	tinued	
RESOURCE	STRONG EXAMPLE	EMERGING EXAMPLE	NON-EXAMPLE
Intervention and Extension Systems	The campus has an intervention and extension system that has been implemented, and it meets the needs of each individual student. Every student has a goal and is involved in activities to help them meet their goal.	The campus has an intervention and extension system that has been implemented, but it does not meet the needs of each individual student.	The campus does not have an intervention or extension system evident on campus.
Data Driven Instructional Coaching	Evidence of observation and feedback is in TADS. Feedback is aligned to the effectiveness rating and the student assessment data. Data Driven Instructional Coaching (DDIC) protocol is utilized to drive conversations around student growth and teacher growth.	Evidence of observation and feedback is in TADS. Some of the feedback is aligned to the effectiveness rating and the student assessment data. Data Driven Instructional Coaching (DDIC) protocol is not utilized.	There is some evidence of observation and feedback in TADS. The feedback does not support data driven instructional coaching.
Pillar IV	- School Design		
Wednesday Extended Day PD	Core teachers are actively engaged in new learning and planning. The teachers and campus are active leaders/facilitators of the PD. District guidance is incorporated meaningfully and authentically.	School is going through the motions, relying more heavily on district personnel to lead. Teachers are less actively engaged	School is unprepared, attendance is low, and/or activities are not consistent with district standards.
Master Schedule Guidance	School schedule has planned intervention for students who need it. High Schools and Middle Schools have SRW courses for struggling readers. Elementary Schools are providing additional 30 minutes of reading per day for struggling readers. High Schools have students scheduled appropriately including relevant sequences needed for HB5/accountability. All schools are using space and time in ways that maximize student potential, capitalizing on technology and personalized learning approaches.	School has some avenues of intervention in place. School may still be relying on after- school "tutorials" or other actions as interventions. School has not capitalized on technology or personalized learning approaches to meet student needs.	School does not offer SRW courses and/or additional reading support at the elementary level.
Imagine Learning	All students with a Lexile below 750 are using the program daily.	Some students with a Lexile below 750 are using the program daily.	Very few or no students with a Lexile below 750 are using the program.
Imagine Math	Student use of Imagine Math is strategic, with the correct personalized pathway in place for students.	Student use of Imagine Math is random or very irregular.	There is not an expectation for students to use Imagine Math on campus.

Table A-2. Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric, 2019–2020 (Continued)				
Pillar IV	– School Design - continued			
IAT Manager	Campus IAT teams meet regularly, with action-oriented outcomes and clear evidence of progress monitoring and clear evidence that students are making progress. Significant decreases in absences, behavioral referrals and student course failures are evident. Significant increases in math and literacy are evident.	Campus IAT teams exist nominally and meet regularly but there is little evidence of impact.	Campus IAT teams are not meeting.	
Grad Labs (High Schools)	The school has a grad lab and grad coach in place. All students who need access to credit recovery can use grad lab. Scaffolds or supports needed are continually available such as: additional face time with a content teacher or tutor, use of the foundational levels of coursework to build readiness, etc. The tone and culture of grad lab is proactive and supportive. The grad coaches actively intervene for students not making progress.	The school has a grad lab and grad coach in place, and students have access to needed courses but not necessarily the needed supports and scaffolds. Grad coach plays more of an evaluative role and less of an intervention role.	The school does not have a grad lab during the day and/or does not have a grad coach available.	
College and Career Readiness (High Schools)	The school has a college readiness plan in place that spans Grades 9-12. This plan supports student development of academics and experiences necessary for college admissions. Financial aid, essay, and application workshops are in place. College Success Advisor is used in a meaningful way. Campus attends College Readiness trainings. Khan Academy SAT Prep is regularly used by all students in Grades 9-12. College access is handled in a proactive way, responsive to the needs of students who may be the first in their families to attend college.	The school's college readiness plan focuses primarily on Grades 11-12 or, for Grades 9- 12, is inclusive of some but not all the financial, academic and leadership components that students need for college admission and persistence. The approach on the campus is more voluntary than turnaround, without proactive inclusion of reluctant students.	There is not a clear plan in place or campus implementation of the plan is limited/ineffective. District resources that are offered are not being used/leveraged.	

Table A-2. Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric, 2019–2020 (Continued)				
Pillar V -	- Social and Emotional Support			
RESOURCE	STRONG EXAMPLE	EMERGING EXAMPLE	NON-EXAMPLE	
Schoolwide Behavior Support System	Classroom cultures are supportive, inclusive, and appropriate to the developmental level of students. Approaches to discipline reflect a value for the student as a learner and thinker. There are low rates of discipline referrals. There is a system of accountability for teachers, ensuring that they take proactive steps to address students' needs before referring for disciplinary action outside the classroom. Students are respectful to each other and connected to the school community.	Classroom cultures rely on punitive responses, behavioral approaches that limit student questioning and creativity, and/or developmentally inappropriate or unrealistic expectations. There are moderate rates of discipline referrals, and they are disproportionately higher for some groups of students (low SES, special ed, males, etc.).	Classroom culture is inconsistent, and there are high rates of discipline referrals.	
Wraparound Resource Specialist	There is clear evidence of resources available to students, including advertisement of resources in student-friendly language. There are avenues in place such as time/processes for students and parents to be able to request help. The resources available match the needs, as evidenced by improvements in overall student attendance and in the attendance of chronic absentees.	There is some evidence that resources are available to the campus, but these are not easy to find and may or may not address the highest needs at the school.	It is very difficult to access resources and/or there is clearly a significant gap between available resources and student/family needs.	
Essential Positions: Nurse and Counselor	All positions are staffed. Clear evidence that students are welcome, aware of, and using the resources that each position brings. The presence of the position is making a proactive impact on the campus - e.g., health activities and connections to external resources are evident beyond assistance to students who are sick, resources about college and social and emotional health are evident and abundant.	All positions are staffed. The traditional roles of these positions are being carried out - students are using the clinic when sick. Students are visiting the counselor. Evidence of turnaround level impact is not yet present. Staff typically remain in the clinic or counselor's office and wait for students to approach them.	All positions are not yet staffed.	
Cultural Proficiency PD	The campus has participated in Cultural Proficient Professional Development and has implemented systems and best practices. Staff members build a positive and inclusive environment in their classrooms. The data show that incidents of student behavior have decreased. There is evidence of equity in behavior incidents, referrals, and suspensions. The data show that student achievement gaps are closing.	The campus has participated in Cultural Proficient Professional Development and has implemented systems and best practices. Staff members are working to build a positive and inclusive environment in their classrooms, but not all classrooms are at the expected level. The data are beginning to show trends in decreased student behaviors.	The campus has not participated in any Cultural Proficient Professional Development.	

Table A-2. Achieve 180 Program Implementation Rubric, 2019–2020 (Continued)				
Pillar VI	– Family and Community Empo	owerment		
RESOURCE	STRONG EXAMPLE	EMERGING EXAMPLE	NON-EXAMPLE	
Parent Communication	There is clear evidence that parents have a voice. The school has communicated times and avenues for parent conferences, and parents are included in meaningful decision-making activities. Parents taking advantage of these opportunities include all racial and socioeconomic groups at the school.	Some parents are taking part in parent conferences, and some parents have voice in meaningful decision-making capacity, but there are significant racial and/or socioeconomic gaps.	Communication is generally from the school to the parents, with little significant opportunity for parent input.	
Family Community Events	The school has high attendance at family community events, inclusive of all racial and socioeconomic groups. There is a variety of different types of events, offering many different points of engagement for parents. There is a significant number of events, held at varied times and on varied days of the week, to provide multiple opportunities for parents to attend.	The school has shown increases in attendance at family community events.	The school is struggling with attendance at family community events.	
FACE Specialist	The campus and the FACE Specialist have collaborated and completed multiple family friendly activities including: school climate survey, family friendly campus walk- throughs, parent-teacher conference for parents, PTA/PTO creation, and other parent workshops.	The campus and the FACE Specialist have collaborated to hold parent workshops on campus but have not successfully completed a family friendly campus walk-through or established a functioning PTA/PTO.	The campus and the FACE Specialist have not had the opportunity to collaborate.	

Source: Achieve 180 Program Administrators, 10/20/2020

Tab	Table A-3. Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their 2019–2020 Texas Education Agency(TEA) Comparison Group Schools in HISD by Achieve 180 Program Tier				
	2019–2020 Achieve 180	Non-Achieve 180 Program		2019–2020 Achieve	Non-Achieve 180 Program
	Program Campus	TEA Comparison Group Campus		180 Program Campus	TEA Comparison Group Campus
	gp	Clifton MS		Attucks MS	Fleming MS
	Deady MS	Fonville MS			Foster ES
	,	Navarro MS			Henderson N ES
		Clifton MS		Blackshear ES	McGowen ES
		Fondren MS			Reynolds ES
		Fonville MS			Frost ES
	Henry MS	Marshall MS	с.	David EQ	McGowen ES
		Navarro MS		BIUCE ES	Ross ES
		Ortiz MS			Whidby ES
		Welch MS			Garcia ES
	High School Ahead Acad MS	No Campuses in Comparison Group			Gross ES
		Elmore ES			Martinez R. ES
	Highland Heighte EC	Kelso ES		Dogan ES	Milne ES
	Highland Heights ES	Milne ES			Peck ES
Tion 2		Osborne ES			Sanchez ES
lier 3		Furr HS	-		Whittier ES
	Kashmere HS	Northside HS		Mading ES	Burrus ES
		Scarborough HS			McGowen ES
		Furr HS			Reynolds ES
	North Forest HS	Northside HS	Tier 2		Isaacs ES
		Scarborough HS			Jefferson ES
	Sugar Grove MS	Fonville MS			Martinez R. ES
	Wesley ES	Foster ES		Martinez C. ES	Milne ES
		Henderson N ES			Mitchell ES
		Furr HS			Osborne ES
	Wheatley HS	Northside HS			Peck ES
		Scarborough HS		Thomas MS	Fleming MS
		Fleming MS		ITIOITIAS IVIS	McReynolds MS
	Williams MS	McReynolds MS			Furr HS
		Welch MS		Washington HS	Northside HS
					Scarborough HS
				Wisdom HS	Austin HS
				WISCOUTTIO	Houston Math, Science, Technology HS
					Foster ES
				Woodson	Frost ES
				110003011	Reynolds ES
					Whidby ES
					Furr HS
				Worthing HS	Scarborough HS
					Sterling HS
				Yates HS	No Non-A180 HISD Campus in Comparison Group

# Appendix A: TEA Comparison Group Schools (Title I, Part A only)

Tabl	e A-3. Achieve Compar	180 Program Schools and ison Group Schools in HIS	Their∶ D by A	2019–2020 Texa chieve 180 Pro	as Education Agency (TEA) gram Tier (Continued)
	2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Campus	Non-Achieve 180 Program TEA Comparison Group Campus		2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Campus	Non-Achieve 180 Program TEA Comparison Group Campus
		Brookline ES			Hartsfield ES
		Elrod ES	ł	Codwell ES	Revnolds ES
		Emerson ES	1		Thompson ES
		Henderson J ES	ł	Cook ES	Bastian ES
	Bonham FS	McNamara ES	ł		Frost ES
	20111011120	Neff FS	-		Law ES
		Park Place ES			Clifton MS
		Smith FS	-	Edison MS	Marshall MS
Tier 1		White E ES	1		Navarro MS
	Cullen MS	Fleming MS			Isaacs ES
	Calientitie	Bastian ES			Kelso ES
		Elmore ES	ł	Fondren ES	Mitchell ES
	Foerster ES	Milne FS	ł		Oates ES
		Shadydale ES	ł		Tijerina ES
		McReynolds MS			Fleming MS
	Forest Brook MS	Welch MS	ł	Key MS	Welch MS
	Gregory-Lincoln PK-8	No HISD Campus in Comparison Group	1	Liberty HS	No Campuses in Comparison Group
		Foster ES	•	Elberty Ho	Almeda ES
		Frost ES	ł		Berry ES
	Hilliard ES	Henderson N ES	ł		Brookline ES
	T IIIIdid E0	McGowen ES	ł		Burbank ES
		Whidby FS			Coop ES
	Holland MS	Clifton MS			Cornelius ES
Tier 1		Marshall MS	ł	Marshall ES	Herrera ES
		Navarro MS	ł		Hobby ES
		Welch MS	Area		Kennedy ES
	Lawson MS	Fondren MS	Support		I vons ES
		Hartman MS	ł		Park Place FS
		Ortiz MS	-		Patterson ES
		Davila FS			Smith FS
	Looscan ES	Jefferson ES	ł	Montromery ES	No HISD Campus in Comparison Group
		Love ES	-	Sharpstown US	
		Martinez R ES	1	Sharpstown no	Garcia ES
		Mitchell ES			Garden Villas ES
		Oates ES	ł		Gregg ES
		Waltrin HS			Ketelsen ES
	INAUSOITTIO	Browning ES		Sherman ES	Martinez R ES
	Pugh ES	Davila ES			Peck ES
		De Zavala ES	ł		Scroggins ES
		Greag ES	ł		Whittier ES
		Ketelsen ES	ł	Stevens ES	Coop ES
		Love ES	ł		Eliot ES
		Martinez R ES	ł		Garcia ES
		Oates FS	1		Gregg ES
		Rucker ES	1		Gross ES
		Scroggins ES	1		Hobby ES
		Whittier ES	1		Sanchez ES
	I		1		Whittier ES
				ТСАН	No HISD Title I Campus in Comparison Group
					Foster FS
				Young ES	Henderson N ES

Г

Table A-3. Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their 2019–2020 Texas Education Agency (TEA)							
Achieve 180 Program Tier (Continued)							
	2019–2020 Achieve 180 Brogram Campus	Non-Achieve 180 Program					
	Rollfort ECC	No Compusos in Comparison Group					
	Demont LCC	Davila ES					
		Gregg ES					
		Martinez R ES					
		Mitchell ES					
	Gallegos ES						
		Uales ES					
		Scrogging ES					
		Whittier ES					
		Fostor ES					
		Hartefield ES					
		Henderson N ES					
	Kashmere Gardens ES	McGowen ES					
		Reynolds ES					
		Thompson ES					
		Barrick ES					
		Bonner ES					
		Brookline ES					
		Cunningham ES					
Light		Elrod ES					
Support	Lewis ES	Golfcrest ES					
		Henderson J ES					
		Kennedy ES					
		Scarborough ES					
		Smith ES					
		Austin HS					
		Northside HS					
	Reagan Ed Ctr PK-8	Pilgrim Academy EE-8					
		Barrick ES					
		Benbrook ES					
	Shearn ES	Deanda ES					
		Elrod ES					
		Grissom ES					
		Scarborough ES					
		Seguin ES					
		Austin HS					
	Westbury HS	Chavez HS					
		Houston Math, Science, Technology HS					
		Northside HS					

Sources: 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group; External Funding, 2019-2020 Title I, Part A Campuses

Appendix A: Achieve 18	0 Program Budget and	<b>Expenditure Report</b>
------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

Table A-4. Achieve 180 Program Budget and Expenditures by Category and Object Description, and byDepartment, School, or School-Level for Three-Year Program Schools, 2019–2020									
	То	tal	Colore (Friend Down (its				Incontivos	2. Stinanda	
	10	lai	Salary/Fillig	e benernts	Non-Salary/Pay & Benefits		incentives & Stipends		
	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual	Actual		
	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Annual Budget	
Program Total	\$29,075,404.46	\$32,579,053.78	\$10,538,454.83	\$10,958,163.70	\$3,591,697.97	\$4,937,403.09	\$12,441,600.00	\$13,851,630.13	
Department/Office Total	\$5,658,015.97	\$10,425,559.95	\$24,003.92	\$6,923.16	\$2,812,230.32	\$4,168,952.08	\$406,500.00	\$3,496,030.13	
Achieve 180 Office	\$5,158,697.99	\$6,357,570.29	\$1,687.55	\$767.29	\$2,756,405.32	\$4,108,952.08	\$2,200.00	\$2,200.00	
Chief Acad. Officer	\$482,441.37	\$4,046,509.94	\$22,316.37	\$6,155.87	\$55,825.00	\$60,000.00	\$404,300.00	\$3,493,830.13	
Recruitment & Selection	\$16,876.61	\$21,479.72							
Three-Year Schools' Total	\$19,969,125.90	\$18,864,803.57	\$9,056,372.30	\$9,386,050.28	\$778,555.35	\$768,451.01	\$10,048,600.00	\$8,632,100.00	
			Three-Y	ear Schools					
Elementary Schools	\$8,716,044.54	\$8,240,073.02	\$4,214,734.73	\$4,243,455.93	\$459,727.38	\$453,617.09	\$3,979,100.00	\$3,482,100.00	
Bellfort ECC	\$69,195.88	\$69,845.00	\$69,195.88	\$69,845.00					
Blackshear ES	\$510,641.84	\$444,308.48	\$236,101.36	\$225,268.00	\$76,540.48	\$76,540.48	\$198,000.00	\$142,500.00	
Bonham ES	\$516,415.50	\$462,944.00	\$217,056.61	\$211,944.00			\$297,000.00	\$251,000.00	
Bruce ES	\$437,082.52	\$411,012.00	\$210,082.52	\$200,012.00			\$227,000.00	\$211,000.00	
Cook ES	\$407,051.78	\$389,688.00	\$208,551.78	\$211,188.00			\$198,500.00	\$178,500.00	
Dogan ES	\$540,055.47	\$507,526.56	\$198,604.91	\$194,576.00	\$74,350.56	\$74,350.56	\$267,100.00	\$238,600.00	
Edison MS	\$453,626.99	\$409,911.00	\$251,626.99	\$240,411.00			\$202,000.00	\$169,500.00	
Foerster ES	\$601,937.35	\$562,010.00	\$234,717.17	\$219,010.00			\$367,000.00	\$343,000.00	
Fondren ES	\$133,763.73	\$112,500.00	\$8,763.73		1		\$125,000.00	\$112,500.00	
Gallegos ES	\$192,179.21	\$259,534.00	\$135,356.21	\$198,634.00	\$524.00				
Highland Heights ES	\$643,832.45	\$671,872.04	\$325,192.42	\$395,711.69	\$74,160.35	\$74,160.35	\$243,500.00	\$202,000.00	
Hilliard ES	\$423,671.04	\$395,623.00	\$203,261.04	\$200,123.00			\$219,500.00	\$195,500.00	
Kashmere Gardens ES	\$234,082.08	\$231,781.00	\$231,470.40	\$229,281.00			\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	
Lewis ES	\$210,080.36	\$209,136.00	\$209,863.36	\$209,136.00			A177 500 00	<u></u>	
Looscan ES	\$291,942.96	\$282,642.00	\$114,442.96	\$129,142.00	477.000.04	474 400 75	\$177,500.00	\$153,500.00	
Mading ES	\$387,161.41	\$377,840.75	\$182,592.37	\$203,858.00	\$77,069.04	\$71,482.75	\$127,500.00	\$102,500.00	
Martinez, C. ES	\$444,021.52	\$400,039.65	\$222,521.52	\$209,539.65			\$221,500.00	\$190,500.00	
Nonigomery ES	\$343,752.70	\$305,091.00	\$109,252.70	\$145,591.00			\$174,500.00	\$159,500.00	
Pugli ES Stovons ES	\$337,336.31	\$520,769.00	\$140,030.51	\$120,709.00			\$210,500.00	\$190,000.00	
Wesley FS	\$255,521.57	\$155,500.00	\$14,021.37	\$197 218 00	\$82 517 90	\$82 517 90	\$219,300.00	\$133,300.00	
Woodson FS	\$614 198 14	\$573 635 05	\$244 133 09	\$227 570.00	\$74 565 05	\$74 565 05	\$295,500.00	\$271 500.00	
Young FS	\$286 261 40	\$290 128 59	\$165 761 40	\$194 628 59	ç74,505.05	ç, <del>,</del> ,505.05	\$120,500.00	\$95 500 00	
Middle Schools	\$3,778,011.05	\$3,497,307,53	\$1.567.561.02	\$1,556,966.00	\$81.641.53	\$81.641.53	\$2.128.700.00	\$1.858.700.00	
Attucks MS	\$503.046.41	\$419.959.00	\$232.046.41	\$182,459.00	<i><b>40</b>2,012.000</i>	<i><b>40</b>2)012100</i>	\$271.000.00	\$237.500.00	
Cullen MS	\$466,626.17	\$406,916.00	\$230,026.17	\$204,316.00			\$236,600.00	\$202,600.00	
Forest Brook MS	\$621,644.69	\$567,125.00	\$253,936.19	\$235,525.00			\$367,600.00	\$331,600.00	
Henry MS	\$687,973.57	\$627,794.53	\$226,832.04	\$194,153.00	\$81,641.53	\$81,641.53	\$379,500.00	\$352,000.00	
HS Ahead Academy MS	\$331,811.86	\$378,134.00	\$207,211.86	\$281,534.00			\$124,600.00	\$96,600.00	
Key MS	\$455,504.80	\$394,149.00	\$230,504.80	\$219,149.00			\$225,000.00	\$175,000.00	
Lawson MS	\$711,403.55	\$703,230.00	\$187,003.55	\$239,830.00			\$524,400.00	\$463,400.00	

Table A-4.	Achieve 180 Program Budget and Expenditures by Category and Object
	Description, and by Department, School, or School-Level for Three-Year
	Program Schools, 2019–2020 (Continued)

			Misc. Con	tracts &		
			Operating Costs, General			
	Substitute Teachers		Supplies		Textbooks	
	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual
	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget
Program Total	\$2,432,353.13	\$2,267,131.64	\$71,298.53	\$562,423.47		\$2,301.75
Department/Office Total	\$2,415,281.73	\$2,267,130.64	\$0.00	\$486,523.94	\$0.00	\$0.00
Achieve 180 Office	\$2,398,405.12	\$2,245,650.92				
Chief Acad. Officer				\$486,523.94		
Recruitment & Selection	\$16,876.61	\$21,479.72				
Three-Year Schools' Total	\$14.299.72	\$1.00	\$71.298.53	\$75.899.53	\$0.00	\$2.301.75
Three-Year Schools			,,			
Elementary Schools	\$6,183.43	\$0.00	\$56,299.00	\$60,900.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Bellfort ECC		-				
Blackshear ES						
Bonham ES	\$2,358.89					
Bruce ES						
Cook ES						
Dogan ES						
Edison MS						
Foerster ES	\$220.18					
Fondren ES						
Gallegos ES			\$56,299.00	\$60,900.00		
Highland Heights ES	\$979.68					
Hilliard ES	\$910.00					
Kashmere Gardens ES	\$111.68					
Lewis ES	\$217.00					
Looscan ES						
Mading ES						
Martinez, C. ES						
Montgomery ES						
Pugh ES						
Stevens ES						
Wesley ES	\$1,386.00					
Woodson ES						
Young ES						
Middle Schools	\$108.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Attucks MS						
Cullen MS						
Forest Brook MS	\$108.50					
Henry MS						
HS Ahead Academy MS						
Key MS						
Lawson MS						
Table A-4. Achieve 180	Program Budget and E	Expenditures by Category	and Object Description, and by			
------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------			
Department	, School, or School-Lev	vel for Three-Year Program	n Schools, 2019–2020 (Continued)			

					<u>~</u>								
	То	tal	Salary/Fring	e Benefits	Non-Salary/Pa	ay & Benefits	Incentives & Stipends						
	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual	Actual						
	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Annual Budget					
Program Total	\$29,075,404.46	\$32,579,053.78	\$10,538,454.83	\$10,958,163.70	\$3,591,697.97	\$4,937,403.09	\$12,441,600.00	\$13,851,630.13					
Department/Office Total	\$5,658,015.97	\$10,425,559.95	\$24,003.92	\$6,923.16	\$2,812,230.32	\$4,168,952.08	\$406,500.00	\$3,496,030.13					
Achieve 180 Office	\$5,158,697.99	\$6,357,570.29	\$1,687.55	\$767.29	\$2,756,405.32	\$4,108,952.08	\$2,200.00	\$2,200.00					
Chief Acad. Officer	\$482,441.37	\$4,046,509.94	\$22,316.37	\$6,155.87	\$55,825.00	\$60,000.00	\$404,300.00	\$3,493,830.13					
<b>Recruitment &amp; Selection</b>	\$16,876.61	\$21,479.72											
Three-Year Schools' Total	\$19,969,125.90	\$18,864,803.57	\$9,056,372.30	\$9,386,050.28	\$778,555.35	\$768,451.01	\$10,048,600.00	\$8,632,100.00					
Three-Year Schools													
High Schools	\$6,916,268.79	\$6,624,308.02	\$3,067,275.03	\$3,381,013.35	\$237,186.44	\$233,192.39	\$3,588,800.00	\$2,992,800.00					
Kashmere HS	\$1,086,284.91	\$1,077,243.00	\$555,483.53	\$629,441.62	\$79,401.38	\$79,401.38	\$451,400.00	\$368,400.00					
Liberty HS	\$130,862.88	\$192,276.00	\$130,862.88	\$192,276.00									
Madison HS	\$911,730.60	\$756,869.48	\$261,818.92	\$219,069.48			\$649,800.00	\$537,800.00					
Milby HS	\$209,627.83	\$217,467.00	\$209,555.78	\$217,467.00									
North Forest HS	\$738,150.96	\$777,381.57	\$339,619.66	\$426,381.57			\$395,500.00	\$351,000.00					
Sharpstown HS	\$565,368.21	\$461,022.00	\$93,256.53	\$63,022.00			\$472,000.00	\$398,000.00					
Washington HS	\$588,663.28	\$534,759.00	\$199,069.23	\$213,659.00	\$3,994.05		\$385,600.00	\$321,100.00					
Westbury HS	\$192,513.54	\$191,826.00	\$191,866.04	\$191,826.00									
Wheatley HS	\$1,163,936.15	\$1,239,719.34	\$627,213.34	\$777,398.68	\$79,518.38	\$79,518.38	\$438,500.00	\$365,500.00					
Worthing HS	\$691,958.31	\$620,000.63	\$206,357.00	\$215,728.00	\$74,272.63	\$74,272.63	\$411,000.00	\$330,000.00					
Yates HS	\$637,172.12	\$555,744.00	\$252,172.12	\$234,744.00			\$385,000.00	\$321,000.00					
Combined-Level School	\$558,801.52	\$503,115.00	\$206,801.52	\$204,615.00			\$352,000.00	\$298,500.00					
Gregory-Lincoln PK-8	\$558,801.52	\$503,115.00	\$206,801.52	\$204,615.00			\$352,000.00	\$298,500.00					

Table A-4. Achieve 180 Program Budget and Expenditures by Category and Object												
Description, and by Department, School, or School-Level for Three-Year												
Program Schools, 2019–2020 (Continued)												
	Substitute	e Teachers	Misc. Con	tracts &	Textbooks							
	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual						
	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget						
Program Total	\$2,432,353.13	\$2,267,131.64	\$71,298.53	\$562,423.47		\$2,301.75						
Department/Office Total	\$2,415,281.73	\$2,267,130.64	\$0.00	\$486,523.94	\$0.00	\$0.00						
Achieve 180 Office	\$2,398,405.12	\$2,245,650.92										
Chief Acad. Officer				\$486,523.94								
Recruitment & Selection	\$16,876.61	\$21,479.72										
Three-Year Schools' Total	\$14,299.72	\$1.00	\$71,298.53	\$75,899.53	\$0.00	\$2,301.75						
Three-Year Schools												
High Schools	\$8,007.79	\$1.00	\$14,999.53	\$14,999.53	\$0.00	\$2,301.75						
Kashmere HS												
Liberty HS												
Madison HS	\$111.68											
Milby HS	\$72.05											
North Forest HS	\$3,031.30											
Sharpstown HS	\$111.68											
Washington HS												
Westbury HS	\$647.50											
Wheatley HS	\$3,704.90	\$1.00	\$14,999.53	\$14,999.53		\$2,301.75						
Worthing HS	\$328.68											
Yates HS												
		Combined-Lev	el School									
Gregory-Lincoln PK-8												

Source: HISD Budgeting and Financial Planning Department, Achieve 180 Program Budget and Expenditure Report, 9/16/2020

Note: Includes General Funds (Achieve 180 Program and Targeted Assistance) and Federal Grants (Title I).

Table A-5. Achieve 180 Program Budget and Expenditures by Category and Object Description, and by Department, School, or School-Level for Two-Year and One-Year Program Schools, 2019–2020												
			Salary/Frin	ge Benefits	Non-Salary/Pa	y & Benefits	Incentives & Stipends					
	Actual Expenditures	Annual Budget	Actual Annual Expenditures Budget		Actual Expenditures	Annual Budget	Actual Expenditures	Annual Budget				
Two-Year Schools												
Two-Year Schools' Total	\$3,313,908.99	\$3,138,279.52	\$1,326,171.19	\$1,414,779.52	\$912.30	\$0.00	\$1,986,500.00	\$1,723,500.00				
Elementary Schools												
Codwell ES	\$234,401.54	\$210,924.00	\$73,901.54	\$65,424.00			\$160,500.00	\$145,500.00				
Marshall ES	\$394,148.66	\$477,009.00	\$142,148.66	\$250,009.00			\$252,000.00	\$227,000.00				
Shearn ES		\$57,797.00		\$57,797.00								
Sherman ES	\$241,980.24	\$215,656.00	\$71,980.24	\$60,656.00			\$170,000.00	\$155,000.00				
Middle Schools												
Deady MS	\$532,088.08	\$432,607.00	\$234,088.08	\$183,107.00			\$298,000.00	\$249,500.00				
Holland MS	\$355,090.86	\$297,379.00	\$80,090.86	\$65,379.00			\$275,000.00	\$232,000.00				
Sugar Grove MS	\$475,990.96	\$428,063.00	\$152,490.96	\$144,263.00	\$200.00		\$323,300.00	\$283,800.00				
Thomas MS	\$517,667.74	\$515,951.52	\$271,467.74	\$310,751.52			\$246,200.00	\$205,200.00				
Williams MS	\$496,847.02	\$436,922.00	\$234,309.22	\$211,422.00	\$712.30		\$261,500.00	\$225,500.00				
Conbined-Level School												
Reagan Ed. Ctr. K-8	\$65,693.89	\$65,971.00	\$65,693.89	\$65,971.00								
			One-Ye	ear School								
One-Year School's Total	\$134,353.60	\$150,410.74	\$131,907.42	\$150,410.74								
Wisdom, HS	\$134,353.60	\$150,410.74	\$131,907.42	\$150,410.74								

Table A-5. Achieve	180 Program	Budget and	Expenditure	s by Categor	ry and Object	and One-					
Year Program Schools, 2019–2020 (Continued)											
	Substitute	Teachers	Misc. Contract	ts & Operating	Textb	ooks					
	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual	Actual	Annual					
	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget	Expenditures	Budget					
Two-Year Schools											
Two-Year Schools' Total	\$325.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00					
Elementary Schools											
Codwell ES											
Marshall ES											
Shearn ES											
Sherman ES											
Middle Schools											
Deady MS											
Holland MS											
Sugar Grove MS											
Thomas MS											
Williams MS	\$325.50										
Conbined-Level School											
Reagan Ed. Ctr. K-8											
		One-Ye	ar School								
One-Year School's Total	\$2,446.18										
Wisdom, HS	\$2,446.18										

Source: HISD Budgeting and Financial Planning Department, Achieve 180 Program Budget and Expenditure Report, 9/16/2020

Note: Includes General Funds (Achieve 180 Program and Targeted Assistance) and Federal Grants (Title 1).

# **Appendix A: Evaluation Methods**

This is a three-year evaluation which is impacted by programmatic and educational disruptions that occurred due to the unprecedented health crisis presented by the international Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic in 2019–2020. The purpose of this 2019–2020 (Year 3), Part B, Achieve 180 Program report is to assess (1) progress made toward program goals and objectives from 2016–2017 (baseline year) to 2019–2020 (Year 3), (2) performance differences in educator and student outcomes between (a) Achieve 180 Program schools of different school levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high) and between (b) Achieve 180 Program schools and non-Achieve 180 Program, Title I, Part A, TEA-matched comparison schools of similar demographics, (3) impacts of the Achieve 180 Program on student outcomes, and (4) associations between the Achieve 180 Program's level of implementation fidelity and specified educator and student outcomes. Performance trend analyses are based on school-level ratings or rates for all educators or students. Analyses of statistical significance of change in performance ratings and rates are based on paired samples (pre- and post- performance measurements) at the school-, educator-, or student-level. Therefore, assessments of change (including statistical significance) may be based on a subsample of the population used in the associated trend analysis (as with student attendance analyses).

The results of the three-year longitudinal analyses of this evaluation encompass more than two and threefourths of three school years that were enacted primarily as planned, programmatically, (from August 28<sup>th</sup> of the 2017–2018 through March 20<sup>th</sup> of the 2019–2020 school years) and about 10 out of 40 weeks (or 25%) of a school year that were largely disrupted, programmatically and educationally, due to the COVID-19 pandemic (from March 23rd of the 2019–2020 through June 1<sup>st</sup> of the 2019–2020 school years). This included new virtual learning platforms that were offered to all students from mid-April through June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020. Educational impacts associated with the pandemic were inescapable, impossible to assess, and, therefore, resulted in a key limitation of this evaluation.

Two school-level populations were included in this program evaluation, educators (e.g., principals and other school leaders, and teachers) and their students during the 2019–2020 academic year. Depending on the analysis at hand, the evaluation strategy used outcome measures of (a) Pillar I – principal effectiveness, using the School Leader Appraisal System (SLAS), (b) Pillar II – teacher effectiveness, using the Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS), (c) Pillar V – student attendance rates, and (d) Pillar III - student achievement based on formative District-Level Assessment (DLA) literacy and mathematics results, with attention to special student populations for assessment of progress made toward program goals and objectives for student attendance and graduation analyses.

Unless otherwise specified in this report, results are presented for the same 55 participating Achieve 180 Program schools, including 2016–2017 (baseline year), 2017–2018 (Year 1), 2018–2019 (Year 2), and 2019–2020 (Year 3). Results are grouped by the number of years of Achieve 180 Program participation for 3-year schools (n=43) that participated from 2017–2018 to 2019–2020, two-year schools (n=10) schools that participated from 2018–2019 to 2019–2020, and one-year schools (n=2) schools that participated in either 2017–2018 (n=1) or in 2019–2020 (n=1).

Evaluation methods, including data sources, data collection strategies, and data limitations, are provided in this section. Unless otherwise specified in this report, results are presented for the same 54 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program schools for 2016–2017 (baseline year), 2017–2018 (Year 1), 2018–2019 (Year 2), and/or 2019–2020 (Year 3) or results are presented in a way that accounts for the number of year(s) of program participation for each school or group of schools, as determined by the descriptive or statistical

analysis being conducted. Therefore, Achieve 180 Program and non-Achieve 180 results in this report will differ from results for the groups in prior reports. The primary focuses of this report are on level of performance, change in performance, and the difference or "gap" between the performances of specified groups. The following references in this report to the 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part A begin with "Part A" and are not introduced in bold print. In the tables in the Appendices, newly participating Achieve 180 Program schools in 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 are identified with asterisks and schools that were not a Teacher and School Leader (TSL) Grant participant in 2017–2018 through 2019–2020 are identified with a caret (^). Some outcomes presented in the report are lagging indicators, and for those, the most recent available results are presented. Finally, to protect participants' anonymity, results for fewer than five students are masked in this report.

## **Data Collection**

The list of participating 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program schools was compiled by district and Achieve 180 Program administrators. The 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Logic Model was developed by its program administrators. District, school, and student enrollment and demographic data were obtained using the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) statewide data collection and reporting system operated by the Texas Education Agency (TEA), which includes student-level information on students enrolled on the last Friday of October each year. Only students who met the average daily attendance eligibility criterion of greater than zero for the respective year were included in reported counts.

Of the Title I, Part A HISD campuses in the spring of each year of Achieve 180 Program implementation (255 in 2017–2018, 255 in 2018–2019, and 254 in 2019–2020), all 55 Achieve 180 Program schools had schoolwide Title I programs. Title I programs are implemented on either a schoolwide- or targeted assistance- basis. A schoolwide program permits a school with at least 40 percent of its students from families at or below the federal poverty threshold to use Title I funds and other federal education program funds and resources to supplement the educational program of the entire school to raise academic achievement for all enrolled students. In contrast, Title I schools that either have less than 40 percent of its students from families at or below the federal poverty threshold, or that choose not to operate a school-wide program, offer a "targeted assistance program" for students identified as failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the state's challenging academic achievement standards. All Achieve 180 Program schools' Title I programs were implemented on a schoolwide basis.

For comparative purposes, the HISD non-Achieve 180 Program, Title 1 schools listed among the 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Groups (Appendix A, Table A-3, pp. 100–102) for Achieve 180 Program schools were used to compare the program schools' performance to their peer campuses. Because comparison schools included multiple schools, the number of comparison schools exceeds the number of program schools. Only non-HISD and non-Title 1, Part A schools were excluded from analyses of comparison schools using the TEA Campus Comparison Groups listing. The Achieve 180 Program schools that did not have lists for TEA Campus Comparison Groups were: Bellfort ECC, High School Ahead Academy, and Liberty HS. Achieve 180 Program schools that did not have non-Achieve 180 Program schools listed among schools on the TEA Campus Comparison Groups listing were: Victory Preparatory South HS and Yates HS. The only HISD comparison school listed for Texas Connections Academy Houston (TCAH) was not a Title I, Part A school. No comparison schools in HISD were listed for Gregory-Lincoln PK-8 or Montgomery ES. Details are available on the <u>TEA website</u>.

The HISD School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating is one of two components used in the School Leader Appraisal System (SLAS). A School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating is specific to a campus and is included as a component of a school leader's SLAS summative rating if the school leader was in their current

position at the campus from September 1 through the last day of school for students. The School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating reflects the campus performance level based on multiple metrics and is school-level specific (i.e., elementary, middle, high, kindergarten-grade 8, and grades 6–12). For comparisons across years, only the School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating is presented in this report and does not include the Coaching and Feedback rating of the SLAS, which was made available beginning in the 2018–2019 school year. School Leader Appraisal Scorecard composite performance levels are rated as: Highly Effective (3.50–4.00), Effective (2.50–3.49), Needs Improvement (1.50–2.49), or Ineffective (1.00–1.49), with ratings of 2.50 or higher used to identify the performance of effective principals ('Effective' or 'Highly Effective').

SLAS data were extracted from HISD's Effective School Scorecard Ratings file and are not available for Texas Connections Academy Houston (TCAH), a virtual, online charter, and 2019–2020 Area Support school or for Victory Preparatory South High School a one-year Achieve 180 Program participant in 2017–2018. Scorecard data were retrieved for 2016–2017 on November 10, 2017; for 2017–2018 on November 28, 2018; for 2018–2019 on November 12, 2019; and for 2019–2020 on November 16, 2020. Ratings are presented for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 principals. Unlike in previous years, for 2019–2020 School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings, STAAR and Campus Accountability were not rated due to the declared state of disaster (COVID-19). Due to differences in the underlying performance indicators used to calculate School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings, comparisons of ratings across years should be made with caution. Please refer to the School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Indicator Methodology for details regarding performance indicators used to calculate School Leader Appraisal Scorecard ratings.

Full-time, cumulative, unduplicated teacher staffing count for teachers who taught at any point during the respective school years were determined using HISD's SAP (Systems, Applications, & Processes) (financial and HR) software. SAP data were retrieved for 2016–2017 from August 15, 2016 to August 28, 2017; for 2017–2018 from August 14, 2017 to June 4, 2018; for 2018–2019 from August 27, 2018 to June 3, 2019; and for 2019–2020 from August 12, 2019 to June 1, 2020. In 2019–2020, multiple SAP rosters were used to ensure the inclusion of all 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 teachers who were full-time and eligible to receive an appraisal during the respective year. SAP data were linked to HISD's Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) Feedback and Development (F&D) Tool to extract teachers' TADS summative appraisal ratings for each year assessed. The teachers' campuses identified in SAP and associated with Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) ratings were utilized. If a teacher changed campuses during the school year, the last campus for the teacher was used. Percentages were based on the number of teachers with a summative TADS rating. Linking the SAP and TADS data resulted in higher numbers of teachers with TADS summative ratings as reported in this report than in prior reports.

The TADS Tool is used by teachers, appraisers, principals, and district officials to track appraisal activity. TADS data were retrieved for teachers' TADS summative ratings and are intended to measure their effectiveness in the classroom. In this report, an aggregate teacher count and percentage of teachers with Effective or Highly Effective Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) ratings are rounded to the nearest tenth for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 teachers. TADS summative ratings of 2.50 or higher are used to identify the performance of effective teachers ('Effective' (2.50–3.49) or 'Highly Effective' (3.50–4.00)). In 2016–2017, for most teachers, ratings for Instructional Practice (IP) and Professional Expectations (PR) components were included in teachers' summative rating calculations of teachers assigned to Teacher Incentive Fund Year 4 (TIF4) campuses. In 2017–2018, ratings for IP and PR components were included in teachers' summative ratings for IP, PR, and SP (if

available) components were included in teachers' summative ratings. In 2019–2020, the Student Performance Rating (SP) was waived from the summative rating calculations for all teachers due to the declared state of disaster (COVID-19), except for teachers who carried over their 2018–2019 ratings. Due to differences in the underlying performance indicators used to calculate TADS ratings, comparisons of ratings across years should be made with caution. Only teacher's ID and campus numbers were provided for teachers who did not receive a TADS summative rating or were not an employee in HISD in a specific appraisal period. No data were provided for Camp Forest Glen, Camp Olympia, DAEP Secondary, East Regional Office, Harper DAEP, Hattie Mae White, and RDSPD staff (non-Achieve 180 Program) since they are not included in the TADS system.

A teacher was eligible for appraisal if s/he was present for the beginning of the school year until the end of April of each academic year. Teachers may not have been rated due to late hiring, job title changes, incorrect job titles in SAP, or split roles that required teachers to teach students less than 50 percent of the instructional day. For each year, the cumulative, unduplicated number of teachers in the district was calculated using teacher rosters from throughout each school year. This number was used as the denominator to determine the proportion of teachers for whom Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) summative ratings were given.

Budgets and expenditures for the 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program's central office and school-based departments, programs, and activities were provided by HISD's Budgeting and Financial Planning Department and included General Fund and Federal Grants. Budget and expenditure data used for this report did not include Achieve 180 Program costs that were paid through some departmental budgets (other than the Chief Academic Officer, Recruitment and Selection, and Achieve 180 School Office) that supported the multifaceted work carried out by many district departmental teams. For example, funding streams for much of the work of the Pillar Leaders (Superintendent's Cabinet), Pillar Owners (cross-functional team representatives for HISD departments), and the Area Superintendents, School Support Officers, and Directors have not been reported as a part of the Achieve 180 Program.

Student attendance, chronic absence, and demographic data were retrieved from district PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year (PRSNT INELIG DAYS CNT + PRSNT ELIG DAYS CNT)/(ABSENT DAYS CNT + PRSNT INELIG DAYS CNT + PRSNT ELIG DAYS CNT). Students in all grades and all schools that attended in the Grading Cycles are included in the calculations. The latter criterion was not used in calculations for this report in Year 1. Therefore, comparisons to prior Achieve 180 Program reports should be made with caution. For Chronic Absence rates, students in campus membership 83 percent or more were PRSNT\_INELIG\_DAYS\_CNT included in the Denominator (ABSENT\_DAYS\_CNT + + PRSNT ELIG DAYS CNT)/TAUGHT DAYS CNT). Campus students with an absence rate of 0.1 or were included in the Numerator ABSENT DAYS CNT/(ABSENT DAYS CNT greater + PRSNT INELIG DAYS CNT + PRSNT ELIG DAYS CNT). The calculation used for the Chronic Absence Rate was Numerator / Denominator. Attendance and chronic absence results are also presented by student group. To protect participants' anonymity, results for fewer than five are masked in this report.

Four-year graduation data for the Class of 2017, Class of 2018, and Class of 2019 were retrieved from TEA Confidential Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, August 6, 2018, TEA Confidential Class of 2018 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, June 6, 2019, and TEA Confidential Class of 2019 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, June 2020. For state accountability four-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,310 was used for the Class of 2017 completion, a class size of 12,889 was

used for the Class of 2018, and a class size of 12,997 was used for the Class of 2019. Five-year graduation data for the Class of 2017 and Class of 2018 were retrieved from TEA Confidential Class of 2017 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, updated on June 6, 2019, and TEA Confidential Class of 2018 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, June 4, 2020. For state accountability five-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,204 was used for HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,789 was used for HISD Class of 2018. The data included Status (Graduated, Continued H.S., Received GED (TxCHSE recipient), and Dropped Out), race/ethnicity, Economically Disadvantaged, Ever ELL in grades 9–12 (for EL), and Special Education (SWD). Any student who is determined to be a graduate, continuer, Texas Certificate of High School Equivalency (TxCHSE) recipient, or dropout in a given year is counted as a member of a class. Four-year graduation rates were calculated by dividing the number of graduates by the total number of graduates, continuers, TxCHSE recipients, and dropouts in the class in a given year. Results are not reported for fewer than five students.

Since the statewide assessments were suspended because of the pandemic, students' District-Level Assessment (DLA) results on tests in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics were used to determine the impact of the Achieve 180 Program on student performance. The DLA are STAAR compatible curriculum-based, district-created assessments administered both online and on paper in December (D. D. Dixon, personal communication, June 2, 2020), intended to be a cumulative assessment of student learning in preparation for STAAR. DLA proficiency scores use the most rigorous percent-correct performance levels of the past four years of equivalent STAAR-tested grades/courses. DLA measure students' learning in preparation for STAAR and are appropriate in the evaluation of program effectiveness (D. D. Dixon, personal communication, June 2, 2020). Data from these assessments provide school leaders and teachers key formative information regarding student learning. However, student participation in DLA varied by campus and was not randomized. To address these data limitations, propensity-score matching was used to select students who completed the DLA to generate treatment and control groups from two distinct student groups (Achieve 180 Program participants and comparison group schools), controlling for students' background characteristics and previous performance on aligned content area tests. Included were all students in the PEIMS Fall snapshots who had an average daily attendance code of greater than zero, DLA data in the assessed subjects in 2019-2020 and had prior-year 2018-2019 STAAR or STAAR EOC test results in the subject area being assessed (ELA or mathematics), were on the same campus during the PEIMS Fall 2019 snapshot date and DLA test administration, and who tested in English were included. Spanish version DLA results were not sufficient to conduct comprehensive analyses. Scores are based on the proportion of items answered correctly. DLA data were provided by A4E.

## **Data Analysis**

A mixed-methods, quasi-experimental design was used in this evaluation. First, to assess progress made toward accomplishing program goals, descriptive statistics were used to assess the amount of change in educator or student performance from (a) year to year and (b) the year prior to campus participation in the Achieve 180 Program (baseline) to the campus's last year of program participation. The results are presented for the groups of three-year, two-year, one-year participants: three-year (2016–2017 to 2019–2020), two-year (2017–2018 to 2019–2020), or one-year (2016–2017 to 2017–2018 or 2018–2019 to 2019–2020) as well as by school-level (elementary, middle, high, or combined level) and by Achieve 180 Program school. Progress toward program goals and objectives was measured using the following outcomes: (a) percentage of Effective/Highly Effective school leaders, (b) percentage of Effective/Highly Effective teachers who were paid stipends and retained, (c) student attendance and chronic absence rates, (d) parent and family engagement, and (e) graduation rates. Performance gaps between the Achieve 180 Program and its comparison non-Achieve 180 schools were examined using descriptive statistics.

Second, to assess the statistical significance of progress made toward accomplishing Achieve 180 Program goals from baseline (pre-test) to the campus's last year of program participation or (for lagging indicators) the last year of available data (post-test), paired-samples tests including Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test (for analyzing the small sample sizes of 43 schools or smaller and/or for analyzing non-normally distributed, continuous outcome data) using School Leader Appraisal Scorecard, TADS, student attendance, and program-level graduation data. Pearson's Chi-Square Test of Independence (for categorical graduation outcomes) was used for school-level graduation data. Statistical significance tests (p<0.05) were run for three-year and two-year groups of Achieve 180 Program schools (n=43 and n=10, respectively) and for three-year and two-year groups by school level (elementary, middle, or high). In addition, estimates of program impact were calculated (using r effect sizes). The interpretation values for Wilcoxon test effect size (r) commonly in published literature are: 0.10 - < 0.3 (small effect), 0.30 - < 0.5 (moderate effect) and >= 0.5 (large effect). The interpretation values for d effect sizes commonly in published literature are: 0.2 (small effect), 0.5 (moderate effect) and 0.8 (large effect).

Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test results are presented by group based on years of program participation for SLAS ratings, TADS ratings, attendance rates, and chronic absence rates using one average School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating based on school-level data, the percentage of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings based on teacher-level data, and the annual attendance and chronic absence rates based on student-level data – one rate or percentage per school per year. School-level results for annual trends in student attendance and chronic absence rates are based on student-level data to include all campus students in each year, while school-level analyses of the statistical significance and effect sizes (Wilcoxon tests) of rate changes reported by school are based on paired pre- and post-year student-level data (grouped by their schools' years of program participation). Only students who remained at the identified school in the pre- and post-year were retained in the subset of students on the campus in each of the years. Therefore, the number of students included in the Wilcoxon (paired samples) analyses differ from the annual trend rates. Pearson's Chi-Square Test of Independence was used to analyze graduation data only. Cramér's V Effect Size was used to determine the degree of program impacts. Chi-Square results are presented by group based on years of program participation and by school and/or student subgroup.

In addition, using the Wilcoxon results, Kruskal-Wallis with post-hoc tests were run for the groups of 43 threeyear and 10 two-year program schools to determine whether the school level (elementary, middle, or high) influenced the amount of change Achieve 180 Program schools achieved from pre-program year to postprogram and to ascertain the statistical significance of identified differences due to the school level. The number of combined-level schools (n=3) were not sufficient to include in analyses based on school level. IBM SPSS Statistics 22 was used to conduct the analyses.

Third, to ascertain the quality of associations between program implementation fidelity ratings (independent variable) and educator and student outcomes (dependent variables), correlation analyses were conducted. The direction (positive or negative) and intensity or strength the correlations <0.1 (Very Weak); 0.1 - <0.3 (Weak); 0.3 - <0.5 (Moderate); 0.5 - 1.0 (Strong) are reported explicitly in the Result Section or provided in tables. "Positive" relationships were expected, which indicate an increase in one rating or score was paired with an increase in the implementation fidelity rating. "Negative" relationships (shown with a "-" preceding the number) indicate a decrease in one rating paired with an increase in the other.

The relationships (associations) between each Achieve 180 Program pillar's average implementation fidelity rating and each centralized support is correlated with each key educator outcome (mean School Leader Appraisal Scorecard rating and percentage of teachers with Highly Effective or Effective TADS ratings) and student outcome (percentage of students scoring at or above Approaches Grade level on District-Level

Assessment (DLA) assessments in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics (English and Spanish language versions). In theory, although p-value<=0.05 or <=0.1 is acceptable to determine statistical significance. Significance at p-value <= 0.1 was used in this study given the small sample sizes.

Fourth, to determine the impact of the Achieve 180 Program on summative outcomes, students were matched with non-Achieve 180, Title I, non-Improvement Required (IR) school students to create a comparison group. Students were matched using propensity scores (PSM) in STATA Statistical Analysis Software (psmatch) to better balance Achieve 180 Program and comparison schools' covariates before assessing treatment effects. The propensity score represents the probability of receiving treatment based on measured covariates. Nearest neighbor matching with replacement was utilized. "The propensity score is the probability of treatment assignment conditional on observed baseline characteristics. The propensity score allows one to design and analyze an observational (nonrandomized) study so that it mimics some of the characteristics of a randomized controlled trial" (Austin, 2011, p. 399). Matching methods illuminate aspects of the covariate distributions and reduce bias in the estimation of the treatment effect (Stuart, 2010).

Using comparison schools as explicated previously in this section, Achieve 180 Program students for whom 2018–2019 State Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) and 2019–2020 English language arts (ELA) and mathematics District-level Assessment (DLA) data were available were matched with students in non-Achieve 180, Title I comparison schools in the same year(s) using exact match/nearest neighbor matching with replacement. Each program school and its students were matched only with the schools and students within their specified comparison group. The PSM match selected a control group of students with propensities for treatment similar with those of the Achieve 180 Program students based on the covariates. By creating similar groups, the propensity scores reduce the selection or sampling error and substantially increased the likelihood that the outcomes are comparable. The demographic and educational covariates in this evaluation were economic status, gender, at risk for school dropout status, gifted/talented identification, disability, and prior performance on associated content-related STAAR tests. These characteristics were the basis on which students were matched and assigned to treatment (Achieve 180 Program students) and non-treatment (non-Achieve 180 students) groups. Collinearity was found between gifted and talented and economic disadvantaged status and were the variables of least balance between the treatment and control groups.

Descriptive statistics of student characteristics (gender, gifted/talented, disability, economic disadvantage, and at-risk statuses) before and after PSM matching were analyzed to examine the extent to which improved balance between the groups was achieved due to PSM matching. Following PSM matching procedures, t-tests were conducted to estimate the program's effects on Achieve 180 Program students' performance (Thoemmes, 2012) based on DLA results before and after PSM matching. Treatment effect is estimated in the matched subsample using two sample t-tests (Thoemmes, 2012) before and after matching to determine the DLA ELA and mathematics performances difference between the treatment and comparison groups. The difference between the groups' (treatment vs control) before matching performance versus after matching performance of the differences before and after matching was also assessed. Results are presented for the non-Achieve 180 group and for the Achieve 180 Program, overall, and by tier and school. The outcome data met the assumptions for linearity, equality of variance, and collinearity using the Shapiro-Wilk test, Normal Q-Q plots, and Detrended Normal Q-Q plots.

## **Data Limitations**

• Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Houston Independent School District closed all campuses on March 13, 2020, through the remainder of the school year. Campuses were unable to host face-to-face events

for students and families. All campuses and districts in Texas were labeled Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster for 2020 in the state accountability system (TEA). On varying levels, this global health crisis adversely impacted students, families, and district staff, to include the Achieve 180 Program activities and data collection, and thus impact the results presented in this report.

- The results of this three-year longitudinal evaluation encompass more than two and three-fourths of three school years that were enacted as planned, programmatically, (from August 28<sup>th</sup> of the 2017–2018 through March 20<sup>th</sup> of the 2019–2020 school years) and about 10 out of 40 weeks (or 25%) of a school year that were largely disrupted, programmatically and educationally, due to the COVID-19 pandemic (from March 23rd of the 2019–2020 through June 1<sup>st</sup> of the 2019–2020 school years). The associated academic impacts were inescapable, impossible to assess, and therefore, were a key limitation of this evaluation.
- Student attendance rates for 2019–2020 may be inflated due to effects of the pandemic, including the changes in instructional modalities and differences in how attendance was gauged across the years assessed.
- During the years of program implementation, other supports and programs may have been provided for these principals, teachers, and scholars that could have contaminated the Achieve 180 Program, such is the case with observational data where participants have not been randomly selected into treatment and non-treatment groups. Further, the Achieve 180 Program's centralized support and programs have not been isolated for program participants only. This evaluation did not account for these exposures, which could have influenced the results. Only students, therefore, who were exposed to the Achieve 180 Program and its implementers were included as program participants in the analyses. However, this evaluation involves a quasi-experimental design with Propensity Score Matching and includes a comparable group to determine program effect.
- The Achieve 180 Program budget and expenditure data provided for this evaluation were not sufficient to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the program as necessary to arrive at sound fiscal decisions regarding the potential value added by the program and program sustainability.
- The Achieve 180 Program budget and expenditure data used for this report did not include Achieve 180 Program costs that were paid through some departmental budgets (other than the Chief Academic Officer, Recruitment and Selection, and Achieve 180 School Office) that supported the multifaceted work carried out by many district-level departmental teams. For example, funding streams for much of the work of the Pillar Leaders (Superintendent's Cabinet), Pillar Owners (cross-functional team representatives for HISD departments), and the Area Superintendents, School Support Officers, and Directors have not been reported as a part of the Achieve 180 Program. In addition, budget data presented in Achieve 180 Program reports prior to the 2018–2019 Achieve 180 Program Evaluation, Part B report do not include Federal Grants (Title I) budget information and expenditure data as provided for this report by HISD's Budgeting and Financial Planning Department.
- The anonymity of school leaders, teachers, students, and parents/communities is paramount in this and
  most studies. In some cases, protecting their identities precluded the release of classroom-level or
  school-level data that depict leader, teacher, or other staff responses to program interventions. Because
  program-level, treatment group-level, campus-level, teacher or classroom-level, and student-level data
  are necessary to assess Achieve 180 Program strategies, impacts, and outcomes, data were collected

at each of these levels, when appropriate and available. Results of this evaluation are presented at the program level, treatment group level, and campus level, as available.

- In some cases, program interventions differed within treatment groups or program interventions were the same or similar across treatment groups. It is also possible that differences may have existed between the same types of supports that were provided by different area schools offices. Furthermore, some non-Achieve 180 Program schools may have received similar or identical support to those received by Achieve 180 Program schools.
- Results in this report may differ from previous reports due to differences in the dates that data were extracted from source databases.
- Texas Connections Academy Houston (TCAH) is an Achieve 180 Program (Tier 1A) virtual, online school for students in grades 3–12 and the campus does not offer the same testing opportunities that other HISD campuses offer. To participate in some testing programs, TCAH students must go to a designated location, whereas other district students may, in some cases, be tested at school or may receive supports for test participation that are not readily available to students who participate through an online platform. Therefore, test results for some measures may be lower for TCAH.
- PEIMS Fall data were used to identify students on HISD, non-HISD, and Achieve 180 Program campuses. By relying on PEIMS for student enrollment information, it is possible that students served by Achieve 180 Program schools who enrolled after the Fall snapshot were not included in the analysis.
- For lagging indicators of outcomes that become available in the following academic year (such as graduation rates); 2017–2018 results are presented for baseline data, however, four-year Class of 2020 and five-year Class of 2019 and Class of 2020 results were not available for this report.
- Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the state waived the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) testing requirement for 2019–2020. Therefore, district-level assessments (DLA) were used for this analysis as an indicator of student academic performance. It is important to note that students' DLA test participation is impacted largely by district policy which allows campuses to determine student participation in the DLA. For 2019–2020, limitations to full student participation in DLA was coupled with the immeasurable challenges facing schools, families, and students due to the pandemic. Therefore, DLA results are present here with caution.
- The format of some information provided in the Appendices is not consistent with Research and Accountability guidelines due to the sources that produced them.

# Appendix B: Effective Principals

Table B-1. HISD School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings and Change by Non-Achieve 180 and           Achieve 100 Browney Affiliation for Three March 190 Bro												
Matched Non-Achieve 180 Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020												
	Mean S	School Le	ader Scor	ecard	Mean S	School Lea	ader Score	card Rating				
		Rati	ng			Percentag	ge-Point Ch	ange				
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017 to 2017– 2018	2017– 2018 to 2018– 2019	2018– 2019 to 2019– 2020	2016–2017 to 2019–2020 Three-year Change				
Non-Achieve 180 (Matched n=72)	3.1	3.1	2.8	3.7	0.0	▼0.3	▲ 0.9	▲ 0.6				
Achieve 180 Program (n=42)	2.5	2.9	2.8	3.4	▲0.4	▼0.1	▲0.6	<b>▲</b> 0.9				
Non-Achieve 180 Elementary Schools (n=54)	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.9	▼0.1	▼0.2	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲0.7				
A180 Elementary Schools (n=22)	2.5	2.9	2.8	3.6	▲0.4	▼0.1	▲0.8	<b>▲</b> 1.1				
Bellfort ECC	3	3	3	4	0.0	0.0	▲1.0	▲1.0				
Blackshear ES	2	3	3	3	▲1.0	0.0	0.0	▲1.0				
Bonham ES	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Bruce ES	3	3	2	4	0.0	▼1.0	▲2.0	▲1.0				
Cook ES	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Dogan ES	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Foerster ES	3	2	3	3	▼1.0	▲1.0	0.0	0.0				
Fondren ES <sup>^</sup>	2	3	3	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	▲1.0	▲2.0				
Gallegos ES	3	3	2	4	0.0	▼1.0	▲2.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0				
Highland Heights ES	2	2	3	4	0.0	▲1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲2.0				
Hilliard ES	2	3	3	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲2.0				
Kashmere Gardens ES	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Lewis ES	3	3	3	4	0.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0				
Looscan ES^	2	3	4	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	▲2.0				
Mading ES	3	3	3	4	0.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0				
Martinez C ES	3	3	2	3	0.0	▼1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0				
Montgomery ES	2	3	3	4	▲1.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲2.0				
Pugh ES	2	3	3	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	▲1.0	▲2.0				
Stevens ES^	2	3	2	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▼1.0	▲2.0	▲2.0				
Wesley ES	2	3	3	3	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0				
Woodson	2	3	3	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲2.0				
Young ES	3	3	2	4	0.0	▼1.0	▲2.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0				
Non-Achieve 180 Middle Schools (n=10)	3.0	2.9	2.4	3.1	▼0.1	▼0.5	▲0.7	<b>▲</b> 0.1				
A180 Middle Schools (n=8)	2.5	2.8	2.5	3.1	<b>▲</b> 0.3	▼0.3	▲0.6	▲ 0.6				
Attucks MS	2	3	3	3	▲1.0	0.0	0.0	▲ 1.0				
Cullen MS	2	3	2	3	▲1.0	▼1.0	▲1.0	▲1.0				
Edison MS	3	3	2	3	0.0	▼1.0	▲1.0	0.0				
Forest Brook MS	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Henry MS	2	2	3	3	0.0	▲1.0	0.0	▲1.0				
High School Ahead Acad MS <sup>^</sup>	3	2	2	3	▼1.0	0.0	▲1.0	0.0				

Table B-1.	HISD School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings and Change by Non-Achieve 180 and
	Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their
	Matched Non-Achieve 180 Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020
	(Continued)

	Mean S	School Le Rati	ader Scor	ecard	Mean School Leader Scorecard Rating Percentage-Point Change					
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017 to 2017– 2018	2017– 2018 to 2018– 2019	2018– 2019 to 2019– 2020	2016–2017 to 2019–2020 Three-year Change		
Key MS	3	3	2	3	0.0	▼1.0	▲1.0	0.0		
Lawson MS	2	3	3	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	▲1.0	▲2.0		
Non-Achieve 180 High Schools (n=8)	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	▼1.0	▼1.0		
A180 High Schools (n=11)	2.4	2.8	2.9	3.0	▲0.4	<b>▲</b> 0.1	<b>▲</b> 0.1	▲0.6		
Kashmere HS	2	2	3	3	0.0	▲1.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0		
Liberty HS	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Madison HS	2	3	3	3	▲1.0	0.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0		
Milby HS	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
North Forest HS	2	3	3	3	▲1.0	0.0	0.0	▲1.0		
Sharpstown HS	2	3	3	3	▲1.0	0.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0		
Washington HS	2	2	3	3	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	▲1.0		
Westbury HS	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Wheatley HS	2	3	2	3	▲1.0	▼1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0		
Worthing HS	2	3	3	3	<b>▲</b> 1.0	0.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0		
Yates HS	3	3	3	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Non-Achieve 180 Combined-Level Schools (n=0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
A180 Combined-Level Schools (n=1)	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	▲1.0	0.0	0.0	▲1.0		
Gregory-Lincoln PK-8	2	3	3	3	▲1.0	0.0	0.0	▲1.0		

Sources: 2016–2017 (10/23/2017), 2017–2018 (11/28/2018), 2018–2019 (11/12/2019), 2019–2020 (11/16/2020) Effective School Leader Scorecard Ratings, and 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

Notes: This figure presents one of two components used in the School Leader Appraisal System (SLAS), excludes Coaching and Feedback rating, rounded to nearest tenth (program-level) or whole number (school-level). Data were not available for TCAH, a virtual, online school and three-year program participant or Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter school and one-year (2017–2018) program participant. Data were available for one one-year school, Wisdom HS. All Non-Achieve 180 schools are TEA comparison group schools in HISD and Title I, Part A schools. No appropriate comparison HISD, Title I school was listed for Bellfort ECC, Gregory-Lincoln PK-8, High School Ahead Academy MS, Liberty HS, Montgomery ES, and Yates HS. \*New Achieve 180 Program school in 2018–2019. ^Not a TSL Grant participant.

Table B-2.	HISD School Leader Appraisal Scorecard Ratings and Change by Non-Achieve 180 and
	Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Two-Year and One-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools
	and Their Matched Non-Achieve 180 Schools (Aggregated), 2017–2018 through 2019–2020

Two-Year Schools										
	Mean Scor	School Le ecard Rat	eader ting	Mean Sch Per	ool Leader Scored centage-Point Cha	ard Rating				
	2017 2018	2018 2019	2019 2020	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2018–2019 to 2019–2020	2017–2018 to 2019–2020 Two-Year Change				
Non-Achieve 180 (Matched n=39)	3.1	2.8	3.8	▼0.3	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲0.7				
Achieve 180 Program (n=10)	2.3	2.6	3.5	▲0.3	▲0.9	<b>▲</b> 1.2				
Non-Achieve 180 Elementary Schools (n=31)	3.2	3.0	3.9	▼0.2	▲0.9	▲0.7				
A180 Elementary Schools (n=4)	2.3	3.0	4.0	▲0.7	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲1.7				
Codwell ES	2	3	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲2.0				
Marshall ES <sup>^</sup>	2	3	4	<b>▲</b> 1.0	▲1.0	▲2.0				
Shearn ES <sup>^</sup>	3	3	4	0.0	▲1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0				
Sherman ES^	2	3	4	▲1.0	▲1.0	▲2.0				
Non-Achieve 180 Middle Schools (n=7)	3.0	2.3	3.1	▼0.7	▲0.8	<b>▲</b> 0.1				
A 180 Middle Schools (n=5)	2.2	2.2	3.0	0.0	▲0.8	▲0.8				
Deady MS	2	2	3	0.0	▲1.0	▲1.0				
Holland MS^	2	3	3	▲1.0	0.0	▲1.0				
Sugar Grove MS	2	2	3	0.0	▲1.0	▲1.0				
Thomas MS	2	2	3	0.0	▲1.0	▲1.0				
Williams MS	3	2	3	▼1.0	▲1.0	0.0				
High Schools (n=0)	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Non-Achieve 180 Combined- Level Schools (n=1)	3.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0				
A180 Combined-Level Schools (n=1)	3.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0	<b>▲</b> 1.0				
Reagan Ed Ctr PK-8	3	3	4	0.0	▲1.0	▲1.0				
		One	-Year Sch	ools						
				2018–2019 to 2019–2020 One-year Change						
Non-Achieve 180 (Matched n=2)		3.0	2.5		▼	0.5				
Achieve 180 Program (n=1)		3.0	2.0		▼	1.0				
Wisdom HS*		3	2		V	1.0				

Sources: 2017–2018 (11/28/2018), 2018–2019 (11/12/2019), 2019–2020 (11/16/2020) Effective School Leader Scorecard Ratings, and 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

Notes: This figure presents one of two components used in the School Leader Appraisal System (SLAS), excludes Coaching and Feedback rating, rounded to nearest tenth (program-level) or whole number (school-level). Data are not available for Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter school and one-year (2017–2018) program participant. Data were available for one one-year school. \*New Achieve 180 Program school in 2018–2019. ^Not a TSL Grant participant.

Scorecard Ratings, Pre-Program to Post-Program Change by Number Years in Program													
Outcome Measure	Statistical Test	N	N Positive Diff./Ranks	N Negative Diff./Ranks	N Ties	SE	df	p (2-tailed)	Test Statistic	Effect Size			
School Leader Scorecard_3-Year	Wilcoxon	42	28	0	14	42.083	-	0.000*	z=4.824	r = 0.53/large			
School Leader Scorecard_3-Year_ES	Wilcoxon	22	16	0	6	18.788	-	0.000*	z=3.619	r = 0.55/large			
School Leader Scorecard_3-Year_MS	Wilcoxon	8	4	0	4	2.646	I	0.059	z=1.890	-			
School Leader Scorecard_3-Year_HS	Wilcoxon	11	7	0	4	5.292	I	0.008*	z=-2.646	r = 0.56/large			
Sschool Leader Scorecard_2-Year	Wilcoxon	10	9	0	1	8.147	-	0.006*	z=2.762	r = 0.62/large			
School Leader Scorecard_2-Year_ES	Wilcoxon	4	-	-	I	-	I	-	-	-			
Sschool Leader Scorecard_2-Year_MS	Wilcoxon	5	4	0	I	2.5	I	0.046*	z=2.000	r = 0.53/large			
School Leader Scorecard_2-Year_HS	Wilcoxon	I	-	-	I	-	I	-	-	-			
School Leader Scorecard_ES/MS/HS	Kruskal-Wallis	51	-	-	-	-	2	0.028*	7.172	-			
MS-ES (pre to post change per school)	PairWise	١	-	-	I	4.71	I	0.170	z=1.907	-			
HS-ES (pre to post change per school)	Comparisons	-	-	-	-	4.84	-	0.05*	z=2.397	-			
HS-MS (pre to post change per school)	(adjusted p value)	-	-	-	-	5.551	-	1.000	z=0.472	-			

Sources: 2017–2018 (11/28/2018), 2018–2019 (11/12/2019), 2019–2020 (11/16/2020) Effective School Leader Scorecard Ratings, and 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

Notes: Standardized z for Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. \*Statistically significant p=<0.05; Negative Diff./Ranks means a decline from pre-measure to post-measure. Positive Diff./Ranks means an increase from pre-measure to post measure. Effect sizes (r) interpreted as commonly in published are: 0.10 - < 0.3 (small effect), 0.30 - <0.5 (moderate effect) and >= 0.5 (large effect). No data available for Victory Preparatory South HS and TCAH 3–12. Due to small sample sizes, no results for one-year or combined-level schools.

# **Appendix C: Effective Teachers**

Table C-1. Mean Percentage of Teachers with Effective or Highly Effective Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) Ratings and Percentage-Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 **Three-Year Schools** Percentage of Teachers with **Number Teachers with TADS** Mean TADS Rating **Effective or Highly Effective** Ratings **Percentage-Point Change TADS** Rating 2016-2016-2017-2018-2017 to 2017 2018 2019 2019-2016-2017-2019-2017-2018-2019-2016-2018-2020 to to to 2017 2018 2019 2020 2017 2018 2019 2020 2017-2018-2019-Three-2018 2019 2020 Year Change Non-Achieve 180 3,030 3,018 87.6 88.1 (Three-year Matched 2,894 2,775 87.3 89.6 ▲0.3 ▲0.5 ▲1.5 ▲ 2.3 n=72) **Three-Year Achieve** 1,683 1,713 1,624 81.1 81.1 82.9 ▲ 0.1 0.0 ▲1.8 ▲ 1.9 1,623 81.0 180 Program (n=42) Non-Achieve 180 **Elementary Schools** 1,828 1,794 1.725 1,641 88.6 86.7 86.8 87.5 ▼1.9 ▲ 0.1 ▲ 0.7 ▼1.1 (n=54) A180 Elementary 712 696 628 76.8 77.0 77.1 79.1 ▲ 0.2 ▲0.1 ▲ 2.0 ▲ 2.3 641 Schools (n=22) Bellfort ECC 20 20 19 95.0 95.0 94.7 94.7 0.0 19 ▼0.3 0.0 ▼0.3 Blackshear ES 31 30 24 20 80.6 60.0 45.8 75.0 ₹20.6 ▼14.2 ▲ 29.2 ▼5.6 ₹22.9 Bonham ES 62 59 50 56 82.3 59.3 70.0 82.1 ▲10.7 **▲**12.1 ▼0.1 В С

Bruce ES	35	34	32	25	60.0	88.2	90.6	76.0	▲28.2	▲2.4	▼14.6	<b>▲</b> 16.0
Cook ES	37	36	37	35	70.3	50.0	54.1	48.6	▼20.3	<b>▲</b> 4.1	▼5.5	▼21.7
Dogan ES	37	38	33	33	81.1	94.7	87.9	84.8	<b>▲</b> 13.7	▼6.9	▼3.0	▲ 3.8
Foerster ES	37	40	38	44	81.1	87.5	81.6	88.6	▲6.4	▼5.9	▲7.1	▲7.6
Fondren ES^	24	22	21	17	75.0	95.5	90.5	94.1	<b>▲</b> 20.5	▼5.0	▲ 3.6	<b>▲19.1</b>
Gallegos ES	25	24	23	23	76.0	95.8	91.3	65.2	<b>▲</b> 19.8	▼4.5	▼26.1	▼10.8
Highland Heights ES	32	30	28	28	93.8	76.7	85.7	75.0	▼17.1	<b>▲</b> 9.0	▼10.7	▼18.8
Hilliard ES	35	37	31	25	80.0	78.4	93.5	96.0	▼1.6	▲15.2	▲2.5	<b>▲</b> 16.0
Kashmere Gardens ES	23	20	17	22	73.9	95.0	64.7	95.5	▲21.1	▼30.3	▲ 30.7	<b>▲</b> 21.5
Lewis ES	48	45	45	43	66.7	86.7	91.1	93.0	▲20.0	▲4.4	<b>▲</b> 1.9	▲ 26.4
Looscan ES^	25	15	21	21	80.0	73.3	81.0	76.2	▼6.7	▲7.6	▼4.8	▼3.8
Mading ES	33	34	29	27	66.7	64.7	72.4	77.8	▼2.0	▲7.7	▲ 5.4	▲11.1
Martinez C ES	31	29	28	24	83.9	72.4	82.1	95.8	▼11.5	▲9.7	▲13.7	<b>▲</b> 12.0
Montgomery ES <sup>^</sup>	38	37	33	29	78.9	86.5	84.8	82.8	▲7.5	▼1.6	▼2.1	▲ 3.8
Pugh ES	24	24	24	26	58.3	79.2	79.2	88.5	▲20.8	0.0	<b>▲</b> 9.3	<b>▲</b> 30.1
Stevens ES <sup>^</sup>	39	38	36	36	94.9	86.8	83.3	83.3	▼8.0	▼3.5	0.0	▼11.5
Wesley ES	17	22	22	20	64.7	77.3	54.5	60.0	<b>▲</b> 12.6	▼22.7	▲ 5.5	▼4.7
Woodson	41	41	30	33	61.0	46.3	50.0	57.6	▼14.6	▲3.7	▲7.6	▼3.4
Young ES	18	21	20	22	88.9	81.0	55.0	45.5	▼7.9	▼26.0	▼9.5	▼43.4

 

 Table C-1.
 Mean Percentage of Teachers with Effective or Highly Effective Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) Ratings and Percentage-Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 (Continued)

	Numb	er Teach Rati	ers with ings	TADS	Perce Effec	entage o tive or H TADS	f Teache lighly Eff Rating	rs with fective	Mean TADS Rating Percentage-Point Change			
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017 to 2017– 2018	2017– 2018 to 2018– 2019	2018– 2019 to 2019– 2020	2016– 2017 to 2019– 2020 Three- Year Change
Non-Achieve 180 Middle Schools (n=10)	498	485	463	427	81.7	85.8	87.7	89.2	▲4.1	▲1.9	▲1.5	▲7.5
A180 Middle Schools (n=8)	285	302	302	296	82.5	81.8	77.2	80.4	▼0.7	▼4.6	▲3.2	▼2.1
Attucks MS	21	27	29	31	76.2	63.0	86.2	90.3	▼13.2	▲23.2	▲4.1	▲14.1
Cullen MS	32	31	32	30	84.4	83.9	59.4	46.7	▼0.5	▼24.5	▼12.7	▼37.7
Edison MS	35	39	33	34	94.3	84.6	81.8	76.5	▼9.7	₹2.8	▼5.3	▼17.8
Forest Brook MS	49	49	50	43	83.7	95.9	82.0	81.4	▲12.2	▼13.9	▼0.6	₹2.3
Henry MS	45	50	47	50	82.2	88.0	87.2	86.0	▲5.8	₹0.8	▼1.2	▲3.8
High School Ahead Acad MS^	14	11	11	10	78.6	63.6	45.5	90.0	▼14.9	▼18.2	▲44.5	▲11.4
Key MS	36	42	38	37	75.0	73.8	81.6	83.8	▼1.2	▲7.8	▲2.2	▲8.8
Lawson MS	53	53	62	61	81.1	79.2	71.0	85.2	▼1.9	▼8.3	▲14.3	<b>▲</b> 4.1
Non-Achieve 180 High Schools (n=8)	704	739	706	707	87.6	90.9	97.8	94.6	▲3.3	▲6.9	▼3.2	▲7.0
A180 High Schools (n=11)	647	677	643	661	85.8	85.7	86.9	88.0	▼0.1	▲1.2	▲1.1	▲2.2
Kashmere HS	38	42	41	45	71.1	83.3	95.1	82.2	▲12.3	▲11.8	▼12.9	▲11.2
Liberty HS	22	18	19	18	100.0	94.4	100.0	88.9	▼5.6	▲5.6	▼11.1	▼11.1
Madison HS	97	95	71	77	73.2	82.1	66.2	89.6	▲8.9	▼15.9	▲23.4	▲16.4
Milby HS	77	91	90	88	93.5	94.5	94.4	97.7	▲1.0	▼0.1	▲3.3	▲4.2
North Forest HS	51	50	46	54	88.2	86.0	76.1	68.5	₹2.2	▼9.9	₹7.6	▼19.7
Sharpstown HS	77	80	79	78	92.2	91.3	97.5	98.7	▼1.0	▲6.2	▲1.2	▲6.5
Washington HS	47	47	45	49	93.6	89.4	86.7	93.9	▼4.3	₹2.7	▲7.2	▲0.3
Westbury HS	112	117	121	111	87.5	85.5	93.4	88.3	₹2.0	▲7.9	▼5.1	▲0.8
Wheatley HS	47	51	47	52	87.2	70.6	70.2	76.9	▼16.6	▼0.4	▲6.7	▼10.3
Worthing HS	29	40	40	47	72.4	75.0	82.5	80.9	▲2.6	▲7.5	▼1.6	▲8.4
Yates HS	50	46	44	42	86.0	87.0	88.6	90.5	▲1.0	▲1.7	▲1.8	▲4.5

Table C-1. Mean Percentage of Teachers with Effective or Highly Effective Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS) Ratings and Percentage-Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 (Continued)

	Numb	er Teach Rati	ers with ings	TADS	Perce Effec	ntage of tive or H TADS	Teacher ighly Eff Rating	s with ective	Pe	Mean T ercentage	ADS Rat e-Point C	ing Change
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017	2017-         2018-         2019-           2018         2019         2020		2019– 2020	2016– 2017 to 2017– 2018	16– 2017– 2018 117 2018 2019 o to to 17– 2018– 2019 18 2019 2020		2016–2017 to 2019–2020 Three- Year Change
Non-Achieve 180 Combined-Level Schools (n=0)	-	-			_	-	-	-	_	_	_	-
A180 Combined- Level Schools (n=1)	39	38	37	39	69.2 71.1 81.1 76.9		▲1.8	▲10.0	₹4.2	▲7.7		
Gregory-Lincoln PK-8	39	38	37	39	69.2	71.1	81.1	76.9	▲1.8	▲10.0	▼4.2	▲7.7

Sources: SAP Weekly Report 2016–2017 (8/15/2016 to 8/28/2017), 2017–2018 (8/14/2017 to 6/04/2018), 2018–2019 (8/27/2018 to 6/03/2019), and 2019–2020 (8/12/2019 to 6/01/2020); TADS Tool 2016–2017 (10/23/2017), 2017–2018 (10/22/2018), 2018–2019 (12/04/2019), and 2019–2020 (11/06/2020); 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

Notes: TADS ratings based on multiple metrics were rounded to the nearest whole number. The proportion of campus teachers rated Highly Effective or Effective ratings was rounded to one decimal-point. Due to changes in the teachers for whom the Student Performance component was included in the annual calculation of their appraisal ratings from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020, comparisons are made with caution. All Non-Achieve 180 schools are TEA comparison group schools in HISD and Title I, Part A schools. Data were not available for Texas Connections Academy Houston (TCAH), a virtual, online, three-year program participant. No comparison HISD, Title I school was listed for Bellfort ECC, Gregory-Lincoln PK-8, High School Ahead Academy MS, Liberty HS, Montgomery ES, TCAH, Victory Preparatory South HS, and Yates HS.\*New Achieve 180 Program school in 2018–2019. ^Not a TSL Grant participant. Table C-2. Mean Percentage of Teachers with Effective or Highly Effective Teacher Appraisal and Development<br/>System (TADS) Ratings and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve 180 Program<br/>Affiliation for Two-Year and One-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their Non-Achieve 180<br/>Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2017–2018 or 2018–2019 to 2019–2020

	Numbe	er Teache DS Ratir	ers with	Percen with Ef	tage of T fective o ive TADS	eachers r Highly Rating	Per	Mean TADS R rcentage-Poin	ating t Change	
	2017 -2018	2018 -2019	2019 -2020	2017 2018	2018 –2019	2019 -2020	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2018–2019 to 2019–2020	2017–2018 to 2019–2020 Two-Year Change	
Non-Achieve 180 (Two-year Matched n=39)	1,559	1,505	1,429	89.0	87.4	89.3	▼1.6	▲1.9	▲0.3	
Two-Year Achieve 180 Program (n=10)	390	352	320	79.5	74.1	77.5	▼5.4	▲3.4	▼2.0	
Non-Achieve 180 Elementary Schools (n=31)	1,196	1,163	1,118	86.2	87.1	88.7	▲0.9	▲1.6	▲2.5	
A180 Elementary Schools (n=4)	147	134	122	79.6	76.9	80.3	₹2.7	▲ 3.4	▲0.7	
Codwell ES	28	24	24	82.1	79.2	87.5	▼3.0	▲8.3	▲ 5.4	
Marshall ES^	50	45	42	74.0	62.2	73.8	▼11.8	▲11.6	▼0.2	
Shearn ES^	33	31	28	66.7	83.9	75.0	▲17.2	▼8.9	▲8.3	
Sherman ES^	36	34	28	97.2	88.2	89.3	▼9.0	▲1.1	▼7.9	
Non-Achieve 180 Middle										
Schools (n=7)	299	282	249	85.6	86.2	89.2	▲0.6	▲3.0	▲3.6	
A 180 Middle Schools (n=5)	183	169	150	76.0	67.0	70.0	▼9.0	▲3.0	▼6.0	
Deady MS	40	34	33	80.0	61.8	81.8	▼18.2	▲20.1	<b>▲</b> 1.8	
Holland MS^	37	34	35	89.2	79.4	82.9	▼9.8	▲3.4	▼6.3	
Sugar Grove MS	40	35	34	55.0	57.1	73.5	▲2.1	▲16.4	<b>▲</b> 18.5	
Thomas MS	34	30	18	70.6	73.3	50.0	▲2.7	▼23.3	▼20.6	
Williams MS	32	36	30	87.5	63.9	50.0	▼23.6	▼13.9	▼37.5	
High Schools (n=0)	-	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	
Non-Achieve 180 Combined- Level Schools (n=1)	64	60	62	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
A180 Combined-Level		10	40							
Schools (n=1)	60	49	48	90.0	91.8	93.8	▲1.8	▲1.9	▲3.8	
Reagan Ed Ctr PK-8	60	49	48	90.0	91.8	93.8	▲1.8	▲1.9	▲3.8	
			C	one-Year	Schools					
							2018–2019 to 2019–2020 One-year Change			
Non-Achieve 180 (Matched n=2)		216	216		96.8	94.9	▼1.9			
Achieve 180 Program (n=1)					94.7	94.4		▼0.3		
Wisdom HS*					94.7	94.4		▼0.3		

Sources: SAP Weekly Report 2017–2018 (8/14/2017 to 6/04/2018), 2018–2019 (8/27/2018 to 6/03/2019), and 2019–2020 (8/12/2019 to 6/01/2020); TADS Tool 2017–2018 (10/22/2018), 2018–2019 (12/04/2019), and 2019–2020 (11/02/2019), 2019–2019), 2019–2019

(11/06/2020); 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

Notes: TADS ratings based on multiple metrics were rounded to the nearest whole number. The proportion of campus teachers rated Highly Effective or Effective ratings was rounded to one decimal-point. Due to changes in the teachers for whom the Student Performance component was included in the annual calculation of their appraisal ratings from 2016–2017 to 2019–2020, comparisons are made with caution. All Non-Achieve 180 schools are TEA comparison group schools in HISD and Title I, Part A schools. Data were not available for Victory Preparatory South HS, a charter, one-year program participant (2017–2018). Data were available for one other one-year school, Wisdom HS.\*New Achieve 180 Program school in 2018–2019. ^Not a TSL Grant participant.

Appraisal and Development System Ratings, Pre-Program to Post-Program by Number Years in Program													
Outcome Measure	Statistical Test	N	N Positive Diff./Ranks	N Negative Diff./Ranks	N Ties	SE	df	p (2-tailed)	Test Statistic	Effect Size			
TADS_3-Year	Wilcoxon	42	25	17	0	79.975	-	0.311	z=1.013	r = 0.11			
TADS_3-Year_ES	Wilcoxon	22	11	11	0	30.8	-	0.485	z=0.698	r = 0.11			
TADS_3-Year_MS	Wilcoxon	8	5	3	0	7.141	-	0.779	z=0.280	r = 0.07			
TADS_3-Year_HS	Wilcoxon	11	8	3	0	11.247	-	0.534	z=0.622	r = 0.13			
TADS_2-Year	Wilcoxon	10	5	5	0	9.811	-	0.721	z=357	r =0.08			
TADS_2-Year_ES	Wilcoxon	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
TADS_2-Year_MS	Wilcoxon	5	2	3	0	3.708	-	0.345	z=944	r = -0.30/small			
TADS_2-Year_HS	Wilcoxon	Ι	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
TADS_ES/MS/HS	Kruskal-Wallis	51	-	-	-	-	2	0.756	0.558	-			
MS-ES (pre to post change per school)	PairWise	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
HS-ES (pre to post change per school)	Comparisons	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
HS-MS (pre to post change per school)	(adjusted p value)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_			

Sources: SAP Weekly Report 2017–2018 (8/14/2017 to 6/04/2018), 2018–2019 (8/27/2018 to 6/03/2019), and 2019–2020 (8/12/2019 to 6/01/2020); TADS Tool 2017–2018 (10/22/2018), 2018–2019 (12/04/2019), and 2019–2020 (11/06/2020); 2019–2020 TEA Campus Comparison Group (by school)

Notes: Standardized z for Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. \*Statistically significant p=<.05; Negative Diff./Ranks means a decline from pre-measure to post-measure. Positive Diff./Ranks means an increase from pre-measure to post measure. Effect sizes (r) interpreted as commonly in published are: 0.10 – < 0.3 (small effect), 0.30 –</li>
 <0.5 (moderate effect) and >= 0.5 (large effect). No data available for Victory Preparatory South HS and TCAH 3–12. Due to small sample sizes, no results presented for one-year or combined-level schools.

# Appendix D: Student Attendance and Chronic Absence

# Table D-1. Attendance Rates and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and TheirNon-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020

Three-Year Schools															
		Enro	llment		ŀ	ttenda	nce Rat	е	Attendance Rate Change						
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016–2017 to 2017–2018	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2018–2019 to 2019–2020	2016–2017 to 2019–2020 Three-Year Change			
Non-Achieve 180															
(Three-year Matched n=72)	63,339	61,105	60,594	58,259	94.9	94.7	94.5	96.0	▼0.2	▼0.2	▲1.5	▲1.1			
Three-Year Achieve 180															
Program (n=43)	44,069	42,951	42,544	42,729	93.8	93.6	93.7	95.5	▼0.2	▲0.1	▲1.8	▲1.7			
Non-Achieve 180															
Elementary Schools (n=54)	37,801	36,405	36,091	34,507	96.2	96.2	95.9	96.8	0.0	▼0.3	▲0.9	▲0.6			
A180 Elementary Schools															
(n=22)	14,644	13,751	13,155	12,879	95.2	95.1	94.7	95.9	▼0.1	▼0.4	▲1.2	▲0.7			
Bellfort ECC	399	420	399	407	95.8	95.9	94.9	95.5	<b>▲</b> 0.1	▼1.0	▲0.6	▼0.3			
Blackshear ES	624	595	503	479	95.0	95.2	95.1	95.6	▲0.2	▼0.1	▲0.5	▲0.6			
Bonnam ES	1,220	1,115	1,117	1,094	95.5	95.9	95.0	96.1	▲0.4	♦ 0.9	▲ 1.1	▲0.6			
Bluce ES	761	720	711	490	95.0	95.9	96.0	96.1	▲0.3 ▼0.2	▲0.1	▲0.1	▲0.5			
Dogan ES	701	601	675	676	95.0	94.0	94.2	94.9	♦ 0.2	♦ 0.0	<b>▲</b> 0.7	♦ 0.1			
Exercise FS	708	886	902	906	93.5	90.0	90.2	95.9	▼0.6	▼1.1	<b>♦</b> 2.0	▲0.4			
Fondren ESA	481	409	302	345	95.5	96.5	95.2	97.2	<b>↓</b> 0.0	▼0.6	▲ 1 3	▲ 0.3			
Gallegos ES	453	412	384	395	97.0	96.9	96.4	96.8	▼0.1	▼0.5	▲ 1.5 ▲ 0.4	▼0.2			
Highland Heights ES	693	649	603	563	94.2	93.7	92.7	95.0	▼0.5	▼1.0	▲2.3	▲0.8			
Hilliard ES	860	698	641	675	93.1	91.5	93.1	94.9	▼1.6	1.6	▲1.8	▲ 1.8			
Kashmere Gardens ES	520	458	492	525	94.1	94.2	93.0	95.4	▲0.1	▼1.2	▲2.4	▲1.3			
Lewis ES	954	909	949	890	96.5	96.7	95.9	96.7	▲0.2	▼0.8	▲0.8	▲0.2			
Looscan ES^	487	393	382	357	95.6	95.5	95.7	96.4	▼0.1	▲0.2	▲0.7	▲0.8			
Mading ES	594	570	490	437	95.2	95.8	96.2	97.0	▲0.6	▲0.4	▲0.8	▲1.8			
Martinez C ES	606	553	499	440	96.0	95.5	95.0	96.3	▼0.5	▼0.5	▲ 1.3	▲0.3			
Montgomery ES <sup>^</sup>	808	648	623	574	95.1	95.4	94.3	96.2	▲0.3	▼1.1	▲ 1.9	▲1.1			
Pugh ES	471	426	421	415	96.2	96.4	96.1	96.9	▲0.2	▼0.3	▲0.8	▲0.7			
Stevens ES^	826	781	746	734	96.0	95.3	94.9	96.2	▼0.7	▼0.4	▲1.3	▲0.2			
Wesley ES	423	437	409	436	93.4	93.5	94.0	95.3	<b>▲</b> 0.1	▲0.5	▲ 1.3	▲1.9			
Woodson	951	906	781	767	94.3	93.5	93.6	95.7	▼0.8	<b>▲</b> 0.1	▲2.1	▲1.4			
Young ES	340	424	475	517	95.1	94.7	93.0	96.6	▼0.4	▼1.7	▲3.6	▲1.5			
Non-Achieve 180 Middle															
Schools (n=10)	9,912	9,270	9,194	8,644	94.7	94.3	94.0	95.8	▼0.4	▼0.3	▲1.8	▲1.1			
A180 Middle Schools (n=8)	6,433	6,224	6,246	6,065	93.4	92.4	92.7	94.8	▼1.0	▲0.3	▲2.1	▲1.4			
	606	609	633	536	92.7	89.8	90.6	93.2	▼2.9 ▼E.4	▲0.8	▲2.6	▲0.5			
	020	5//	492	407	95.9	90.5	07.0	91.7	▼ 5.4	▼2.9	▲4.1 ▲4.0	▼4.2			
Eaison MS	/32	709	/15	/11	95.1	95.5	95.0	96.0	▲0.4	▼0.5	▲ 1.0	▲0.9			
FOREST BROOK MIS	1,092	1,023	1,001	943	92.7	92.1	92.8	94.4	▼0.6	▲ 0.7	▲ 1.6 ▲ 0.0	▲1./			
	1,009	2951	217	220	94.5 97 0	92.7	93.8	94.7	▼ 1.8 ▼ 2.9		▲ 0.9 ▲ 0.1	▲ U.Z			
Kov MS	220 Q01	201	217	230	07.2	04.4	04.0	92.1	▼2.0	0.0	▲3.0	▲0.0			
Lawson MS	1.243	1.264	1.390	1.479	93.2	94.4	94.8	96.2	1.2	▲0.4	▲ 1.4	▲3.0			

Table D-1. Attendance Rates and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and TheirNon-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020(Continued)

				Thr	ree-Yea	ar Scho	ools					
		Enro	llment		A	ttenda	nce Ra	te		Attendance	e Rate Char	ige
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016–2017 to 2017–2018	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2018–2019 to 2019–2020	2016–2017 to 2019–2020 Three-Year Change
Non-Achieve 180 High Schools (n=8)	15,626	15,430	15,309	15,108	92.2	91.6	91.8	94.4	▼0.6	▲0.2	▲2.6	▲2.2
A180 High Schools (n=11)	14,049	14,639	15,158	14,980	89.8	90.0	90.4	93.3	▲0.2	▲0.4	▲2.9	▲3.5
Kashmere HS	771	870	970	961	88.7	88.3	89.8	90.8	▼0.4	▲1.5	▲1.0	▲2.1
Liberty HS	255	445	454	406	85.5	80.9	81.8	86.8	▼4.6	▲ 0.9	▲ 5.0	▲1.3
Madison HS	2,007	1,837	1,976	1,978	88.1	88.5	90.3	93.0	▲0.4	▲ 1.8	▲2.7	▲4.9
Milby HS	1,514	1,831	2,060	2,176	90.4	91.3	93.3	95.7	▲0.9	▲2.0	▲2.4	▲5.3
North Forest HS	1,121	1,158	1,172	1,114	89.0	89.9	88.2	92.8	▲0.9	▼1.7	▲4.6	▲3.8
Sharpstown HS	1,960	1,904	1,991	2,051	91.7	90.7	89.6	92.2	▼1.0	▼1.1	▲2.6	▲0.5
Washington HS	885	932	910	904	91.3	89.0	90.6	93.0	▼2.3	▲1.6	▲2.4	▲1.7
Westbury HS	2,518	2,595	2,639	2,639	92.3	92.9	92.8	95.0	▲0.6	▼0.1	▲2.2	▲2.7
Wheatley HS	987	1,077	1,010	870	88.3	87.5	85.8	90.5	▼0.8	▼1.7	▲4.7	▲2.2
Worthing HS	1,032	1,029	958	935	86.4	90.1	90.8	94.8	▲ 3.7	▲0.7	▲4.0	▲8.4
Yates HS	999	961	1,018	946	88.4	89.2	89.1	93.2	▲0.8	▼0.1	▲4.1	▲4.8
Non-Achieve 180 Combined-Level Schools	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A180 Combined-Level Schools (n=2)	8,943	8,337	7,985	8,805	99.4	99.3	99.6	99.7	▼0.1	▲0.3	▲0.1	▲0.3
Gregory-Lincoln PK-8	802	849	823	798	94.5	95.8	96.4	97.5	▲1.3	▲0.6	▲1.1	▲3.0
TCAH^	8,141	7,488	7,162	8,007	100.0	99.8	100.0	100.0	▼0.2	▲ 0.2	0.0	0.0

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. ^Indicates Non-TSL Grant participant. All Non-Achieve 180 schools are TEA comparison group schools in HISD and Title I, Part A schools. No appropriate TEA comparison group schools were listed for Bellfort ECC, Gregory-Lincoln PK-8, High School Ahead Academy MS, Liberty HS, Montgomery ES, TCAH, Victory Preparatory South HS, and Yates HS. Table D-2. Attendance Rates and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve180 Program Affiliation for Two-Year and One-Year Achieve 180 Program Schoolsand Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through2019–2020

Two-Year Schools												
		Enro	llment		4	Attenda	nce Rat	e		Attendance	Rate Change	
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016–2017 to 2017–2018	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2018–2019 to 2019–2020	2017–2018 to 2019–2020 Two-Year Change
Non-Achieve 180 (Two-year Matched n=39)		30,620	30,326	28,675		96.1	95.9	96.8		▼0.2	▲0.9	▲0.7
Two-YearAchieve 180 Program (n=10)		7,789	7,574	7,421		94.7	95.1	96.3		▲0.4	▲1.2	▲1.6
Non-Achieve 180 Elementary Schools (n=31)		23,834	23,591	22,499		96.5	96.3	97.1		▼0.2	▲0.8	▲0.6
A180 Elementary Schools (n=4)		3,002	2,722	2,680		95.8	96.0	96.6		▲0.2	▲0.6	▲0.8
Codwell ES		501	452	458		95.0	94.8	96.1		▼0.2	▲1.3	▲1.1
Marshall ES^		1,143	1,008	961		95.5	96.3	96.6		▲0.8	▲0.3	▲1.1
Shearn ES^		713	653	638		96.6	96.2	97.2		▼0.4	▲1.0	▲0.6
Sherman ES^		645	609	623		96.2	96.0	96.4		▼0.2	▲0.4	▲0.2
Non-Achieve 180 MiddleSchools (n=7)		5,552	5,448	4,926		94.4	93.8	95.7		▼0.6	▲1.9	▲1.3
A180 MiddleSchools (n=5)		3,611	3,760	3,665		93.3	93.8	95.6		▲0.5	▲1.8	▲2.3
Deady MS		789	755	771		94.6	93.5	95.8		▼1.1	▲2.3	▲1.2
Holland MS^		770	769	795		94.1	93.6	95.6		▼0.5	▲2.0	▲1.5
Sugar Grove MS		784	798	867		92.7	95.6	95.9		▲2.9	▲0.3	▲3.2
Thomas MS		645	787	680		92.5	94.6	96.4		▲2.1	▲1.8	▲3.9
Williams MS		623	651	552		92.1	91.5	93.3		▼0.6	▲1.8	▲1.2
High Schools (n=0)						-	-	-		-	_	-
Non-Achieve 180 Combined-Level Schools (n=1)		1,234	1,287	1,250		97.1	96.9	97.6		▼0.2	▲0.7	▲0.5
A180 Combined-Level Schools (n=1)		1,176	1,092	1,076		96.3	96.8	97.6		▲0.5	▲0.8	▲1.3
Reagan Ed Ctr PK-8		1,176	1,092	1,076		96.3	96.8	97.6		▲0.5	▲0.8	▲1.3
		-		One-Ye	ar Sch	ools						
									2016–2017 to 2017–2018 One-year		2018–2019 to 2019–2020 One-year	
Achieve 180 Program (n=2)	186	263	2,336	2,255	90.3	91.6	91.5	93.9	Change		Change	
Non-Achieve 180 (matched n=2)	-	-	4,738	4,753	-	-	92.5	94.3			▲1.8	
Achieve 180 Program (n=2)									▲1.3		▲2.4	
Victory Prep South HS	186	263			90.3	91.6			▲1.3			
Wisdom HS* (pre 18-19/post 19-20)			2,336	2,255			91.5	93.9			▲2.4	

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Andicates Non-TSL Grant participant. \*New Achieve 180 Program school in 2018–2019. All Non-Achieve 180 schools are TEA comparison group schools in HISD and Title I, Part A schools. No HISD TEA comparison group schools were listed for Victory Preparatory South HS. Table D-3. Wilcoxon and Kruskal-Wallis Results for Pre- to Post-Program School-Level Change in Student Attendance and ChronicAbsence Rates for Achieve 180 Program Schools by Number Years in the Program and School Level (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020

Student Attendance Rate	Statistical	Number of	Number of Positive	Number of	Number					
(pre- to post-program rate)	Test	Schools	Ranks	Ranks	of Ties	SE	df	p (2-tailed)	Test Statistic	Effect Size
Student Attendance_3-Year_all	Wilcoxon	43	38	4	1	79.958	-	0.000*	z=5.04	r = 0.54/large
Student Attendance_3-Year_ES	Wilcoxon	22	19	3	0	30.784	I	0.000*	z=3.784	r = 0.57/large
Student Attendance_3-Year_MS	Wilcoxon	8	7	1	0	7.141	I	0.123	z=1.54	r = 0.39/moderate
Student Attendance_3-Year_HS	Wilcoxon	11	11	0	0	11.247	I	0.003*	z=2.934	r = 0.63/large
Student Attendance_2-Year_all	Wilcoxon	10	10	0	0	9.798	١	0.005*	z=2.807	r = 0.63/large
Student Attendance_2-Year_ES	Wilcoxon	4	4	0	0	2.716	I	0.066	z=-1.841	-
Student Attendance_2-Year_MS	Wilcoxon	5	5	0	0	3.691	I	0.042*	z=2.032	r = 0.64/large
Student Attendance_2-Year_HS	Wilcoxon	-	-	-	-	-	I	-	-	-
Student Attendance_ES/MS/HS (pre- to post-program rate change)	Kruskal- Wallis	50	-	-	-	-	2	0.000*	16.225	_
ES-MS			-	_	-	4.949	-	0.096	z=-2.145	_
ES-HS	PairWise		-	_	-	5.24	-	0.000*	z=-3.911	_
MS-HS	Compansons		-	-	-	5.969	-	0.293	z=-1.655	-
Student Chronic Absence Rate (pre- to post-program rate)										
Student Chronic Absence_3-Year_all	Wilcoxon	43	3	39	1	79.972	-	0.000*	z=-5.102	r = 0.55/large
Student Chronic Absence_3-Year_ES	Wilcoxon	22	1	21	0	30.794	-	0.000*	z=-4.059	r = 0.61/large
Student Chronic Absence_3-Year_MS	Wilcoxon	8	2	6	0	7.141	-	0.161	z=-1.400	r = 0.35/moderate
Student Chronic Absence_3-Year_HS	Wilcoxon	11	0	11	0	11.242	-	0.003*	z=-2.936	r = 0.63/large
Student Chronic Absence_2-Year_all	Wilcoxon	10	0	10	0	9.811	-	0.005*	z=-2.803	r = 0.63/large
Student Chronic Absence_2-Year_ES	Wilcoxon	4	4	0	0	2.739	I	0.068	z=-1.826	-
Student Chronic Absence_2-Year_MS	Wilcoxon	5	0	5	0	3.708	I	0.043*	z=-2.023	r = 0.64/large
Student Chronic Absence_2-Year_HS	Wilcoxon	-	-	—	-	-	I	-	-	-
Student Chronic Absence_ES/MS/HS	Kruskal-									
(pre- to post-program rate change)	Wallis	50	_	_	-	-	2	0.000*	19.419	-
ES-MS	Pairwise		_	_	-	4.951	-	0.299	z=1.647	-
ES-HS	Comparisons		-	-	-	5.242	-	0.000*	z=4.398	-
MS-HS	2.5		_	-	-	5.971	-	0.038*	z=2.496	-

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data aggregated by school. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. The chronic absence rate is the total number of students absent 10 percent or more of school days they are enrolled in the campus divided by the total number of students in membership in the campus 83% or more of the school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Statistical significance (p<0.05) was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: two three-year combined-level, four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and two one-year high schools. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test effect size (r) commonly in published literature are: 0.10 – < 0.3 (small effect), 0.30 – < 0.5 (moderate effect) and >= 0.5 (large effect).

Table D-4. Wilcoxon F 180 Pro	Results Summa ogram Schools	ary of Pre- to P by Student Gi	ost-Program A roup and Year	Attendance Rat s of Program P	e Change Type articipation, 20	es for Students )16–2017 to 20′	at Achieve 19–2020
		-	Three-Year Scl	nools			
Type of Change	Number	More	Gains	More	_osses	More	Ties
	Schools	(Than Loss	ses or Ties)	(Than Gai	ns or Ties)	(Than Gains	s or Losses)
Student Group	#	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Students	43	24	56	18	42	1	2
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	4	57	2	29	1	14
Black/African American	42	25	60	16	38	1	2
Hispanic	43	26	60	16	37	1	2
Native American	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	13	6	46	6	46	1	8
Two or More	5	1	20	3	60	1	20
Econ. Disadv.	43	30	70	12	28	1	2
English Learners	43	24	56	17	40	1	2
SWD	42	28	67	11	26	1	2
			Two-Year Sch	ools	•		
Type of Change	Number	More	Gains	More	_osses	More	Ties
	Schools	(Than Loss	ses or Ties)	(Than Gai	ns or Ties)	(Than Gains	s or Losses)
Student Group	#	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Students	10	9	90	1	10	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black/African American	10	9	90	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	10	8	80	2	20	0	0
Native American	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	8	6	75	2	25	0	0
Two or More	0		0		0		0
Econ. Disadv.	10	9	90	1	10	0	0
English Learners	10	7	70	2	20	0	0
SWD	10	9	90	1	10	0	0

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data aggregated by school. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. – Indicates masked results for fewer than five students per group which are not reported. More Gains and More Losses exclude schools with an equal number of gains and losses. "Ties" means no change in rates.

180 Pro	gram <sup>®</sup> Sc	hools by	Student	Group an	d Years of	of Progra	m Partici	pation, 20	016–2017	through	2019–202	20		
	Three-Year Schools           Type of Change         Number         Schools with Statistically         Schools with Statist													
Type of Change	Number	Schools with	Statistically	Schools with	Statistically	Schools with	n Statistically	Schools with	Small Effect	Schools w	ith Medium	Schools with	Large Effect	
	Schools	Significar	nt Results	Significa	nt Gains*	Significar	nt Losses*	(Stat. Si	g. Gains)	Effect (Stat	. Sig. Gains)	(Stat. Si	g. Gains)	
Student Group	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
All Students	43	31	72	12	39	18	58	17	94	0	0	0	0	
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Black/African American	42	20	48	6	30	13	65	12	92	1	8	0	0	
Hispanic	43	28	65	11	39	16	57	16	100	0	0	0	0	
Native American	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
White	13	3	23	1	33	1	33	0	0	0	0	1	100	
Two or More Races/Ethn.	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Econ. Disadv.	43	30	70	10	33	20	67	19	95	1	5	0	0	
English Learners	43	26	60	11	42	14	54	13	93	1	7	0	0	
SWD	42	10	24	3	30	7	70	5	71	2	29	0	0	
					Two-	Year Scho	ols							
Type of Change	Number	Schools with	Statistically	Schools with	Statistically	Schools with	Statistically	Schools with	ith Medium Schools with Large Effe					
	Schools	Significar	nt Results	Significa	nt Gains	Significa	nt Losses	(Stat. Si	g. Gains)	Effect (Stat	Sig. Gains)	(Stat. Si	g. Gains)	
Student Group	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
All Students	10	7	70	1	14	6	86	5	83	0	0	0	0	
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Black/African American	10	4	40	0	0	4	100	4	100	0	0	0	0	
Hispanic	10	6	60	2	33	4	67	4	100	0	0	0	0	
Native American	0	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
White	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Two or More Races/Ethn.	0	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Econ. Disadv.	10	7	70	0	0	7	100	5	71	0	0	0	0	
English Learners	10	6	60	0	0	5	83	0	0	0	0	1	17	
SWD	10	6	60	0	0	6	100	6	100	0	0	0	0	

 Table D-5. Statistical Significance of Wilcoxon Results of Pre- to Post-Program Attendance Rate Changes for Students at Achieve

 180 Program Schools by Student Group and Years of Program Participation, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data aggregated by school. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Results for schools with fewer than five students per group are not reported (-). More Gains and More Losses exclude schools with an equal number of gains and losses. \*Percentages represent the proportion of the number of schools with statistically significant results. The number of statistically significant results includes More Ties (no change). Only effect sizes for results associated with p<0.05 are reported. Very small effect sizes are not noted.

Milecoron Results for School-Level Pre-to Post-Program Change in Student Attendance Rates for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools by School Level, School. and Student Group. 2016–2017 through 2119–2020           Campus Name         Demographics         Count         Pre Mean         Post Mean         Mean         Negative Rank         Post Horographics         0         P         Effect           Elementary School           Mame         All Students         269         95.4         96.2         0.8         85         162         22         4.538         0.00         0.20           Asian or Pacific Islander         2         **											
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size
			E	lementary S	chools						
	All Students	269	95.4	96.2	0.8	85	162	22	-4.538	.000 *	0.20
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	61	92.3	94.1	1.8	17	42	2	-3.057	.002 *	0.28
	Hispanic	203	96.3	96.8	0.5	67	117	19	-3.263	.001 *	0.16
Bellfort ECC	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	258	95.4	96.5	1.1	81	156	21	-4.577	.000 *	0.20
	English Learners	167	96.9	97.5	0.6	52	95	20	-3.401	.001 *	0.19
	Students with Disabilities	24	92.8	94.5	1.7	6	17	1	-1.734	.083	0.25
	All Students	421	94.3	95.3	1.0	166	234	21	-3.037	.002 *	0.10
	Black or African American	350	94.3	94.9	0.6	147	186	17	-1.839	.066	0.07
	Hispanic	64	95.6	97.2	1.6	19	41	4	-2.615	.009 *	0.23
Dissistance	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
FS	Two or More	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
20	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	382	94.4	95.5	1.1	154	209	19	-2.693	.007 *	0.10
	English Learners	53	96.4	97.1	0.7	14	34	5	-2.413	.016 *	0.23
	Students with Disabilities	94	92.8	93.6	0.8	42	49	3	-0.788	.431	0.06
	All Students	773	95.4	96.5	1.1	216	495	62	-9.594	.000 *	0.24
	Asian or Pacific Islander	10	96.7	96.5	-0.2	3	7	0	-0.255	.799	0.06
	Black or African American	181	94.3	95.3	1.0	63	111	7	-3.432	.001 *	0.18
	Hispanic	571	95.8	96.8	1.0	145	373	53	-9.339	.000 *	0.28
Bonham ES	Two or More	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	8	98.1	97.4	-0.7	4	2	2	-0.734	.463	0.18
	Economically Disadvantaged	726	95.6	96.8	1.2	192	477	57	-10.452	.000 *	0.27
	English Learners	457	96.0	97.0	1.0	122	292	43	-7.817	.000 *	0.26
	Students with Disabilities	55	93.2	94.3	1.1	22	31	2	-1.363	.173	0.13

Table D-6.	Table 0-6. Wilcoxon Results for School-Level, School, and Student Group, 2016-2017 through 2019-2020 (Continued)         Elementary Schools by School Level, School, and Student Group, 2016-2017 through 2019-2020 (Continued)         Count Pre Mean Post Mean Difference Mank Tess Statistic Value S												
			Elemen	tary Schools	(Continued)								
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size		
	All Students	445	95.1	96.0	0.9	171	240	34	-3.512	.000 *	0.12		
	Asian or Pacific Islander	5	98.4	99.9	1.5	1	4	0	-1.786	.074	0.56		
	Black or African American	302	94.8	95.5	0.7	118	162	22	-2.744	.006 *	0.11		
	Hispanic	134	96.1	96.8	0.7	50	72	12	-2.032	.042 *	0.12		
Bruce ES	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
Didce E0	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	403	95.3	96.4	1.1	150	220	33	-4.132	.000 *	0.15		
	English Learners	81	96.9	97.7	0.8	36	39	6	-1.018	.309	0.08		
	Students with Disabilities	53	95.0	95.6	0.6	21	28	4	-1.607	.108	0.16		
	All Students	495	94.8	94.8	0.0	187	260	48	-2.536	.011 *	0.08		
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Black or African American	286	94.5	94.2	-0.3	116	151	19	-1.109	.268	0.05		
	Hispanic	200	95.2	95.7	0.5	66	105	29	-2.765	.006 *	0.14		
Cook ES	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	7	94.6	96.0	1.4	3	4	0	-1.185	.236	0.32		
	Economically Disadvantaged	460	94.9	95.3	0.4	167	248	45	-3.454	.001 *	0.11		
	English Learners	115	96.2	96.7	0.5	35	62	18	-2.52	.012 *	0.17		
	Students with Disabilities	74	94.4	94.8	0.4	33	39	2	-0.71	.478	0.06		
	All Students	523	94.7	95.6	0.9	204	283	36	-4.712	.000 *	0.15		
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Black or African American	194	92.8	93.3	0.5	86	101	7	-1.838	.066	0.09		
	Hispanic	324	95.9	97.0	1.1	117	178	29	-4.549	.000 *	0.18		
Dogon ES	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
Dogan L3	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	498	94.8	95.9	1.1	192	271	35	-5.089	.000 *	0.16		
	English Learners	203	96.5	97.3	0.8	75	110	18	-3.499	.000 *	0.17		
	Students with Disabilities	72	93.0	94.3	1.3	32	36	4	-1.629	.103	0.14		

HISD Research and Accountability\_\_\_\_\_\_134

Table D-6. Wilcoxon Results for School-Level Pre- to Post-Program Change in Student Attendance Rates for Three-Year Achieve         180 Program Schools by School Level, School, and Student Group, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 (Continued)												
Elementary Schools (Continued)												
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size	
	All Students	491	93.6	95.3	1.7	179	288	24	-6.423	.000 *	0.20	
	Asian or Pacific Islander	15	96.4	96.2	-0.2	4	10	1	-0.283	.777	0.05	
	Black or African American	316	93.5	95.1	1.6	124	179	13	-4.876	.000 *	0.19	
	Hispanic	152	93.9	95.8	1.9	49	93	10	-4.125	.000 *	0.24	
Foerster ES	Native American	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Two or More	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	White	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Economically Disadvantaged	446	93.9	95.8	1.9	159	263	24	-6.637	.000 *	0.22	
	English Learners	151	94.3	96.3	2.0	46	95	10	-4.581	.000 *	0.26	
	Students with Disabilities	70	90.7	93.7	3.0	22	46	2	-3.41	.001 *	0.29	
	All Students	323	95.3	96.8	1.5	93	206	24	-6.913	.000 *	0.27	
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Black or African American	95	93.0	96.0	3.0	25	67	3	-5.036	.000 *	0.37	
	Hispanic	222	96.3	97.1	0.8	68	133	21	-4.595	.000 *	0.22	
Fondren ES	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Economically Disadvantaged	290	95.4	97.1	1.7	81	187	22	-7.156	.000 *	0.30	
	English Learners	156	96.8	97.5	0.7	45	95	16	-4.163	.000 *	0.24	
	Students with Disabilities	37	93.2	95.6	2.4	10	25	2	-2.662	.008 *	0.31	
	All Students	319	96.8	96.6	-0.2	118	160	41	-1.622	.105	0.06	
	Black or African American	5	95.4	97.0	1.6	4	1	0	-0.677	.498	0.21	
Gallegos ES	Hispanic	309	96.9	96.6	-0.3	111	157	41	-1.736	.083	0.07	
	White	5	96.6	96.2	-0.4	3	2	0	-0.405	.686	0.13	
	Economically Disadvantaged	300	96.9	96.9	0.0	113	149	38	-1.564	.118	0.06	
	English Learners	145	97.4	97.1	-0.3	46	76	23	-2.062	.039 *	0.12	
	Students with Disabilities	49	96.0	96.7	0.7	14	27	8	-1.16	.246	0.12	

Table D-6. Wilcoxon Results for School-Level Pre- to Post-Program Change in Student Attendance Rates for Three-Year Achieve         180 Program Schools by School Level, School, and Student Group, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 (Continued)													
Elementary Schools (Continued)													
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size		
	All Students	425	94.1	95.5	1.4	147	258	20	-5.442	.000	0.19		
	Black or African American	194	93.1	94.3	1.2	71	118	5	-2.813	.005 *	0.14		
	Hispanic	228	95.1	96.6	1.5	75	138	15	-4.887	.000 *	0.23		
Highland	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
Heights ES	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	401	94.1	95.7	1.6	136	246	19	-5.703	.000 *	0.20		
	English Learners	161	95.1	96.7	1.6	51	100	10	-4.508	.000 *	0.25		
	Students with Disabilities	76	92.9	94.4	1.5	28	45	3	-1.768	.077	0.14		
	All Students	459	92.3	93.9	1.6	154	290	15	-6.173	.000 *	0.20		
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Black or African American	342	91.6	93.2	1.6	120	214	8	-5.043	.000 *	0.19		
	Hispanic	108	94.4	95.8	1.4	32	69	7	-3.334	.001 *	0.23		
Hilliard ES	Native American	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	6	93.5	97.1	3.6	0	6	0	-2.201	.028 *	0.64		
	Economically Disadvantaged	423	92.3	94.2	1.9	132	276	15	-7.221	.000 *	0.25		
	English Learners	49	95.2	96.9	1.7	10	36	3	-2.825	.005 *	0.29		
	Students with Disabilities	80	90.7	92.2	1.5	23	57	0	-2.705	.007 *	0.21		
	All Students	325	94.1	95.0	0.9	108	195	22	-5.137	.000 *	0.20		
	Black or African American	261	93.8	94.4	0.6	89	159	13	-4.287	.000 *	0.19		
Kashmere	Hispanic	64	95.6	97.2	1.6	19	36	9	-2.866	.004 *	0.25		
Gardens ES	Economically Disadvantaged	302	94.2	95.4	1.2	99	181	22	-5.211	.000 *	0.21		
	English Learners	38	97.2	97.9	0.7	12	18	8	-1.792	.073	0.21		
	Students with Disabilities	52	92.3	92.4	0.1	17	34	1	-1.936	.053	0.19		

Table D-6. Wilcoxon Results for School-Level Pre- to Post-Program Change in Student Attendance Rates for Three-Year Achieve180 Program Schools by School Level, School, and Student Group, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 (Continued)													
Elementary Schools (Continued)													
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size		
	All Students	661	96.3	95.9	-0.4	304	282	75	-1.204	.228	0.03		
	Black or African American	168	94.2	94.2	0.0	80	78	10	-0.098	.922	0.01		
	Hispanic	485	97.0	96.5	-0.5	222	199	64	-1.686	.092	0.05		
	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
Lewis ES	Two or More	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	625	96.4	96.0	-0.4	292	262	71	-1.372	.170	0.04		
	English Learners	352	97.3	97.1	-0.2	155	149	48	-0.515	.607	0.02		
	Students with Disabilities	83	93.5	93.3	-0.2	37	41	5	-0.289	.773	0.02		
	All Students	365	95.2	96.0	0.8	112	226	27	-5.797	.000 *	0.21		
	Black or African American	22	94.0	93.4	-0.6	8	13	1	-0.052	.958	0.01		
	Hispanic	340	95.3	96.2	0.9	103	211	26	-5.992	.000 *	0.23		
	Two or More	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
LUUSCAITES	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	342	95.1	96.2	1.1	105	212	25	-5.92	.000 *	0.23		
	English Learners	153	96.0	97.0	1.0	49	89	15	-3.938	.000 *	0.23		
	Students with Disabilities	51	94.0	95.3	1.3	20	28	3	-1.728	.084	0.17		
	All Students	386	94.7	95.7	1.0	126	242	18	-6.033	.000 *	0.22		
	Black or African American	287	94.7	95.8	1.1	97	178	12	-5.047	.000 *	0.21		
	Hispanic	96	94.9	95.5	0.6	28	62	6	-3.103	.002 *	0.22		
Mading ES	Two or More	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	363	94.8	96.1	1.3	116	231	16	-6.312	.000 *	0.23		
	English Learners	45	95.1	94.9	-0.2	12	30	3	-1.851	.064	0.20		
	Students with Disabilities	58	94.1	96.3	2.2	13	44	1	-4.251	.000 *	0.39		

HISD Research and Accountability\_\_\_\_\_137

Table D-6. Wilcoxon Results for School-Level Pre- to Post-Program Change in Student Attendance Rates for Three-Year Achieve 180           Program Schools by School Level, School, and Student Group, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 (Continued)												
Elementary Schools (Continued)												
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size	
	All Students	443	95.4	95.3	-0.1	184	230	29	-1.319	.187	0.04	
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Black or African American	159	94.5	94.3	-0.2	75	78	6	-0.221	.825	0.01	
Martinaz C ES	Hispanic	279	95.9	95.9	0.0	109	148	22	-1.726	.084	0.07	
Martinez C ES	White	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Economically Disadvantaged	411	95.6	95.7	0.1	168	215	28	-1.511	.131	0.05	
	English Learners	139	96.9	97.1	0.2	56	68	15	-0.821	.411	0.05	
	Students with Disabilities	67	93.9	92.4	-1.5	30	33	4	-0.185	.853	0.02	
	All Students	542	94.7	96.3	1.6	152	348	42	-8.778	.000 *	0.27	
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Black or African American	228	94.1	96.0	1.9	75	142	11	-5.096	.000 *	0.24	
Mantaamani	Hispanic	311	95.2	96.6	1.4	76	204	31	-7.211	.000 *	0.29	
FS	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
20	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Economically Disadvantaged	500	94.8	96.6	1.8	136	324	40	-9.063	.000 *	0.29	
	English Learners	208	95.8	97.2	1.4	47	139	22	-6.386	.000 *	0.31	
	Students with Disabilities	74	93.9	95.3	1.4	24	46	4	-2.682	.007 *	0.22	
	All Students	332	96.3	96.9	0.6	113	185	34	-4.956	.000 *	0.19	
	Black or African American	10	92.8	92.6	-0.2	4	6	0	-0.051	.959	0.01	
	Hispanic	319	96.5	97.0	0.5	108	177	34	-5.021	.000 *	0.20	
Duah ES	Native American	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Pugn ES	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Economically Disadvantaged	315	96.3	96.9	0.6	107	175	33	-4.906	.000 *	0.20	
	English Learners	153	96.7	97.5	0.8	48	86	19	-4.532	.000 *	0.26	
	Students with Disabilities	41	95.9	95.1	-0.8	14	23	4	-1.026	.305	0.11	

HISD Research and Accountability\_\_\_\_\_138

Table D-6. Wilcoxon Results for School-Level Pre- to Post-Program Change in Student Attendance Rates for Three-Year Achieve           180 Program Schools by School Level, School, and Student Group, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 (Continued)												
Elementary Schools (Continued)												
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size	
	All Students	539	96.0	96.1	0.1	236	258	45	-1.268	.205	0.04	
	Black or African American	54	95.3	95.7	0.4	23	29	2	-0.287	.774	0.03	
	Hispanic	456	96.1	96.2	0.1	198	215	43	-1.325	.185	0.04	
	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Stevens ES	Two or More	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	White	25	96.1	94.8	-1.3	14	11	0	-0.525	.600	0.07	
	Economically Disadvantaged	473	96.0	96.0	0.0	207	224	42	-1.15	.250	0.04	
	English Learners	239	96.8	96.0	-0.8	115	98	26	-1.57	.116	0.07	
	Students with Disabilities	77	94.4	93.4	-1.0	36	38	3	-0.356	.722	0.03	
	All Students	212	93.1	94.9	1.8	76	125	11	-3.801	.000 *	0.18	
	Black or African American	165	92.8	94.4	1.6	59	99	7	-3.365	.001 *	0.19	
	Hispanic	40	94.9	96.1	1.2	17	21	2	-0.993	.320	0.11	
	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Wesley ES	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	White	5	96.5	98.7	2.2	0	3	2	-1.604	.109	0.51	
	Economically Disadvantaged	193	93.0	95.0	2.0	69	113	11	-3.753	.000 *	0.19	
	English Learners	22	95.0	96.2	1.2	9	12	1	-1.026	.305	0.15	
	Students with Disabilities	25	90.8	95.0	4.2	9	14	2	-1.521	.128	0.22	
	All Students	617	94.2	92.8	-1.4	305	292	20	-0.932	.352	0.03	
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Black or African American	552	94.1	92.7	-1.4	275	260	17	-1.211	.226	0.04	
	Hispanic	50	94.2	93.9	-0.3	25	22	3	-0.291	.771	0.03	
Woodson ES	Two or More	5	94.7	96.3	1.6	3	2	0	-0.405	.686	0.13	
Woodson ES	White	6	94.9	89.3	-5.6	2	4	0	-0.105	.917	0.03	
	Economically Disadvantaged	558	94.5	94.2	-0.3	264	275	19	-0.737	.461	0.02	
	English Learners	32	94.6	94.0	-0.6	14	16	2	-0.566	.572	0.07	
	Students with Disabilities	104	93.1	90.8	-2.3	46	54	4	-0.007	.995	0.00	
	Unknown Ethinicity	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	

Table D-6.       Wilcoxon Results for School-Level Pre- to Post-Program Change in Student Attendance Rates for Three-Year Achieve         180 Program Schools by School Level, School, and Student Group, 2016–2017 through 2019–2020 (Continued)													
Elementary Schools (Continued)													
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size		
	All Students	214	94.7	95.0	0.3	81	125	8	-2.286	.022 *	0.11		
	Black or African American	173	94.5	94.7	0.2	64	101	8	-2.118	.034 *	0.11		
	Hispanic	35	95.9	96.6	0.7	14	21	0	-1.18	.238	0.14		
Young ES	Two or More	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	209	94.7	95.2	0.5	78	123	8	-2.435	.015 *	0.12		
	English Learners	12	97.3	97.3	0.0	5	7	0	-0.314	.754	0.06		
	Students with Disabilities	36	92.7	91.7	-1.0	14	21	1	-0.721	.471	0.08		
Middle Schools													
	All Students	413	93.4	91.9	-1.5	199	194	20	-0.940	.347	0.03		
	Black or African American	302	92.8	91.3	-1.5	149	139	14	-0.925	.355	0.04		
	Hispanic	103	95.0	93.7	-1.3	48	50	5	-0.518	.605	0.04		
	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
Attucke MS	Two or More	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
AUGCKS MO	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	353	93.7	93.6	-0.1	159	175	19	-1.013	.311	0.04		
	English Learners	45	95.7	95.1	-0.6	21	22	2	-0.411	.681	0.04		
	Students with Disabilities	76	90.3	90.5	0.2	31	41	4	-1.131	.258	0.09		
	Unknown Ethinicity	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	All Students	383	95.1	89.3	-5.8	284	82	17	-10.792	.000 *	0.39		
	Black or African American	326	94.9	88.9	-6.0	239	70	17	-9.782	.000 *	0.38		
	Hispanic	53	96.9	91.0	-5.9	42	11	0	-4.52	.000 *	0.44		
Cullen MS	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	339	96.0	91.0	-5.0	250	73	16	-10.059	.000 *	0.39		
	English Learners	26	95.7	90.9	-4.8	21	4	1	-2.893	.004 *	0.40		
	Students with Disabilities	90	95.5	87.4	-8.1	66	22	2	-5.823	.000 *	0.43		
1 able D-6. V	80 Program Schools by Sch	ool Lev	el, School,	and Studer	nange in Stu nt Group, 201	6–2017 th	rough 201	tes fo 9–202	20 (Contin	ear Acn ued)	leve		
----------------	----------------------------	---------	-------------	---------------	-------------------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------	----------------		
			Midd	le Schools ((	Continued)	-							
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size		
	All Students	607	95.1	92.7	-2.4	333	230	44	-5.877	.000 *	0.17		
	Black or African American	6	89.9	92.0	2.1	3	3	0	-0.314	.753	0.09		
	Hispanic	594	95.2	92.8	-2.4	326	225	43	-5.902	.000 *	0.17		
Edicon MS	Native American	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	557	95.1	93.6	-1.5	297	217	43	-4.883	.000 *	0.15		
	English Learners	175	95.4	93.0	-2.4	97	65	13	-3.428	.001 *	0.18		
	Students with Disabilities	84	94.3	93.2	-1.1	48	34	2	-1.764	.078	0.14		
	All Students	623	93.2	90.6	-2.6	371	233	19	-5.536	.000 *	0.16		
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Black or African American	401	92.7	90.2	-2.5	236	156	9	-3.806	.000 *	0.13		
	Hispanic	211	94.3	91.6	-2.7	129	72	10	-4.127	.000 *	0.20		
Forest Brook	Native American	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
MS	Two or More	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	White	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Economically Disadvantaged	558	93.4	91.8	-1.6	325	215	18	-4.143	.000 *	0.12		
	English Learners	77	94.4	90.8	-3.6	51	22	4	-3.453	.001 *	0.28		
	Students with Disabilities	90	92.1	87.3	-4.8	58	31	1	-3.232	.001 *	0.24		
	All Students	541	94.7	95.9	1.2	166	322	53	-6.788	.000 *	0.21		
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**		
	Black or African American	324	93.5	95.2	1.7	105	197	22	-5.468	.000 *	0.21		
	Hispanic	199	96.6	97.2	0.6	54	116	29	-4.123	.000 *	0.21		
Gregory-	Native American	5	91.6	92.4	0.8	3	2	0	-0.135	.893	0.04		
Lincoln PK-8	Two or More	5	95.1	97.2	2.1	2	2	1	-0.73	.465	0.23		
	White	5	96.5	95.7	-0.8	2	3	0	-0.405	.686	0.13		
	Economically Disadvantaged	453	94.5	96.2	1.7	125	282	46	-7.719	.000 *	0.26		
	English Learners	86	96.7	97.4	0.7	17	55	14	-3.662	.000 *	0.28		
	Students with Disabilities	51	92.4	94.6	2.2	15	29	7	-2.795	.005 *	0.28		

udent Attendence Detector Thuse Mean Act in

Table D-6. V	Vilcoxon Results for School- 80 Program Schools by Sch	Level P ool Lev	re- to Post el, School,	-Program C and Studer	hange in Stu nt Group, 201	ident Attei 6–2017 th	ndance Ra rough 201	tes fo 9–202	or Three-Y 20 (Contin	ear Ach lued)	ieve
			Midd	le Schools (0	Continued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size
	All Students	717	94.7	93.4	-1.3	343	318	56	-2.92	.003 *	0.08
	Black or African American	73	91.9	88.4	-3.5	42	29	2	-2.464	.014 *	0.20
	Hispanic	626	95.1	94.3	-0.8	288	284	54	-1.634	.102	0.05
Henry MS	Two or More	5	94.2	88.6	-5.6	3	2	0	-1.214	.225	0.38
Thermy wio	White	13	92.8	78.7	-14.1	10	3	0	-2.062	.039 *	0.40
	Economically Disadvantaged	641	94.9	94.5	-0.4	293	298	50	-1.134	.257	0.03
	English Learners	186	95.6	95.7	0.1	82	85	19	0	1.000	0.00
	Students with Disabilities	100	92.7	90.9	-1.8	45	45	10	-0.549	.583	0.04
	All Students	84	89.7	82.9	-6.8	45	39	0	-2.174	.030 *	0.17
	Black or African American	45	90.1	83.7	-6.4	25	20	0	-1.569	.117	0.17
High School	Hispanic	37	90.2	82.1	-8.1	19	18	0	-1.629	.103	0.19
Ahead Acad	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
MS	Economically Disadvantaged	71	90.5	86.9	-3.6	35	36	0	-0.928	.353	0.08
	English Learners	19	89.7	76.3	-13.4	12	7	0	-1.992	.046 *	0.32
	Students with Disabilities	10	92.0	88.2	-3.8	6	4	0	-1.478	.139	0.33
	All Students	539	92.1	89.2	-2.9	304	225	10	-4.405	.000 *	0.13
	Black or African American	333	91.0	89.2	-1.8	182	145	6	-2.35	.019 *	0.09
	Hispanic	197	93.6	89.6	-4.0	117	76	4	-4.022	.000 *	0.20
	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Key MS	Two or More	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	490	92.1	90.6	-1.5	266	214	10	-2.697	.007 *	0.09
	English Learners	88	94.5	90.4	-4.1	52	34	2	-3.346	.001 *	0.25
	Students with Disabilities	97	91.0	86.4	-4.6	51	45	1	-1.076	.282	0.08

Table D-6. V	Vilcoxon Results for School- 80 Program Schools by Sch	Level P ool Lev	re- to Post el, School,	-Program C and Studer	hange in Stu nt Group, 201	dent Atter 6–2017 th	ndance Ra rough 201	tes fo 9–202	or Three-Y 20 (Contin	ear Ach ued)	ieve
			Midd	le Schools ((	Continued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size
	All Students	894	93.8	91.6	-2.2	466	392	36	-4.325	.000 *	0.10
	Asian or Pacific Islander	6	99.2	99.8	0.6	1	4	1	-1.511	.131	0.44
	Black or African American	304	91.6	90.0	-1.6	137	154	13	-0.4	.689	0.02
	Hispanic	573	94.9	92.4	-2.5	322	229	22	-5.377	.000 *	0.16
	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Lawson No	Two or More	5	92.6	89.3	-3.3	2	3	0	-0.405	.686	0.13
	White	5	92.2	84.7	-7.5	4	1	0	-1.753	.080	0.55
	Economically Disadvantaged	748	94.4	93.7	-0.7	371	345	32	-2.073	.038 *	0.05
	English Learners	223	95.1	91.8	-3.3	136	80	7	-4.749	.000 *	0.22
	Students with Disabilities	142	92.8	89.8	-3.0	72	63	7	-1.572	.116	0.09
				High Scho	ols						
	All Students	166	91.6	88.6	-3.0	84	78	4	-1.702	.089	0.09
	Black or African American	106	91.6	90.0	-1.6	49	54	3	-0.456	.649	0.03
	Hispanic	57	91.6	85.9	-5.7	34	22	1	-2.28	.023 *	0.21
	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Kashmere HS	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	146	92.2	92.4	0.2	68	74	4	-0.049	.961	0.00
	English Learners	16	91.6	83.1	-8.5	10	6	0	-1.603	.109	0.28
	Students with Disabilities	42	94.7	92.7	-2.0	22	17	3	-1.012	.312	0.11
	All Students	40	93.0	82.6	-10.4	30	9	1	-3.733	.000 *	0.42
	Black or African American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
LibertyHS	Hispanic	36	93.2	82.9	-10.3	27	8	1	-3.465	.001 *	0.41
LIDENT	White	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	93.0	84.4	-8.6	28	9	1	-3.455	.001 *	0.40
	English Learners	40	93.0	82.6	-10.4	30	9	1	-3.733	.000 *	0.42

Table D-6. V	80 Program Schools by Sch	ool Leve	re- to Post el, School,	and Studer	nange in Stu nt Group, 201	6–2017 th	rough 201	tes fo 9–202	20 (Contin	ear Ach lued)	lieve
			High	n Schools (C	ontinued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size
	All Students	356	91.1	90.1	-1.0	180	172	4	-0.495	.621	0.02
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	130	91.6	89.8	-1.8	74	55	1	-1.735	.083	0.11
	Hispanic	221	90.8	90.3	-0.5	104	114	3	-0.818	.413	0.04
Madison HS	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	281	92.1	92.5	0.4	139	139	3	-0.633	.527	0.03
	English Learners	63	92.5	87.7	-4.8	30	33	0	-0.096	.924	0.01
	Students with Disabilities	62	91.0	92.2	1.2	31	31	0	-0.589	.556	0.05
	All Students	284	93.2	93.3	0.1	135	134	15	-0.6	.548	0.03
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	15	95.6	96.7	1.1	8	6	1	-1.101	.271	0.20
MilbyHS	Hispanic	268	93.1	93.1	0.0	127	127	14	-0.478	.632	0.02
	Economically Disadvantaged	251	93.5	94.2	0.7	113	123	15	-0.299	.765	0.01
	English Learners	51	92.2	90.8	-1.4	26	23	2	-1.134	.257	0.11
	Students with Disabilities	38	94.2	93.5	-0.7	16	20	2	-0.134	.894	0.02
	All Students	185	92.1	91.3	-0.8	81	98	6	-0.78	.435	0.04
	Black or African American	121	91.6	90.7	-0.9	53	65	3	-0.591	.555	0.04
	Hispanic	63	93.0	92.3	-0.7	27	33	3	-0.537	.591	0.05
North Forest	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	171	92.6	92.8	0.2	71	94	6	-1.767	.077	0.10
	English Learners	10	95.8	93.8	-2.0	6	4	0	-0.357	.721	0.08
	Students with Disabilities	25	91.3	90.4	-0.9	11	13	1	-0.257	.797	0.04

Table D.C. Willowen Deputite for Cabeel Level Dre. to Deet Dreaman Chemica in Student Attendence Detector Three Veer Ashiove

	80 Program Schools by Sch	ool Lev	el, School,	and Stude	nt Group, 201	6–2017 th	rough 201	9–202	20 (Contin	ear Ach lued)	leve
			High	n Schools (C	ontinued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size
	All Students	372	95.1	90.1	-5.0	238	125	9	-7.566	.000 *	0.28
	Asian or Pacific Islander	8	98.2	93.0	-5.2	5	3	0	-1.4	.161	0.35
	Black or African American	67	94.9	92.1	-2.8	45	19	3	-3.247	.001 *	0.28
	Hispanic	287	95.2	89.4	-5.8	184	97	6	-6.898	.000 *	0.29
Sharpstown	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
HS	Two or More	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	7	92.7	94.3	1.6	3	4	0	-0.845	.398	0.23
	Economically Disadvantaged	328	95.3	91.5	-3.8	207	112	9	-6.446	.000 *	0.25
	English Learners	186	95.3	88.9	-6.4	127	56	3	-6.311	.000 *	0.33
	Students with Disabilities	41	93.0	91.6	-1.4	19	20	2	-0.098	.922	0.01
	All Students	953	100.0	99.4	-0.6	57	0	896	-6.569	.000 *	0.15
	Asian or Pacific Islander	45	100.0	99.8	-0.2	1	0	44	-1	.317	0.11
	Black or African American	117	100.0	99.3	-0.7	12	0	105	-3.062	.002 *	0.20
	Hispanic	307	100.0	98.9	-1.1	34	0	273	-5.088	.000 *	0.21
ТСАН	Native American	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
ICAI	Two or More	58	100.0	99.9	-0.1	1	0	57	-1	.317	0.09
	White	423	100.0	99.8	-0.2	9	0	414	-2.666	.008 *	0.09
	Economically Disadvantaged	379	100.0	99.1	-0.9	41	0	338	-5.581	.000 *	0.20
	English Learners	13	100.0	93.0	-7.0	6	0	7	-2.201	.028 *	0.43
	Students with Disabilities	60	100.0	99.1	-0.9	4	0	56	-1.826	.068	0.17
	All Students	154	93.6	90.8	-2.8	91	56	7	-3.14	.002 *	0.18
	Black or African American	85	93.6	91.2	-2.4	49	31	5	-2.169	.030 *	0.17
	Hispanic	65	93.5	90.4	-3.1	40	23	2	-2.28	.023 *	0.20
Washington	Two or More	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
HS	White	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	138	94.1	92.9	-1.2	80	51	7	-2.678	.007 *	0.16
	English Learners	18	96.0	90.7	-5.3	12	4	2	-2.12	.034 *	0.35
	Students with Disabilities	30	94.5	90.5	-4.0	17	12	1	-1.796	.072	0.23

Table D.C. Willowan Results for School Lovel Pro- to Post Program Change in Student Attendance Pates for Three-Vear Achieve

HISD Research and Accountability\_\_\_\_\_\_145

Table D-6. V	Vilcoxon Results for School- 80 Program Schools by Sch	Level P ool Lev	re- to Post el, School,	-Program C and Studer	hange in Stu nt Group, 201	dent Atter 6–2017 th	ndance Ra rough 201	tes fo 9–202	or Three-Y 20 (Contin	ear Ach ued)	ieve
			High	n Schools (C	ontinued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size
	All Students	446	95.0	93.1	-1.9	257	171	18	-4.837	.000 *	0.16
	Asian or Pacific Islander	10	96.3	97.7	1.4	6	4	0	-0.408	.683	0.09
	Black or African American	141	94.5	93.4	-1.1	74	62	5	-1.384	.166	0.08
	Hispanic	284	95.1	92.9	-2.2	169	102	13	-4.819	.000 *	0.20
Westbury HS	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	10	95.4	90.8	-4.6	8	2	0	-1.886	.059	0.42
	Economically Disadvantaged	388	95.0	93.7	-1.3	220	152	16	-3.834	.000 *	0.14
	English Learners	76	94.1	90.6	-3.5	45	30	1	-2.815	.005 *	0.23
	Students with Disabilities	62	95.2	92.9	-2.3	36	24	2	-2.069	.039 *	0.19
	All Students	192	91.3	88.1	-3.2	104	87	1	-2.391	.017 *	0.12
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	96	89.9	88.5	-1.4	48	48	0	-0.373	.709	0.03
Wheatley HS	Hispanic	95	92.7	87.5	-5.2	56	38	1	-3.075	.002 *	0.22
	Economically Disadvantaged	169	92.9	92.1	-0.8	87	82	0	-1.125	.261	0.06
	English Learners	39	93.6	86.1	-7.5	26	12	1	-2.56	.010 *	0.29
	Students with Disabilities	48	89.6	87.8	-1.8	24	24	0	-0.846	.397	0.09
	All Students	176	91.4	88.6	-2.8	73	101	2	-1.12	.263	0.06
	Black or African American	138	90.9	87.7	-3.2	60	76	2	-0.371	.710	0.02
Worthing HS	Hispanic	38	93.1	92.2	-0.9	13	25	0	-1.661	.097	0.19
woruning 113	Economically Disadvantaged	151	92.2	91.9	-0.3	53	97	1	-3.334	.001 *	0.19
	English Learners	11	95.7	95.8	0.1	6	5	0	-0.267	.790	0.06
	Students with Disabilities	43	91.6	90.2	-1.4	13	30	0	-2.331	.020 *	0.25

Table D-6. V	Vilcoxon Results for School- 80 Program Schools by Sch	Level P ool Leve	re- to Post <sup>.</sup> el, School,	-Program C and Studer	hange in Stu nt Group, 201	dent Atter 6–2017 th	ndance Ra rough 201	tes fo 9–202	r Three-Y 20 (Contin	ear Ach ued)	ieve
			High	n Schools (C	ontinued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Count	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect Size
	All Students	161	92.0	90.3	-1.7	68	91	2	-0.955	.340	0.05
	Black or African American	140	92.0	89.9	-2.1	59	80	1	-0.819	.413	0.05
	Hispanic	19	91.5	92.7	1.2	7	11	1	-0.61	.542	0.10
Votoo HS	Two or More	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Tales HS	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	137	92.2	92.8	0.6	53	82	2	-2.082	.037 *	0.13
	English Learners	10	96.8	94.6	-2.2	5	5	0	-0.357	.721	0.08
	Students with Disabilities	42	91.8	87.6	-4.2	22	20	0	-0.638	.524	0.07

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data aggregated by school. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Results for schools with fewer than five students per group are not reported (\*\*). More Gains and More Losses exclude schools with an equal number of gains and losses. \*Indicates statistically significant results (p<0.05). Very small effect sizes are not noted. Gregory-Lincoln PK-8 is listed with middle schools. TCAH (grades 3–12) is listed with high schools.

	Achieve 180 Program Sch	ools by S	School Lev	el, School,	and Studen	ige in Stud it Group, 2	2017–2018	B throug	h 2019–20	)20	ear
			EI	ementary Sc	hools					_	
Campus Name	Demographics	Counts	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect size
	All Students	374	94.9	96.4	1.5	137	213	24	-5.285	.000 *	0.19
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	346	95.0	96.4	1.4	125	198	23	-5.178	.000 *	0.20
Codwell ES	Hispanic	25	94.5	95.6	1.1	10	14	1	-1.2	.230	0.17
	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	336	94.7	96.3	1.6	123	193	20	-5.287	.000 *	0.20
	English Learners	9	92.6	97.0	4.4	1	7	1	-2.38	.017 *	0.56
	Students with Disabilities	58	95.2	96.3	1.1	21	35	2	-2.158	.031 *	0.20
	All Students	684	94.8	96.0	1.2	252	368	64	-5.76	.000 *	0.16
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	253	93.3	95.2	1.9	85	151	17	-4.792	.000 *	0.21
	Hispanic	415	95.8	96.6	0.8	159	209	47	-3.484	.000 *	0.12
Marchall ES	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Two or More Ethnicities	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	11	91.6	93.5	1.9	5	6	0	-0.8	.424	0.17
	Economically Disadvantaged	641	94.9	96.2	1.3	232	347	62	-6.073	.000 *	0.17
	English Learners	328	96.6	96.9	0.3	121	164	43	-3.099	.002 *	0.12
	Students with Disabilities	70	92.9	94.6	1.7	26	43	1	-1.734	.083	0.15
	All Students	577	96.5	96.9	0.4	199	306	72	-5.032	.000 *	0.15
	Asian or Pacific Islander	15	96.7	97.4	0.7	5	8	2	-0.875	.381	0.16
	Black or African American	118	94.1	94.3	0.2	46	64	8	-1.706	.088	0.11
	Hispanic	426	97.2	97.8	0.6	139	225	62	-4.849	.000 *	0.17
Shoorn ES	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Sheam LS	Two or More Ethnicities	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	15	95.9	93.4	2.5	8	7	0	-0.057	.955	0.01
	Economically Disadvantaged	511	96.5	97.1	0.6	172	277	62	-5.356	.000 *	0.17
	English Learners	349	97.4	97.9	0.5	115	178	56	-4.047	.000 *	0.15
	Students with Disabilities	39	92.5	95.2	2.7	13	24	2	-2.527	.011 *	0.29

Teble D. 7. Wilcoven Benk Beculte for School Loval Pro. to Post Program Change in Student Attendence Detector Two Very

HISD Research and Accountability\_\_\_\_\_148

Table D-7.	Wilcoxon Results for School 180 Program Schools by So	bl-Level F chool Lev	Pre- to Pos vel, School	t-Program C , and Stude	hange in St nt Group, 20	udent Att 017–2018	endance l through 2	Rates fo 019–202	r Two-Yea 0 (Continι	r Achie ıed)	ve
			Elemen	tary Schools	(Continued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Counts	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect size
	All Students	524	96.0	96.2	0.2	205	257	62	-2.312	.021 *	0.07
	Black or African American	45	93.5	94.9	1.4	17	25	3	-1.501	.133	0.16
	Hispanic	469	96.2	96.3	0.1	185	226	58	-1.843	.065	0.06
	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Snerman FS	Two or More Ethnicities	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
20	White	8	96.9	97.6	0.7	2	5	1	-1.014	.310	0.25
	Economically Disadvantaged	481	95.9	96.3	0.4	187	238	56	-2.523	.012 *	0.08
	English Learners	210	97.2	97.4	0.2	83	96	31	-1.036	.300	0.05
	Students with Disabilities	63	94.2	95.3	1.1	20	38	5	-2.435	.015 *	0.22
				Middle Scho	ols						
	All Students	668	94.2	93.2	-1.0	341	291	36	-2.87	.004 *	0.08
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	9	91.0	89.5	-1.5	4	4	1	-0.56	.575	0.13
	Hispanic	650	94.2	93.3	-0.9	331	284	35	-2.596	.009 *	0.07
DoodyMS	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Deady IVIS	Two or More Ethnicities	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	5	96.2	88.1	-8.1	4	1	0	-1.753	.080	0.55
	Economically Disadvantaged	617	94.5	94.1	-0.4	310	274	33	-1.788	.074	0.05
	English Learners	219	94.6	92.6	-2.0	120	91	8	-2.481	.013 *	0.12
	Students with Disabilities	68	90.5	88.4	-2.1	39	25	4	-1.498	.134	0.13
	All Students	537	94.0	93.1	-0.9	237	272	28	-0.121	.903	0.00
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	116	92.6	92.3	-0.3	52	63	1	-0.914	.361	0.06
	Hispanic	406	94.4	93.3	-1.1	181	199	26	-0.544	.586	0.02
	Native American	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Two or More Ethnicities	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	8	95.1	95.1	0.0	2	6	0	-0.56	.575	0.14
	Economically Disadvantaged	510	94.2	93.7	-0.5	221	261	28	-0.67	.503	0.02
	English Learners	174	93.6	92.0	-1.6	84	84	6	-0.823	.411	0.04
	Students with Disabilities	73	92.3	91.6	-0.7	34	39	0	-0.091	.928	0.01

Table D-7.	Wilcoxon Results for School 180 Program Schools by Sc	bl-Level F chool Lev	Pre- to Post vel, School	t-Program C , and Studer	hange in St nt Group, 20	udent Att 017–2018 (	endance F through 2	Rates foi 019–202	r Two-Yea 0 (Continu	r Achie ıed)	ve
			Middl	e Schools (C	ontinued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Counts	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect size
	All Students	884	96.2	96.8	0.6	284	531	69	-8.164	.000 *	0.19
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	275	95.0	95.8	0.8	96	169	10	-4.5	.000 *	0.19
Reagan	Hispanic	595	96.8	97.2	0.4	183	356	56	-6.693	.000 *	0.19
Ed. Ctr. PK-	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
8	White	10	97.7	98.3	0.6	3	5	2	-0.842	.400	0.19
	Economically Disadvantaged	806	96.3	97.3	1.0	244	498	64	-9.548	.000 *	0.24
	English Learners	341	97.1	97.7	0.6	106	203	32	-5.402	.000 *	0.21
	Students with Disabilities	87	94.3	94.3	0.0	33	47	7	-2.067	.039 *	0.16
	All Students	609	93.1	92.7	-0.4	265	320	24	-1.3	.194	0.04
	Asian or Pacific Islander	24	94.1	97.9	3.8	7	15	2	-2.242	.025 *	0.32
	Black or African American	113	91.0	92.0	1.0	47	63	3	-1.359	.174	0.09
Curren	Hispanic	459	93.6	92.7	-0.9	204	236	19	-0.427	.669	0.01
Grove MS	Two or More Ethnicities	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	11	90.1	87.4	-2.7	5	6	0	-0.178	.859	0.04
	Economically Disadvantaged	559	93.6	94.0	0.4	233	303	23	-2.468	.014 *	0.07
	English Learners	310	93.4	92.8	-0.6	135	161	14	-1.173	.241	0.05
	Students with Disabilities	76	91.5	92.6	1.1	30	45	1	-2.052	.040 *	0.17
	All Students	430	92.6	93.0	0.4	157	266	7	-4.547	.000 *	0.16
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	285	92.0	91.9	-0.1	105	177	3	-3.213	.001 *	0.13
	Hispanic	135	94.4	95.3	0.9	48	83	4	-3.288	.001 *	0.20
Thomas MS	Two or More Ethnicities	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	White	7	85.3	94.4	9.1	3	4	0	-1.183	.237	0.32
	Economically Disadvantaged	371	93.0	94.8	1.8	121	243	7	-6.557	.000 *	0.24
	English Learners	65	94.1	95.0	0.9	24	39	2	-1.404	.160	0.12
	Students with Disabilities	71	90.9	90.4	-0.5	26	44	1	-1.033	.302	0.09

Table D-7	. Wilcoxon Results for Scho 180 Program Schools by S	ol-Level School ar	Pre- to Po nd Student	st-Program Group, 201	Change in 7–2018 thre	Student / ough 2019	Attendanc 9–2020 (C	e Rates ontinue	for Two-Y d)	'ear Ac	hieve
			Middle	e Schools (C	ontinued)						
Campus Name	Demographics	Counts	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Z statistic	p value	Effect size
	All Students	434	92.7	91.4	-1.3	201	214	19	-0.928	.353	0.03
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	201	91.2	90.0	-1.2	84	111	6	-0.833	.405	0.04
\\/illiama	Hispanic	227	94.2	92.4	-1.8	117	98	12	-2.458	.014 *	0.12
MS	Native American	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
1110	White	4	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	395	93.3	92.9	-0.4	177	200	18	-0.069	.945	0.00
	English Learners	95	93.8	91.1	-2.7	53	38	4	-2.688	.007 *	0.20
	Students with Disabilities	68	90.6	92.0	1.4	24	44	0	-2.072	.038 *	0.18

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data aggregated by school. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Results for schools with fewer than five students per group are not reported (\*\*). More Gains and More Losses exclude schools with an equal number of gains and losses. \*Indicates statistically significant results (p<0.05). Very small effect sizes are not noted. Reagan Ed. Center PK-8 is listed with middle schools.

	at One-Year Achie 2019 and 2019–20	eve 180 Pro	of Statistical ogram Schoo	Significance Is by Studen	t Group and	ost-Progr I Year Sch	ools, 2010	dance 6–201	7 and 2017–	2018 an	d 2018–
Campus Name	Demographics	Counts	2016–2017 Pre Mean	2017–2018 Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Zstatistic	p value	Effect size
	All Students	113	90.5	89.5	-1.0	70	40	3	-2.428	.015 *	0.16
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Black or African American	39	88.0	87.2	-0.8	24	15	0	-1.103	.270	0.12
Prep	Hispanic	71	91.5	90.4	-1.1	45	23	3	-2.347	.019 *	0.20
South HS	White	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
	Economically Disadvantaged	98	91.2	89.3	-1.9	64	32	2	-2.956	.003 *	0.21
	English Learners	10	81.4	80.0	-1.4	7	3	0	-0.867	.386	0.19
	Students with Disabilities	1	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Campus			2017-2018	2018–2019	Mean	Negative	Positive				
Campus Name	Demographics	Counts	2017–2018 Pre Mean	2018–2019 Post Mean	Mean Difference	Negative Rank	Positive Rank	Ties	Zstatistic	p value	Effect size
Campus Name	Demographics All Students	<b>Counts</b> 1,381	<b>2017–2018</b> <b>Pre Mean</b> 92.8	<b>2018–2019</b> <b>Post Mean</b> 92.3	Mean Difference -0.5	Negative Rank 618	Positive Rank 712	<b>Ties</b> 51	<b>Z statistic</b> -2.230	<b>p value</b> .260 *	Effect size
Campus Name	Demographics All Students Asian or Pacific Islander	Counts 1,381 71	<b>2017–2018</b> <b>Pre Mean</b> 92.8 94.2	2018–2019 Post Mean 92.3 95.3	Mean Difference -0.5 1.1	Negative Rank 618 28	Positive Rank 712 40	<b>Ties</b> 51 3	<b>Z</b> statistic -2.230 -2.646	<b>p value</b> .260 * .008 *	Effect size 0.04 0.22
Campus Name	Demographics All Students Asian or Pacific Islander Black or African American	Counts 1,381 71 169	2017-2018 Pre Mean 92.8 94.2 93.7	2018–2019 Post Mean 92.3 95.3 94.7	Mean Difference -0.5 1.1	Negative Rank 618 28 63	Positive Rank 712 40 98	<b>Ties</b> 51 3	<b>Z</b> statistic -2.230 -2.646 -2.912	<b>p value</b> .260 * .008 * .004 *	Effect size 0.04 0.22 0.16
Campus Name	Demographics All Students Asian or Pacific Islander Black or African American Hispanic	Counts 1,381 71 169 1,057	2017–2018 Pre Mean 92.8 94.2 93.7 92.5	2018–2019 Post Mean 92.3 95.3 94.7 91.5	Mean Difference -0.5 1.1 1 -1	Negative           Rank           618           28           63           495	Positive Rank 712 40 98 525	<b>Ties</b> 51 3 8 37	Z statistic -2.230 -2.646 -2.912 -0.390	<b>p value</b> .260 * .008 * .004 * .697	Effect size 0.04 0.22 0.16 0.01
Campus Name	Demographics All Students Asian or Pacific Islander Black or African American Hispanic Native American	Counts 1,381 71 169 1,057 2	2017-2018 Pre Mean 92.8 94.2 93.7 92.5 **	2018–2019 Post Mean 92.3 95.3 94.7 91.5 **	Mean Difference -0.5 1.1 1 -1 **	Negative           Rank           618           28           63           495           **	Positive Rank 712 40 98 525 **	Ties           51           3           8           37           **	Z statistic -2.230 -2.646 -2.912 -0.390 **	p value .260 * .008 * .004 * .697 **	Effect size 0.04 0.22 0.16 0.01 **
Campus Name Wisdom HS	Demographics All Students Asian or Pacific Islander Black or African American Hispanic Native American Two or More Ethnicities	Counts 1,381 71 169 1,057 2 3	2017-2018 Pre Mean 92.8 94.2 93.7 92.5 ** **	2018–2019 Post Mean 92.3 95.3 94.7 91.5 **	Mean Difference -0.5 1.1 1 -1 ** **	Negative           Rank           618           28           63           495           **	Positive Rank 712 40 98 525 ** **	Ties 51 3 8 37 **	Z statistic -2.230 -2.646 -2.912 -0.390 ** **	p value .260 * .008 * .004 * .697 **	Effect size 0.04 0.22 0.16 0.01 *** **
Campus Name Wisdom HS	Demographics All Students Asian or Pacific Islander Black or African American Hispanic Native American Two or More Ethnicities White	Counts 1,381 71 169 1,057 2 3 79	2017-2018 Pre Mean 92.8 94.2 93.7 92.5 ** ** 93.2	2018–2019 Post Mean 92.3 95.3 94.7 91.5 ** ** 94.2	Mean Difference -0.5 1.1 1 -1 ** ** **	Negative Rank           618           28           63           495           **           30	Positive Rank 712 40 98 525 ** ** 47	Ties           51           3           8           37           **           **           2	Z statistic -2.230 -2.646 -2.912 -0.390 ** ** -1.402	<i>p value</i> .260 * .008 * .004 * .697 ** ** .161	Effect size 0.04 0.22 0.16 0.01 ** ** 0.11
Campus Name Wisdom HS	Demographics All Students Asian or Pacific Islander Black or African American Hispanic Native American Two or More Ethnicities White Economically Disadvantaged	Counts           1,381           71           169           1,057           2           3           79           1,260	2017–2018 Pre Mean 92.8 94.2 93.7 92.5 ** ** 93.2 93.2	2018–2019 Post Mean 92.3 95.3 94.7 91.5 ** ** 94.2 93.2	Mean Difference -0.5 1.1 1 -1 ** ** 1 0	Negative Rank           618           28           63           495           **           30           551	Positive Rank 712 40 98 525 ** ** 47 661	Ties           51           3           8           37           **           **           2           48	Z statistic -2.230 -2.646 -2.912 -0.390 ** ** -1.402 -3.531	p value .260 * .008 * .004 * .697 ** .161 .000 *	Effect size 0.04 0.22 0.16 0.01 ** ** 0.11 0.07
Campus Name Wisdom HS	Demographics All Students Asian or Pacific Islander Black or African American Hispanic Native American Two or More Ethnicities White Economically Disadvantaged English Learners	Counts 1,381 71 169 1,057 2 3 79 1,260 821	2017–2018 Pre Mean 92.8 94.2 93.7 92.5 ** ** 93.2 93.2 93.2 93.3	2018–2019 Post Mean 92.3 95.3 94.7 91.5 ** ** 94.2 93.2 92.0	Mean Difference -0.5 1.1 1 -1 ** ** 1 0 -1.3	Negative Rank 618 28 63 495 ** ** 30 551 384	Positive Rank 712 40 98 525 ** ** 47 661 402	Ties         51         3         8         37         **         2         48         35	Z statistic -2.230 -2.646 -2.912 -0.390 ** ** -1.402 -3.531 -0.337	p value .260 * .008 * .004 * .697 ** .161 .000 * .736	Effect size 0.04 0.22 0.16 0.01 ** ** 0.11 0.07 0.01

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data aggregated by school. The attendance rate is the ratio of total students' days present to total days in membership for the respective school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Results for schools with fewer than five students per group are not reported (\*\*). More Gains and More Losses exclude schools with an equal number of gains and losses. \*Indicates statistically significant results (p<0.05). Very small effect sizes are not noted.

# Table D-9.Chronic Absence Rates and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and<br/>Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and<br/>Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through<br/>2019–2020

				Т	hree-Ye	ear Scl	nools					
	Enrollm	nent Mer	nbership	(=>83%)	Chro	nic Ab	sence	Rate	(	Chronic Absei	nce Rate Chang	le
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016–2017 to 2017–2018	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2018–2019 to 2019–2020	2016–2017 to 2019–2020 Three-Year Change
Non-Achieve 180												
(Three-year Matched n=72)	47,748	47,432	45,705	44,934	10.1	11.5	11.9	6.7	▲1.4	▲0.4	▼5.2	▼3.4
Three-Year Achieve 180												
Program (n=43)	29,148	29,797	29,309	30,373	15.7	16.4	15.9	9.2	▲0.7	▼0.5	▼6.7	▼6.5
Non-Achieve 180 Elementary	27 260	27 124	25 020	25 172	5.2	6 5	6.0	10	A12	• 0 4	▼2.0	▼1.2
A190 Elementary Schools	27,209	27,134	25,930	23,172	5.5	0.0	0.9	4.0	▲ 1.2	▲0.4	₹ 2.9	▼1.5
(n=22)	10.033	9.612	8.642	8.695	9.1	10.0	11.5	6.2	▲0.9	▲15	▼53	▼2.9
Bellfort ECC	164	181	160	179	8.5	8.8	14.4	6.7	▲0.3	▲ 5.6	▼7.7	▼1.8
Blackshear ES	397	348	300	300	12.8	8.9	11.0	7.3	▼3.9	▲2.1	▼3.7	▼5.5
Bonham ES	852	784	763	763	6.5	6.1	12.5	5.6	▼0.4	▲6.4	▼6.9	▼0.9
Bruce ES	452	455	404	349	8.0	5.5	4.7	3.2	₹2.5	▼0.8	▼1.5	▼4.8
Cook ES	547	555	519	526	10.1	12.3	15.6	9.5	▲2.2	▲3.3	▼6.1	▼0.6
Dogan ES	505	486	462	461	10.1	6.8	5.8	7.8	▼3.3	▼1.0	▲2.0	₹2.3
Foerster ES	523	575	562	605	10.5	12.2	16.9	7.6	▲1.7	▲4.7	▼9.3	₹2.9
Fondren ES^	317	302	257	218	7.6	6.3	5.8	2.8	▼1.3	▼0.5	▼3.0	▼4.8
Gallegos ES	356	315	289	284	2.2	5.4	6.6	2.8	▲3.2	▲1.2	▼3.8	▲0.6
Highland Heights ES	427	439	395	353	11.9	15.9	18.0	8.2	▲4.0	▲2.1	▼9.8	▼3.7
Hilliard ES	550	476	463	470	14.7	25.0	16.8	10.0	▲10.3	▼8.2	▼6.8	▼4.7
Kashmere Gardens ES	363	329	302	369	14.0	13.7	19.2	9.8	▼0.3	▲5.5	▼9.4	▼4.2
Lewis ES	749	745	724	713	6.5	5.4	7.0	5.2	▼1.1	<b>▲</b> 1.6	▼1.8	▼1.3
Looscan ES^	352	301	277	269	8.2	9.6	9.0	6.3	▲1.4	▼0.6	▼2.7	▼1.9
Mading ES	451	408	338	296	8.2	5.4	4.1	2.7	₹2.8	▼1.3	▼1.4	▼5.5
Martinez C ES	405	398	333	309	5.7	9.0	9.3	4.2	▲3.3	▲0.3	▼5.1	▼1.5
Montgomery ES <sup>^</sup>	615	521	442	427	9.8	7.5	12.7	6.8	₹2.3	▲5.2	▼5.9	▼3.0
Pugh ES	367	331	320	323	3.5	4.2	3.8	2.2	▲0.7	▼0.4	▼1.6	▼1.3
Stevens ES^	587	597	527	561	6.5	7.4	12.1	4.3	▲0.9	▲4.7	▼7.8	▼2.2
Wesley ES	224	259	260	2/1	12.9	17.4	15.8	5.2	<b>▲</b> 4.5	▼1.6	▼10.6	▼ <i>1.1</i>
vvoodson	592	592	335	394	12.7	18.9	14.9	8.4	▲ 6.2	▼4.0	▼6.5	▼4.3
Young ES	238	215	210	255	9.7	7.0	15.7	3.1	▼2.7	▲8.7	▼12.6	₹6.6
Schools (n=10)	7 921	7 588	7 357	7 1 2 8	10.3	126	14.2	72	▲23	<b>▲</b> 16	▼70	▼3.1
A180 Middle Schools (n=8)	4 627	4 617	4 546	4 563	14.4	19.3	17.7	10.0	▲ <u>4</u> 9	▼16	▼7.7	▼4.4
Attucks MS	409	408	383	308	16.9	31.1	28.2	13.3	▲ 14 2	▼2.9	▼14.9	▼36
Cullen MS	383	359	290	297	3.4	25.9	38.3	21.9	▲ 22.5	▲ 12 4	▼16.4	<b>↓</b> 18.5
Edison MS	614	601	596	607	86	8.0	79	5.8	▼0.6	▼0.1	▼21	▼2.8
Forest Brook MS	757	746	718	706	15.9	19.3	17.1	13.6	▲34	▼2.2	▼3.5	▼2.3
Henry MS	787	777	735	732	8.9	19.4	14.1	9.2	▲ 10.5	▼5.3	▼4.9	▲0.3
High School Ahead Acad MS^	147	162	106	128	40.8	50.6	46.2	11.7	▲9.8	▼4.4	▼34.5	▼29.1
Key MS	592	553	586	551	20.1	24.1	22.2	11.1	▲4.0	▼1.9	▼11.1	▼9.0
Lawson MS	938	1,011	1,132	1,234	17.1	11.3	11.7	6.3	▼5.8	▲0.4	▼5.4	▼10.8

Table D-9.	Chronic Absence Rates and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and
	Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and
	Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through
	2019–2020 (Continued)

				Th	ree-Ye	ar Scho	ools					
	Enrolli	nent Mer	nbership (=	=>83%)	Chr	onic Ab	sence F	Rate		Chronic Abser	ce Rate Change	e
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016–2017 to 2017–2018	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2018–2019 to 2019–2020	2016–2017 to 2019–2020 Three-Year Change
Non-Achieve 180 High Schools (n=8)	12,558	12,710	12,418	12,634	20.2	21.7	21.2	11.6	▲1.5	▼0.5	▼9.6	▼8.6
A180 High Schools (n=11)	10,189	10,949	11,069	11,762	28.8	27.5	25.5	15.3	▼1.3	▼2.0	▼10.2	▼13.5
Kashmere HS	494	601	629	693	33.6	36.8	29.4	25.3	▲3.2	₹7.4	▼4.1	▼8.3
Liberty HS	170	250	214	260	40.0	49.6	40.2	28.8	▲9.6	▼9.4	▼11.4	▼11.2
Madison HS	1,507	1,407	1,501	1,570	34.4	30.7	24.6	17.0	▼3.7	▼6.1	▼7.6	▼17.4
Milby HS	1,250	1,529	1,753	1,945	26.2	22.0	16.7	8.0	▼4.2	▼5.3	▼8.7	▼18.2
North Forest HS	803	836	839	850	32.1	27.2	34.3	18.0	▼4.9	▲7.1	▼16.3	▼14.1
Sharpstown HS	1,355	1,455	1,425	1,559	23.5	25.8	29.9	19.6	▲2.3	▲4.1	▼10.3	▼3.9
Washington HS	639	638	637	694	23.2	33.1	26.2	15.9	▲9.9	▼6.9	▼10.3	▼7.3
Westbury HS	1,931	2,093	2,042	2,155	22.5	19.2	18.8	10.9	▼3.3	▼0.4	▼7.9	▼11.6
Wheatley HS	683	770	687	657	34.8	38.8	41.6	23.6	▲4.0	▲2.8	▼18.0	▼11.2
Worthing HS	651	683	629	691	37.5	25.8	25.4	7.8	▼11.7	▼0.4	▼17.6	▼29.7
Yates HS	706	687	713	688	30.5	30.1	25.5	16.3	▼0.4	▼4.6	▼9.2	▼14.2
Non-Achieve 180 Combined- Level Schools (n=0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A180 Combined-Level Schools (n=2)	4,299	4,619	5,052	5,353	1.9	0.7	0.6	0.1	▼1.2	▼0.1	▼0.5	▼1.8
Gregory-Lincoln PK-8	601	628	650	623	13.5	5.4	4.6	1.1	▼8.1	▼0.8	▼3.5	▼12.4
TCAH ^	3,698	3,991	4,402	4,730	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data. The chronic absence rate is the total number of students absent 10 percent or more of school days they are enrolled in the campus divided by the total number of students in membership in the campus 83% or more of the school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Statistical significance was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: two three-year combined-level schools. Andicates Non-TSL Grant participant. All Non-Achieve 180 schools are TEA comparison group schools in HISD and Title I, Part A schools. No appropriate HISD TEA comparison group schools were listed for Bellfort ECC, Gregory-Lincoln PK-8, High School Ahead Academy MS, Liberty HS, Montgomery ES, TCAH, and Yates HS.

Table D-10.	Chronic Absence Rates and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Two-Year and One-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), 2016–2017 through 2019–2020

					Two-Ye	ear Sch	ools					
	Enrolln	nent Merr	nbership (	=>83%)	Chi	ronic Abs	sence Ra	te	c	hronic Absen	ce Rate Chang	ge
	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016– 2017	2017– 2018	2018– 2019	2019– 2020	2016–2017 to 2017–2018	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2018–2019 to 2019–2020	2017–2018 to 2019–2020 Two-Year
Non-Achieve 180 (Two-												
year Matched n=39)		24,032	22,971	22,133		6.7	7.1	4.0		▲0.4	▼3.1	₹2.7
Two-YearAchieve 180												
Program (n=10)		6,217	5,796	5,756		11.6	9.8	6.0		▼1.8	▼3.8	▼5.6
Non-Achieve 180		40 500	47 745	47.400							-0.4	-04
Elementary Schools		18,563	17,715	17,103		5.4	5.4	3.3		0.0	▼2.1	▼2.1
A180 Elementary		2 207	2 4 0 4	2.005			0.2	E 2		<b>T</b> 0 F	<b>T</b> 20	<b>W</b> 2 E
Schools (n=4)		2,397	2,101	2,000		<b>0.0</b>	0.3	<b>J.J</b>		♦ 0.5	▼5.0	▼ 3.5
Codwell ES		060	330	940		10.1	13.3	<i>1.1</i> 5.7		▲ 3.2	▼ 1.6	▼2.4
Shoorn ESA		520	472	049 426		6.0	7.3	5.7		▼3.0	▼1.0	▼4.0
Sheam ESA		530	472	430		0.0	0.5	2.0		♦ 0.5	▼2.7	▼3.2
Non-Achieve 190		521	493	470		0.1	9.5	5.5		▲ 1.4	▼4.0	₹2.0
MiddleSchools (n-7)		4,467	4,278	3,968		124	15.0	74		▲26	▼7.6	▼5.0
A180 MiddleSchools						12.4	10.0	1.4		<b>A</b> 2.0	• 1.0	+ 0.0
(n=5)		2,778	2,669	2,753		16.3	13.3	7.8		▼3.0	▼5.5	▼8.5
Deady MS		660	600	631		12.0	16.0	5.9		▲4.0	▼10.1	▼6.1
Holland MS^		590	588	611		13.2	15.6	6.1		▲2.4	▼9.5	▼7.1
Sugar Grove MS		605	590	663		18.8	7.1	8.0		▼11.7	▲0.9	▼10.8
Thomas MS		478	478	464		21.5	8.8	6.0		▼12.7	₹2.8	▼15.5
Williams MS		445	413	384		17.5	20.1	15.6		▲2.6	▼4.5	▼1.9
High Schools (n=0)		-	-	-		-	-	-		_	_	_
Non-Achieve 180		1,002	978	1,062		4.1	4.2	2.5		▲0.1	▼1.7	▼1.6
A180 Combined-Level												
Schools (n=1)		1,042	946	918		5.8	3.3	2.2		₹2.5	▼1.1	▼3.6
Reagan Ed Ctr PK-8		1,042	946	918		5.8	3.3	2.2		₹2.5	▼1.1	▼3.6
			•		One-Ye	ear Sch	ools	•				
									2016-2017		2018-2019	
									to		to	
									2017–2018		2019-2020	
									One-year		One-year	
(matcharler 0)			2.000	4.04.6			10.0	40.4	Change		Change	
(matched n=2)	-	-	3,860	4,014	-	-	19.8	12.1	<b>T</b> 0.4		V /./	
Achieve 180 Program	127	210	1,749	1,643	24.4	24.3	23.7	14.2	▼0.1		♥ 9.5	
VICTORY Prep South HS	127	210	4 740	4.040	24.4	24.3	00.7	44.0	▼0.1		-	
vvisaom HS^ (pre 18-19/po	ost 19-20)		1,749	1,643			23.7	14.2			▼ 9.5	

Sources: PEIMS Average Daily Attendance (ADA) 400 databases for 2016–2017, 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020

Notes: This is based on student-level data. The chronic absence rate is the total number of students absent 10 percent or more of school days they are enrolled in the campus divided by the total number of students in membership in the campus 83% or more of the school year. Students in all grades are included in the calculation. Statistical significance was not assessed for groups smaller than five schools: four two-year elementary, one two-year combined-level, and two one-year high schools (one school from 2016–2017 to 2017–2018, the other from 2018–2019 to 2019–2020). Andicates Non-TSL Grant participant. \*New Achieve 180 Program school in 2018–2019. All Non-Achieve 180 schools are TEA comparison group schools in HISD and Title I, Part A schools. No HISD TEA comparison group schools were listed for Victory Preparatory South HS.

# Appendix E: Four-Year and Five-Year Graduation Rates

.

#### 2019-2020 ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM EVALUATION, PART B

Table E-1. Four-Year Graduation Rates and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for<br/>Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), Class of 2017<br/>through Class of 2019

		Th	ree-Year S	chools					
	Cla	ss Enrolln	nent	Gra	aduation Ra	ate	Gradua	ation Rate Ch	ange
	Class of 2017	Class of 2018	Class of 2019	Class of 2017	Class of 2018	Class of 2019	2016–2017 to 2017–2018	2017–2018 to 2018–2019	2016–2017 to 2018–2019
Non-Achieve 180 (Three-year Matched n=8)	3,158	3,382	3,327	82.8	81.8	82.7	▼1.0	▲0.9	▼0.1
Three-Year Achieve 180 Program (n=12)	3,788	3,897	4,120	66.3	66.4	67.8	▲0.1	▲ 1.4	▲1.5
A180 High Schools (n=11)	2,930	2,999	3,219	71.6	70.1	70.2	▼1.5	▲0.1	▼1.4
Kashmere HS	124	137	180	67.7	67.2	67.2	▼0.5	0.0	▼0.5
Liberty HS	158	126	171	1.9	1.6	1.8	▼0.3	▲0.2	▼0.1
Madison HS	412	399	486	71.8	71.4	69.1	▼0.4	▼2.3	₹2.7
Milby HS	445	304	390	82.5	77.3	76.9	▼5.2	▼0.4	▼5.6
North Forest HS	216	239	211	76.9	77.8	77.7	▲0.9	▼0.1	▲0.8
Sharpstown HS	295	386	368	75.9	73.3	69.6	▼2.6	▼3.7	▼6.3
Washington HS	189	175	216	74.6	64.6	74.5	▼10.0	▲9.9	▼0.1
Westbury HS	474	545	539	84.8	83.1	83.9	▼1.7	▲0.8	▼0.9
Wheatley HS	174	228	232	70.1	66.2	69.4	▼3.9	▲ 3.2	▼0.7
Worthing HS	217	240	213	59.0	65.8	69.0	▲6.8	▲ 3.2	<b>▲</b> 10.0
Yates HS	226	220	213	73.0	65.9	75.1	▼7.1	▲9.2	▲2.1
Non-Achieve 180 Combined- Level Schools (n=0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A180 Combined-Level Schools (n=1)	858	898	901	48.4	53.8	59.0	▲5.4	▲ 5.2	▲ 10.6
TCAH^	858	898	901	48.4	53.8	59.0	▲5.4	▲5.2	<b>▲</b> 10.6
			One-Y	ear Schoo	ols				-
							2016-2017		
							to 2017–2018		
Non Ashieve 400 (motohed in 0)			4 000			07.0	One-year		
Achieve 400 Pregram (n. C)	-	-	1,089	-	_	87.0			
Achieve 180 Program (n=2)	43	/5	461	67.4	93.3	62.3	▲ 25.9		
Victory Prep South HS	43	75		67.4	93.3		▲25.9		
Wisdom HS* (pre 18-19/post 19-20)			461			62.3			

Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 8/6/2018; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/6/2019; TEA, Confidential Class of 2019 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

Notes: For state accountability four-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,310 was used for the HISD Class of 2017, a class size of 12,889 was used for the HISD Class of 2018, and a class size of 12,997 was used for the HISD Class of 2019. ANOn-TSL Grant participant. \*New Achieve 180 Program school in 2018–2019.

Table E-2.	Four-Year Graduation Rates Schools by School and Stu	s, Perc dent G	entage roup,	e Poin Class	t Cha of 20	ange, )17 th	and Cł rough	ni-Squa Class	are R of 20	esults 19	for A	chieve 180 Pr	ogra	m Thr	ee-Ye	ar
		Cla	ISS of 201 N	7 (Basel = 3 788	ine Yea	ar)		Class o	f 2019 ( = 4 12	(Year 2) 0		Class of 2017				
		Class of 2017	Gradu	uates	Cont TxC recipi	tinuer, CHSE ient, or	Class of 2019	Gradu	ates	Conti TxCł recipie Dror	nuer, HSE ent, or	Class of 2019 Mean Difference (Percentage Points)		Chi-Sa	uare Res	ults
		2017	Oradu	ales	DIC	ροαι	2013	Oladu	ales	DIO	Jour	1 011(3)		On-Oq	Fisher's	Cramér's V
Campus Name	Student Group	Ν	n	%	n	%	Ν	n	%	n	%	%-ppts.	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Exact	Effect Size
	All Students	3,788	2,513	66.3	1,275	33.7	4,120	2,793	67.8	1,327	32.2	1.5	1.88	0.170	0.172	0.150
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	1,333	992	74.4	341	25.6	1,402	1,029	73.4	373	26.6	-1.0	0.37	0.542	0.571	-0.012
	Native American	16	7	43.8	9	56.3	19	15	78.9	4	21.1	35.1	4.61	0.032*	0.043	0.363
Inree-Year	Asian/Pacific Islander	64	40	62.5	24	37.5	50	32	64.0	18	36.0	1.5	0.03	0.869	1.000	0.015
Program	Hispanic	1,821	1,166	64.0	655	36.0	2,076	1,358	65.4	718	34.6	1.4	0.81	0.367	0.382	0.003
(12 Schools)	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	40	25	62.5	15	37.5	43	27	62.8	16	37.2	0.3	0.00	0.978	1.000	0.077
(12 00110010)	White	514	283	55.1	231	44.9	530	332	62.6	198	37.4	7.5	6.20	0.013*	0.014	0.013
	Economically Disadvantaged	2,629	1,793	68.2	836	31.8	3,178	2,205	69.4	973	30.6	1.2	0.94	0.333	0.333	0.016
	English Learners	652	313	48.0	339	52.0	869	431	49.6	438	50.4	1.6	0.38	0.539	0.569	0.008
	Students with Disabilities	358	229	64.0	129	36.0	400	259	64.8	141	35.3	0.8	0.05	0.822	0.879	0.005
	All Students	124	84	67.7	40	32.3	180	121	67.2	59	32.8	-0.5	0.01	0.924	1.000	-0.006
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	80	57	71.3	23	28.8	113	82	72.6	31	27.4	1.3	0.04	0.841	0.872	0.0144
	Native American	0	_	_	_	_	0	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	_	_	_	_	0	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Kashmere HS	Hispanic	39	22	56.4	17	43.6	63	37	58.7	26	41.3	23	0.05	0.818	0.839	0.023
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	2	_	_	_	-	0	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	-
	White	2	_	_	_	_	4	_	_	_	_	_	1.50	0.221	0.467	-0.500
	Economically Disadvantaged	110	78	70.9	32	29.1	169	118	69.8	51	30.2	-1.1	0.04	0.846	0.894	-0.012
	English Learners	14	6	42.9	8	57.1	32	17	53.1	15	46.9	10.2	0.41	0.522	0.749	0.095
	Students with Disabilities	30	18	60.0	12	40.0	21	10	47.6	11	52.4	-12.4	0.76	0.382	0 408	-0.123
	All Students	158	3	19	155	98.1	171	3	1.8	168	98.2	-0.1	0.01	0.922	1 000	-0.005
	Race/Ethnicity										00.2	0.11	0.0.	0.011		0.000
	Black/African American	7	0	0.0	7	100.0	12	0	0.0	12	100.0	0.0	_	_	_	
	Native American	1	_	-	-	-	0	_	-	-		-	_	_	_	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	5	0	0.0	5	100.0	4	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Libertv HS	Hispanic	139	2	14	137	98.6	155	3	19	152	98.1	0.5	0.11	0.742	1,000	0.019
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	0	_	-	-		0	_	-			-	_		-	
	White	6	1	16.7	5	83.3	0				_	_	_	_	_	
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/0	3	2.1	137	03.3	150	2	13	1/8	98.7	-0.8	0.28	0.507	0.675	-0.031
	English Learners	153	3	2.1	150	91.9	168	2	1.0	165	08.2	-0.0	0.20	0.097	1 000	-0.007
	Students with Disabilities	2	_			-	1						-	-	-	

Table E-2.	Four-Year Graduation Rates Schools by School and Stu	s, Perc dent G	entage iroup,	e Poin Class	t Cha of 20	ange, 017 th	and Cl rough	ni-Squ Class	are R of 20	esults 19 (Co	for Acontinue	chieve 180 Pı ed)	rogra	m Thi	ree-Yea	ar
		Cla	ass of 201 N	7 (Basel = 3,788	line Yea	ar)		Class c	of 2019 I = 4,12	(Year 2) 0		Class of 2017 to				
		Class of 2017	Gradu	uates	Con TxC recip Dro	tinuer, CHSE ient, or opout	Class of 2019	Gradu	ates	Conti TxC recipie Dro	nuer, HSE ent, or pout	Class of 2019 Mean Difference (Percentage Points)		Chi-Sc	uare Res	ults
Campus Name	Student Group	N	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	Percentage Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Fisher's Exact	Cramér's V Effect Size
	All Students	412	296	71.8	116	28.2	486	336	69.1	150	30.9	-2.7	0.78	0.376	0.380	-0.030
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	167	132	79.0	35	21.0	190	138	72.6	52	27.4	-6.4	1.98	0.159	0.175	-0.075
	Native American	3	-	-	-	_	2	-	-	_	-	_	-	-	-	_
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	_	-	-	_	-	_	-	_
Madison HS	Hispanic	238	162	68.1	76	31.9	286	191	66.8	95	33.2	-1.3	0.10	0.755	0.779	-0.014
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	_	1	-	-	_	-	_	-	_	-	-
	White	2	-	-	-	-	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	_	-	_	-	_
ļ	Economically Disadvantaged	298	220	73.8	78	26.2	378	269	71.2	109	28.8	-2.6	0.59	0.442	0.489	-0.030
	English Learners	75	44	58.7	31	41.3	115	57	49.6	58	50.4	-9.1	1.51	0.219	0.237	-0.089
	Students with Disabilities	63	35	55.6	28	44.4	55	30	54.5	25	45.5	-1.1	0.01	0.912	1.000	-0.010
	All Students	445	367	82.5	78	17.5	390	300	76.9	90	23.1	-5.6	3.98	0.046*	0.047	-0.069
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	30	29	96.7	1	3.3	27	25	92.6	2	7.4	-4.1	0.47	0.492	0.599	-0.091
	Native American	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Milby HS	Hispanic	411	334	81.3	77	18.7	360	274	76.1	86	23.9	-5.2	3.06	0.080	0.093	-0.063
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	384	323	84.1	61	15.9	353	280	79.3	73	20.7	-4.8	2.84	0.092	0.104	-0.062
	English Learners	98	67	68.4	31	31.6	105	66	62.9	39	37.1	-5.5	0.68	0.409	0.461	-0.058
	Students with Disabilities	38	25	65.8	13	34.2	50	36	72.0	14	28.0	6.2	0.39	0.531	0.642	0.067
	All Students	216	166	76.9	50	23.1	211	164	77.7	47	22.3	0.8	0.05	0.830	0.908	0.010
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	135	102	75.6	33	24.4	128	100	78.1	28	21.9	2.5	0.24	0.622	0.663	0.030
	Native American	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	-	_
North Forest HS	Hispanic	75	59	78.7	16	21.3	82	64	78.0	18	22.0	-0.7	0.01	0.925	1.000	0.008
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	_	-	-	_	_	_	-	_
	White	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	_	-	-	_	_	_	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	157	123	78.3	34	21.7	197	156	79.2	41	20.8	0.9	0.04	0.847	0.896	0.010
	English Learners	29	21	72.4	8	27.6	28	21	75.0	7	25.0	2.6	0.05	0.825	1.000	0.029
	Students with Disabilities	22	18	81.8	4	18.2	20	14	70.0	6	30.0	-11.8	0.81	0.369	0.477	-0.139

Table E-2.	Four-Year Graduation Rates Schools by School and Stu	s, Perc dent G	entage iroup,	e Poin Class	t Cha of 20	ange, 017 th	and Cl rough	hi-Squ Class	are R of 20	esults 19 (Co	for A	chieve 180 Pı ed)	rogra	m Thr	ee-Yea	ar
		Cla	ass of 201 N	7 (Basel = 3,788	ine Yea	ar)		Class o	of 2019 I = 4,12	(Year 2)		Class of 2017				
		Class of 2017	Gradu	uates	Con TxC recip Dro	tinuer, CHSE ient, or ppout	Class of 2019	Gradu	ates	Conti TxCl recipie Droj	nuer, HSE ent, or pout	Class of 2019 Mean Difference (Percentage Points)		Chi-Sq	uare Res	ults
Campus Name	Student Group	N	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	Percentage Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Fisher's Exact	Cramér's V Effect Size
	All Students	295	224	75.9	71	24.1	368	256	69.6	112	30.4	-6.3	3.32	0.068	0.080	-0.071
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	73	58	79.5	15	20.5	78	48	61.5	30	38.5	-18.0	5.78	0.016*	0.021	-0.196
	Native American	0	_	-	-	_	1	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	-	_
	Asian/Pacific Islander	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	10	7	70.0	3	30.0	10.0	0.15	0.699	1.000	0.100
Sharpstown HS	Hispanic	210	159	75.7	51	24.3	268	194	72.4	74	27.6	-3.3	0.67	0.411	0.463	-0.038
-	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	2	_	_	_	_	2	_	_	-	_	-	_	_	-	-
	White	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	9	5	55.6	4	44.4	-24.4	0.84	0.360	0.580	-0.244
	Economically Disadvantaged	272	208	76.5	64	23.5	343	245	71.4	98	28.6	-5.1	1.99	0.159	0.168	-0.057
	English Learners	114	76	66.7	38	33.3	148	90	60.8	58	39.2	-5.9	0.95	0.329	0.366	-0.060
	Students with Disabilities	25	16	64.0	9	36.0	41	23	56.1	18	43.9	-7.9	0.40	0.526	0.610	-0.078
	All Students	858	415	48.4	443	51.6	901	532	59.0	369	41.0	10.6	20.16	0.000*	0.000	0.107
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	65	25	38.5	40	61.5	92	50	54.3	42	45.7	15.8	3.85	0.050	0.054	0.157
	Native American	8	3	37.5	5	62.5	10	6	60.0	4	40.0	22.5	0.90	0.343	0.637	0.224
	Asian/Pacific Islander	25	16	64.0	9	36.0	19	13	68.4	6	31.6	4.4	0.09	0.759	1.000	0.046
TCAH^	Hispanic	255	94	36.9	161	63.1	254	132	52.0	122	48.0	15.1	11.76	0.001*	0.001	0.152
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	28	16	57.1	12	42.9	31	18	58.1	13	41.9	1.0	0.01	0.943	1.000	0.009
	White	477	261	54.7	216	45.3	495	313	63.2	182	36.8	8.5	7.28	0.007*	0.007	0.087
	Economically Disadvantaged	321	116	36.1	205	63.9	368	167	45.4	201	54.6	9.3	6.05	0.014*	0.016	0.094
	English Learners	14	4	28.6	10	71.4	16	7	43.8	9	56.3	15.2	0.74	0.389	0.466	0.157
	Students with Disabilities	19	6	31.6	13	68.4	38	23	60.5	15	39.5	28.9	4.25	0.039*	0.052	0.273
	All Students	189	141	74.6	48	25.4	216	161	74.5	55	25.5	-0.1	0.00	0.988	1.000	-0.001
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	109	91	83.5	18	16.5	106	81	76.4	25	23.6	-7.1	1.68	0.195	0.233	-0.088
	Native American	1	-	-	_	_	2	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	-	_
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	_	_	_	_	0	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Washington HS	Hispanic	75	45	60.0	30	40.0	101	74	73.3	27	26.7	13.3	3.46	0.063	0.074	0.140
-	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	2	_	_	_	_	4	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_
	White	1	_	_	-	_	3	_	_	_	_	-	_	_	_	
	Economically Disadvantaged	137	109	79.6	28	20.4	192	150	78.1	42	21.9	-1.5	0.10	0.754	0.786	-0.017
	English Learners	17	9	52.9	8	47.1	43	29	67.4	14	32.6	14.5	1.10	0.294	0.376	0.136
	Students with Disabilities	23	14	60.9	9	39.1	23	17	73.9	6	26.1	13.0	0.89	0.345	0.530	0.139

Table E-2.	Four-Year Graduation Rates	, Perce	entage	Point	Cha	nge, a	and Ch	i-Squa	are Ro	esults	for Ac	hieve 180 Pr	ograr	n Thr	ee-Yea	r
		uent G	noup,	Class	01 20	<b>J</b> 17 th	rougn	Class	01 20		minue	eu)				
		Cla	ass of 201 N	7 (Basel = 3,788	line Yea	ar)		Class o	of 2019 I = 4,12	(Year 2) 20		Class of 2017				
		Class of 2017	Gradu	uates	Con TxC recip Dro	tinuer, CHSE ient, or opout	Class of 2019	Gradu	ates	Conti TxC recipio Dro	nuer, HSE ent, or pout	Class of 2019 Mean Difference (Percentage Points)		Chi-Sq	uare Res	ults
Campus Name	Student Group	N	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	Percentage Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Fisher's Exact	Cramér's V Effect Size
	All Students	474	402	84.8	72	15.2	539	452	83.9	87	16.1	-0.9	0.17	0.678	0.729	-0.013
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	185	163	88.1	22	11.9	182	151	83.0	31	17.0	-5.1	1.96	0.161	0.183	-0.073
	Native American	2	_	_	-	_	1	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	21	15	71.4	6	28.6	12	8	66.7	4	33.3	-4.7	0.08	0.775	1.000	-0.050
Westbury HS	Hispanic	254	215	84.6	39	15.4	334	282	84.4	52	15.6	-0.2	0.00	0.943	1 000	-0.003
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	_	_	_	_	3	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_
	White	11	6	54.5	5	45.5	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	45.5	4 41	0.036*	0 101	0 495
	Economically Disadvantaged	387	334	86.3	53	13.7	469	403	85.9	66	14 1	-0.4	0.03	0.874	0.921	-0.005
	English Learners	94	61	64.9	33	35.1	147	100	68.0	47	32.0	31	0.25	0.614	0.674	0.033
	Students with Disabilities	46	36	78.3	10	21.7	53	43	81.1	10	18.9	2.8	0.13	0.723	0.804	0.036
	All Students	174	122	70.1	52	29.9	232	161	69.4	71	30.6	-0.7	0.02	0.876	0.913	-0.008
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	94	76	80.9	18	19.1	119	88	73.9	31	26.1	-7.0	1 41	0 235	0 255	-0.081
	Native American	1	-	_	-	_	0	-	-	-		-	-	-	_	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	_	_	-	_	1	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Wheatley HS	Hispanic	78	46	59.0	32	41.0	110	70	63.6	40	36.4	4.6	0 42	0.517	0 545	0.047
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	0	-	_	-	_	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_	-
	White	0	_	_	_	_	1	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
	Economically Disadvantaged	125	88	70.4	37	29.6	202	149	73.8	53	26.2	34	0 44	0 508	0.526	0.037
	English Learners	29	15	51.7	14	48.3	40	24	60.0	16	40.0	8.3	0.47	0.494	0.624	0.082
	Students with Disabilities	24	19	79.2	5	20.8	33	20	60.6	13	39.4	-18.6	2 22	0 137	0 161	-0 197
	All Students	217	128	59.0	89	41.0	213	147	69.0	66	31.0	10.0	4.69	0.03*	0.035	0.104
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	183	110	60.1	73	39.9	169	121	71.6	48	28.4	11.5	5 14	0.023*	0.025	0 121
	Native American	0	_	_	-	_	0	_	-	-		-	-	-	_	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	2	_	_	-	_	2	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Worthing HS	Hispanic	28	14	50.0	14	50.0	42	25	59.5	17	40.5	9.5	0.62	0.432	0.470	0.094
5	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	2	_	_	<u> </u>	-	0		_	_		_	_	_	_	_
	White	2	_	_	-	_	0	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	<u> </u>
	Economically Disadvantaged	- 162	95	58.6	67	41 4	199	145	72.9	54	27.1	14.3	8 11	0.004*	0.005	0 150
	English Learners	6	3	50.0	3	50.0	21	12	57.1	9	42.9	7.1	0.10	0.756	1.000	0.060
	Students with Disabilities	25	13	52.0	12	48.0	36	26	72.2	10	27.8	20.2	2.62	0.106	0.175	0.207

Table E-2.	Four-Year Graduation Rates Schools by School and Stu	s, Perc dent G	entage iroup,	e Poin Class	t Cha of 20	ange, )17 th	and Cl rough	ni-Squ Class	are R of 20	esults 19 (Co	for A ontinu	chieve 180 Pi ed)	rogra	m Thi	ree-Yea	ar
		Cla	ass of 201 N	7 (Basel = 3,788	ine Yea	ar)		Class o	of 2019 N = 4,12	(Year 2) 20		Class of 2017 to				
		Class of 2017	Gradu	IN = 3,788		tinuer, CHSE ient, or	Class of 2019	Gradu	ates	Conti TxC recipie Dro	nuer, HSE ent, or pout	Class of 2019 Mean Difference (Percentage Points)		Chi-Sc	uare Res	ults
				Glaudales								Percentage			Fisher's	Cramér's V
Campus Name	Student Group	Ν	n	%	n	%	Ν	n	%	n	%	Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Exact	Effect Size
	All Students	226	165	73.0	61	27.0	213	160	75.1	53	24.9	2.1	0.25	0.615	0.664	0.024
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	205	149	72.7	56	27.3	186	145	78.0	41	22.0	5.3	1.45	0.228	0.243	0.061
	Native American	0	_	-	-	-	2	-	-	_	-	-	_	-	-	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	_	_	-	_	0	_	_	_	_	-	_	-	-	_
Yates HS	Hispanic	19	14	73.7	5	26.3	21	12	57.1	9	42.9	-16.6	1.20	0.273	0.333	-0.173
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	_	_	_	_	1	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	-
	White	1	_	_	_	_	3	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_
	Economically Disadvantaged	136	96	70.6	40	29.4	158	121	76.6	37	23.4	6.0	1.36	0.244	0.287	0.068
	English Learners	9	4	44.4	5	55.6	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	38.9	2.27	0.132	0.287	0.389
	Students with Disabilities	41	29	70.7	12	29.3	29	17	58.6	12	41.4	-12.1	1.11	0.293	0.318	-0.126

Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 8/6/2018 and TEA, Confidential Class of 2019 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020 Notes: For state accountability four-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,310 was used for the HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,997 was used for the HISD Class of 2019. \* p<0.05; – results not reported for fewer than five students.

Table E-3.	Four-Year Graduation Rates School by School and Stud	s, Perc ent Gr	entage oup, C	e Poin lass o	t Cha of 201	ange, 17 and	and Ch d Class	ni-Squ of 20	are R 18	esults	for A	chieve 180 Pi	rogra	m On	e-Year	,
		(	Class of 2 N	2017 (Bas N = 43	seline)		Cli	ass of 20	18 (Pos N = 75	st-Progra	m)	Class of 2017 to Class of 2018 Mean Difference				
		Class of 2017	Gradu	uates	Con TxC recip Dro	tinuer, CHSE ient, or opout	Class of 2018	Gradu	ates	Conti TxC recipie Dro	inuer, HSE ent, or pout			Chi-Sq	juare Res	ults
Campus Name	Student Group	N	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	Percentage Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Fisher's Exact	Cramér's V Effect Size
	All Students	43	29	67.4	14	32.6	75	70	93.3	5	6.7	25.9	13.56	0.000*	0.000	0.339
	Race/Ethnicity								-							
	Black/African American	14	10	71.4	4	28.6	31	29	93.5	2	6.5	22.1	4.08	0.043*	0.065	0.301
	Native American	0	-	-	1	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Victory Prep	Hispanic	28	19	67.9	9	32.1	41	38	92.7	3	7.3	24.8	7.14	0.008*	0.011	0.322
South HS	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	25	71.4	10	28.6	62	59	95.2	3	4.8	23.8	10.86	0.001*	0.002	0.335
	English Learners <sup>c</sup>	5	1	20.0	4	80.0	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	51.4	3.09	0.079	0.242	0.507
	Students with Disabilities	0	_	_	-	-	4	_	-	_	_	-	-	_	-	-

Sources: TEA, Confidential Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 8/6/2018; TEA, Confidential Class of 2018 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/6/2019 Notes: For the other one-year Achieve 180 Program school, Wisdom HS, results are pending. For state accountability four-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,310 was used for the HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,889 was used for the HISD Class of 2018. \* p<0.05; – results not reported for fewer than five students. Table E-4. Five-Year Graduation Rates and Percentage Point Change by Non-Achieve 180 and<br/>Achieve 180 Program Affiliation for Three-Year Achieve 180 Program Schools and<br/>Their Non-Achieve 180 Comparison Schools (Aggregated), Class of 2017 and Class<br/>of 2018

	Three	e-Year Scho	ools		
	Class Er	nrollment	Graduati	on Rate	Graduation Rate Change
	Class of	Class of	Class of	Class of	Class of 2017 to
	2017	2018	2017	2018	Class of 2018
Non-Achieve 180 (Three-year Matched n=8)	3,132	3,342	85.6	85.9	▲0.3
Three-Year Achieve 180 Program (n=12)	3,705	3,836	73.0	72.1	▼0.9
A180 High Schools (n=11)	2,876	2,951	76.6	75.0	▼1.6
Kashmere HS	120	136	73.3	69.9	▼3.4
Liberty HS	138	114	10.9	6.1	₹4.8
Madison HS	407	393	76.9	77.9	<b>▲</b> 1.0
Milby HS	438	296	85.6	83.4	₹2.2
North Forest HS	214	240	79.0	79.6	▲0.6
Sharpstown HS	286	382	82.2	79.3	₹2.9
Washington HS	188	169	81.4	70.4	▼11.0
Westbury HS	475	541	88.0	85.6	₹2.4
Wheatley HS	176	222	72.7	72.5	▼0.2
Worthing HS	214	239	63.6	69.5	▲5.9
Yates HS	220	219	78.2	70.8	₹7.4
Non-Achieve 180 Combined- Level Schools (n=0)	-	-	-	-	-
A180 Combined-Level Schools					
(n=1)	829	885	60.8	62.4	▲1.6
TCAH^	829	885	60.8	62.4	▲1.6
	One Class of	-Year School	DIS		
Achieve 180 Program (n=2)	2017	2018			Class of 2017
Non-Achieve 180 (Matched n=2)	-	-	-	-	to Class of 2018
Achieve 180 Program (n=2)	302	387	86.0	93.3	
Victory Preparatory South HS	302	387	86.0	93.3	▲7.3
Wisdom HS* (pre 2018–19; post 2019–20)					

Sources: TEA Confidential Class of 2017 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, updated on 6/6/2019; TEA Confidential Class of 2018 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

Notes: For state accountability five-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,204 was used for HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,789 was used for HISD Class of 2018. Wisdom HS results are pending. No comparison HISD, Title I school was listed for Victory Preparatory South HS. ^Non-TSL Grant participant. \*New Achieve 180 Program school in 2018–2019.

Table E-5.	Five-Year Graduation Rates	, Perce	ntage	Point	Char	nge, a	nd Chi	-Squa	re Res	ults f	or A	chieve 180 P	rograr	n Thr	ee-Yea	ir
	Schools by School and Sti	ident G	roup,	Class	of 20	bir an	d Clas	S OT 20	J18							
		C	ass of 20	17 (Base	line Yea	ar)	[		Class of	2018 ()	(ear 2)					
			N	l = 3,705		,			N	= 3,836						
					Con	tinuer,				Conti	nuer,					
					TxC	CHSE				TxCł	ISE	Class of 2017 to				
		Class of			recip	oient, or	Class of			recipie	ent, or	Class of 2018				
		2017	Grad	uates	Dr	opout	2018	Grad	uates	Drop	out	Mean Difference		Chi-So	quare Res	ults
												Percentage	_		Fisher's	Cramér's V
Campus Name	Student Group	N	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	exact	Effect Size
	All Students	3,705	2,706	73.0	999	27.0	3,836	2,765	72.1	1,071	27.9	-0.9	0.87	0.352	0.353	-0.011
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	1,313	1,040	79.2	273	20.8	1,397	1,081	77.4	316	22.6	-1.8	1.33	0.249	0.263	-0.022
Three-Vear	Native American	15	9	60.0	6	40.0	17	9	52.9	8	47.1	-7.1	0.16	0.688	0.735	-0.071
	Asian/Pacific Islander	63	47	74.6	16	25.4	64	51	79.7	13	20.3	5.1	0.47	0.495	0.532	0.061
Program	Hispanic	1,772	1,254	70.8	518	29.2	1,820	1,269	69.7	551	30.3	-1.1	0.47	0.495	0.511	-0.011
(12 Schools)	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	37	30	81.1	7	18.9	41	29	70.7	12	29.3	-10.4	1.13	0.288	0.307	-0.120
(12 3010013)	White	505	326	64.6	179	35.4	497	326	65.6	171	34.4	1.0	0.12	0.730	0.741	0.011
F	Economically Disadvantaged	2,589	1,909	73.7	680	26.3	2,791	2,060	73.8	731	26.2	0.1	0.00	0.951	0.975	0.001
	English Learners	620	348	56.1	272	43.9	701	384	54.8	317	45.2	-1.3	0.24	0.622	0.657	-0.014
	Students with Disabilities	356	252	70.8	104	29.2	349	241	69.1	108	30.9	-1.7	0.25	0.616	0.623	-0.019
	All Students	120	88	73.3	32	26.7	136	95	69.9	41	30.1	-3.4	0.38	0.538	0.580	-0.039
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	78	61	78.2	17	21.8	93	69	74.2	24	25.8	-4.0	0.37	0.541	0.592	-0.047
	Native American	0	-	-	-	١	2	-	-	-	١	-	-	-	I	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	١	0	-	-	-	١	-	-	-	I	-
Kashmere HS	Hispanic	37	22	59.5	15	40.5	41	25	61.0	16	39.0	1.5	0.02	0.891	1.000	0.016
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	2	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	2	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	108	82	75.9	26	24.1	128	93	72.7	35	27.3	-3.2	0.33	0.568	0.655	-0.037
	English Learners	13	6	46.2	7	53.8	15	9	60.0	6	40.0	13.8	0.54	0.464	0.705	0.139
	Students with Disabilities	30	19	63.3	11	36.7	20	10	50.0	10	50.0	-13.3	0.88	0.349	0.393	-0.132
	All Students	138	15	10.9	123	89.1	114	7	6.1	107	93.9	-4.8	1.75	0.186	0.262	-0.083
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	7	4	57.1	3	42.9	7	2	28.6	5	71.4	-28.5	1.17	0.280	0.592	-0.289
	Native American	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	0.31	0.6	1.0	-0.3
Liberty HS	Hispanic	121	8	6.6	113	93.4	103	4	3.9	99	96.1	-2.7	0.82	0.366	0.553	-0.060
-	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	6	2	33.3	4	66.7	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	122	15	12.3	107	87.7	102	6	5.9	96	94.1	-6.4	2.69	0.101	0.113	-0.110
	English Learners	132	13	9.8	119	90.2	112	7	6.3	105	93.8	-3.5	1.04	0.307	0.355	-0.065
	Students with Disabilities	1	-	-	-	_	0	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-

### 2019-2020 ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM EVALUATION, PART B

Table E-5.	Five-Year Graduation Rates Schools by School and Stu	, Perce Ident G	ntage roup.	Point Class	Char of 20	nge, ai )17 an	nd Chi <sup>.</sup> d Clas	-Squa s of 20	re Res 018 (C	ults f ontin	or A ued)	chieve 180 P	rograr	n Thr	ee-Yea	r
			ass of 20	17 (Basel	ine Yea	ar)			Class of	2018 ()	(ear 2)					
			Ν	N = 3,705		,			N	= 3,836	,					
		Class of	Grad		Cor Tx( recip	itinuer, CHSE bient, or	Class of	Grad	uates	Conti TxCł recipie	nuer, ISE ent, or	Class of 2017 to Class of 2018		Chi-Sc	nuare Res	ulte
		2017	Ulau	uales		οροαι	2010	Ulau	uares		Jour	Percentage			Fisher's	Cramér's V
Campus Name	Student Group	Ν	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	exact	Effect Size
	All Students	407	313	76.9	94	23.1	393	306	77.9	87	22.1	1.0	0.10	0.746	0.800	0.012
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	165	135	81.8	30	18.2	167	137	82.0	30	18.0	0.2	0.00	0.959	1.000	0.003
	Native American	3	-	-	-	_	2	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	_	3	_	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	-
Madison HS	Hispanic	235	176	74.9	59	25.1	217	163	75.1	54	24.9	0.2	0.00	0.957	1.000	0.003
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
	Economically Disadvantaged	295	232	78.6	63	21.4	296	236	79.7	60	20.3	1.1	0.11	0.745	0.762	0.013
	English Learners	74	49	66.2	25	33.8	71	46	64.8	25	35.2	-1.4	0.03	0.857	0.863	-0.015
	Students with Disabilities	61	38	62.3	23	37.7	33	21	63.6	12	36.4	1.3	0.02	0.898	1.000	0.013
	All Students	438	375	85.6	63	14.4	296	247	83.4	49	16.6	-2.2	0.64	0.422	0.464	-0.030
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	30	29	96.7	1	3.3	20	19	95.0	1	5.0	-1.7	0.09	0.768	1.000	-0.042
	Native American	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Milby HS	Hispanic	404	342	84.7	62	15.3	270	225	83.3	45	16.7	-1.4	0.21	0.646	0.668	-0.0177
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	0	-	-	-	I	0	-	-	-	I	-	1	-	-	-
	White	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	381	329	86.4	52	13.6	253	215	85.0	38	15.0	-1.4	0.23	0.628	0.643	-0.019
	English Learners	95	69	72.6	26	27.4	66	48	72.7	18	27.3	0.1	0.00	0.989	1.000	0.001
	Students with Disabilities	36	29	80.6	7	19.4	38	33	86.8	5	13.2	6.2	0.54	0.463	0.538	0.085
	All Students	214	169	79.0	45	21.0	240	191	79.6	49	20.4	0.6	0.03	0.873	0.908	0.008
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	133	104	78.2	29	21.8	160	124	77.5	36	22.5	-0.7	0.02	0.887	1.000	-0.008
	Native American	0	-	1	1	-	0	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
North Forest HS	Hispanic	75	60	80.0	15	20.0	80	67	83.8	13	16.3	3.8	0.37	0.544	0.677	0.049
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
	White	4	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_
	Economically Disadvantaged	156	126	80.8	30	19.2	211	179	84.8	32	15.2	4.0	1.06	0.304	0.326	0.054
	English Learners	29	22	75.9	7	24.1	22	15	68.2	7	31.8	-7.7	0.37	0.543	0.752	-0.085
	Students with Disabilities	21	18	85.7	3	14.3	28	18	64.3	10	35.7	-21.4	2.83	0.093	0.114	-0.240

### 2019-2020 ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM EVALUATION, PART B

Table E-5.	Five-Year Graduation Rates	, Perce	ntage	Point	Char	nge, a	nd Chi	-Squa	re Res	ults f	or A	chieve 180 P	rogra	n Thr	ee-Yea	r
	Schools by School and Stu	ident G	roup,	Class	01 20	n an	u Clas	5 01 20		ontin	uea)					
		CI	ass of 20	17 (Base	line Yea	ar)			Class of	2018 (\	'ear 2)					
			1	N = 3,705		<i>.</i>			Ν	= 3,836						
					Cor	tinuer,				Conti	nuer,					
					TxC	CHSE				TxCł	ISE	Class of 2017 to				
		Class of			recip	pient, or	Class of	<u> </u>		recipie	ent, or	Class of 2018			-	
		2017	Grad	uates	Dr	opout	2018	Grad	uates	Drop	out	Mean Difference		Chi-So	quare Resi	ults
Campus Name	Student Group	N	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	Percentage Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Fisher's exact	Cramér's V Effect Size
	All Students	286	235	82.2	51	17.8	382	303	79.3	79	20.7	-2.9	0.85	0.358	0.375	-0.036
	Race/Ethnicity			0.0												
	Black/African American	70	60	85.7	10	14.3	73	58	79.5	15	20.5	-6.2	0.97	0.324	0.382	-0.082
	Native American	0	I	-	-	I	2	-	1	I	I	-	-	-	-	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	21.8	0.87	0.350	0.547	0.234
Sharpstown HS	Hispanic	205	168	82.0	37	18.0	282	225	79.8	57	20.2	-2.2	0.36	0.550	0.563	-0.027
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	13	8	61.5	5	38.5	-18.5	0.55	0.457	0.615	-0.175
F	Economically Disadvantaged	264	219	83.0	45	17.0	354	287	81.1	67	18.9	-1.9	0.36	0.548	0.598	0.263
	English Learners	110	80	72.7	30	27.3	157	108	68.8	49	31.2	-3.9	0.48	0.488	0.500	0.009
	Students with Disabilities	26	17	65.4	9	34.6	29	26	89.7	3	10.3	24.3	4.73	0.030*	0.048	0.293
	All Students	829	504	60.8	325	39.2	885	552	62.4	333	37.6	1.6	0.45	0.502	0.518	0.016
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	60	34	56.7	26	43.3	91	55	60.4	36	39.6	3.7	0.21	0.645	0.736	0.038
	Native American	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	3	37.5	5	62.5	-25.0	1.00	0.317	0.619	-0.250
	Asian/Pacific Islander	25	20	80.0	5	20.0	27	23	85.2	4	14.8	5.2	0.24	0.621	0.722	0.069
TCAH^	Hispanic	243	123	50.6	120	49.4	272	149	54.8	123	45.2	4.2	0.89	0.345	0.377	0.042
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	26	21	80.8	5	19.2	31	20	64.5	11	35.5	-16.3	1.85	0.174	0.240	-0.180
	White	467	301	64.5	166	35.5	456	302	66.2	154	33.8	1.7	0.32	0.571	0.581	0.019
	Economically Disadvantaged	314	150	47.8	164	52.2	339	172	50.7	167	49.3	2.9	0.57	0.449	0.481	0.030
	English Learners	13	6	46.2	7	53.8	28	10	35.7	18	64.3	-10.5	0.41	0.524	0.732	-0.100
	Students with Disabilities	17	10	58.8	7	41.2	29	24	82.8	5	17.2	24.0	3.18	0.074	0.093	0.263
	All Students	188	153	81.4	35	18.6	169	119	70.4	50	29.6	-11.0	5.90	0.015*	0.018	-0.129
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	108	95	88.0	13	12.0	96	73	76.0	23	24.0	-12.0	4.97	0.026*	0.028	-0.156
	Native American	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington HS	Hispanic	74	52	70.3	22	29.7	68	44	64.7	24	35.3	-5.6	0.50	0.479	0.591	-0.059
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	2.22	0.136	0.400	-0.667
	Economically Disadvantaged	141	117	83.0	24	17.0	135	99	73.3	36	26.7	-9.7	3.77	0.052	0.058	-0.117
	English Learners	17	10	58.8	7	41.2	17	7	41.2	10	58.8	-17.6	1.06	0.303	0.494	-0.177
	Students with Disabilities	23	16	69.6	7	30.4	25	16	64.0	9	36.0	-5.6	0.17	0.683	0.765	-0.059

Table E-5.	Five-Year Graduation Rates	Perce	ntage	Point	Char	nge, ai	nd Chi	Squa	re Res	ults f	or A	chieve 180 P	rograr	n Thr	ee-Yea	r
	Schools by School and Stu	dent G	roup,	Class	OT 20	bir an	d Clas	s of 20	J18 (C	ontin	uea)					
		CI	ass of 20	17 (Basel	ine Yea	ar)			Class of	2018 (\	(ear 2)					
			1	N = 3,705					N	= 3,836	5					
		Class of 2017	Grad	uates	Cor Tx( recip Dr	ntinuer, CHSE pient, or opout	Class of 2018	Grad	uates	Conti TxCł recipie Drop	nuer, HSE ent, or pout	Class of 2017 to Class of 2018 Mean Difference		Chi-Sc	uare Res	ults
												Percentage	2		Fisher's	Cramér's V
Campus Name	Student Group	N 175	n	%	n	%	N	n 100	%	n To	%	Point(s)	X <sup>-</sup>	Pr	exact	Effect Size
	All Students	475	418	88.0	57	12.0	541	463	85.6	78	14.4	-2.4	1.28	0.257	0.268	-0.036
	Race/Ethnicity	405	407	00.0	40	0.7	400	405	00.7	47	0.0	0.4	0.00	0.000	4 000	0.007
	Black/African American	185	167	90.3	18	9.7	182	165	90.7	17	9.3	0.4	0.02	0.899	1.000	0.007
	Native American	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M/2 24h	Asian/Pacific Islander	21	17	81.0	4	19.0	17	13	76.5	4	23.5	-4.5	0.11	0.736	1.000	-0.055
Westbury HS	Hispanic	255	224	87.8	31	12.2	323	268	83.0	55	17.0	-4.8	2.67	0.102	0.126	-0.068
	I WO OF MORE RACES/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		11	/	63.6	4	36.4	14	12	85.7	2	14.3	22.1	1.65	0.199	0.350	0.257
	Economically Disadvantaged	387	344	88.9	43	11.1	421	362	86.0	59	14.0	-2.9	1.54	0.215	0.244	-0.044
	English Learners	94	69	73.4	25	26.6	149	101	67.8	48	32.2	-5.6	0.87	0.352	0.390	-0.060
	Students with Disabilities	47	38	80.9	9	19.1	43	35	81.4	8	18.6	0.5	0.00	0.947	1.000	0.007
	All Students	176	128	12.1	48	27.3	222	161	72.5	61	27.5	-0.2	0.00	0.964	1.000	-0.002
	Race/Ethnicity	05	00	04.0	45	45.0	400	05	07.0		40.0	0.0	0.00	0.540	0.555	0.040
	Black/African American	95	80	84.Z	15	15.8	109	95	87.2	14	12.8	3.0	0.36	0.548	0.555	0.042
	Native American	1	-	-	-	-	0	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
W/b = =41=++ 110	Asian/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	50 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
wheatley HS	Hispanic	79	48	60.8	31	39.2	109	64	58.7	45	41.3	-2.1	0.08	0.778	0.880	-0.021
	Iwo or More Races/Ethnicities	0	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	0	-	-	-	-	2		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	128	92	71.9	36	28.1	167	129	77.2	38	22.8	5.3	1.11	0.292	0.343	0.061
	English Learners	30	15	50.0	15	50.0	42	22	52.4	20	47.6	2.4	0.04	0.842	1.000	0.024
	Students with Disabilities	26	20	76.9	6	23.1	36	26	72.2	10	27.8	-4.7	0.17	0.676	0.773	-0.053
	All Students	214	136	63.6	78	36.4	239	166	69.5	73	30.5	5.9	1.77	0.183	0.195	0.063
	Race/Ethnicity	100											- 10			
	Black/African American	182	115	63.2	67	36.8	205	145	70.7	60	29.3	7.5	2.49	0.115	0.129	0.080
	Native American	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Asian/Pacific Islander	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
worthing HS	Hispanic	26	17	65.4	9	34.6	32	19	59.4	13	40.6	-6.0	0.22	0.639	0.787	-0.062
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	2	-	-	-	-		-	-	<u> </u>	-	-	-	-	-	
	White	2	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Economically Disadvantaged	163	102	62.6	61	37.4	207	151	72.9	56	27.1	10.3	4.54	0.033*	0.042	0.1107
	English Learners	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	15	6	40.0	9	60.0	-60.0	5.46	0.020*	0.038	-0.522
	Students with Disabilities	27	15	55.6	12	44.4	35	18	51.4	17	48.6	-4.2	0.10	0.747	0.801	-0.041

Table E-5.	Five-Year Graduation Rates Schools by School and St	s, Perce udent G	ntage roup,	Point Class	Char of 2(	nge, a 017 an	nd Chi d Clas	Squa s of 20	re Res 018 (C	ults f ontin	or A ued)	chieve 180 P	rograi	n Thr	ee-Yea	ir
		С	ass of 20	17 (Basel	ine Ye	ar)			Class of	2018 (\	(ear 2)					
		Class of	r	N = 3,705	Cor	ntinuer,	Class of		N	= 3,836 Conti	nuer,	Class of 2017 to				
		2017	Grad	Graduates recipient, or 201				Grad	uates	recipie	ent, or	Mean Difference		Chi-So	quare Res	ults
Campus Name	Student Group	N	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	Percentage Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Fisher's exact	Cramér's V Effect Size
eampue riame	All Students	220	172	78.2	48	21.8	219	155	70.8	64	29.2	-7.4	3.17	0.075	0.081	-0.085
	Race/Ethnicity															
	Black/African American	200	156	78.0	44	22.0	194	139	71.6	55	28.4	-6.4	2.11	0.146	0.164	-0.073
	Native American	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	١	-	-	-	-	-
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	I	-	-	-	-	-
Yates HS	Hispanic	18	14	77.8	4	22.2	23	16	69.6	7	30.4	-8.2	0.35	0.556	0.726	-0.092
	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	١	-	-	-	-	-
	White	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	١	-	-	-	-	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	130	101	77.7	29	22.3	178	131	73.6	47	26.4	-4.1	0.68	0.410	0.426	-0.047
	English Learners	8	4	50.0	4	50.0	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	21.4	0.71	0.398	0.608	0.218
	Students with Disabilities	41	32	78.0	9	22.0	33	14	42.4	19	57.6	-35.6	9.87**	0.002*	0.003	-0.365

Sources: TEA Confidential Class of 2017 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, updated on 6/6/2019; TEA Confidential Class of 2018 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

Notes: For state accountability five-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,204 was used for HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,789 was used for HISD Class of 2018. \*p<0.05; -no results reported for less than five students.

Table E-6.	Table E-6. Five-Year Graduation Rates, Percentage Point Change, and Chi-Square Results for Achieve 180 Program One-Year School by Student Group, Class of 2017 and Class of 2018															
		Cl	ass of 20	17 (Basel N = 43	ine Yea	ar)		Class of	2018 (Ye N = 75	ar 2)						
Campus Name	Student Group	Class of 2017	ass of r 2017 Graduates			ntinuer, CHSE bient, or opout	Class of 2018	Grad	uates	Conti TxCl recipie Drop	nuer, ISE ent, or pout	Class of 2017 to Class of 2018 Mean Difference		Chi-So	quare Resi	ults
		N	n	%	n	%	N	n		n	%	Percentage Point(s)	X <sup>2</sup>	Pr	Fisher's exact	Cramér's V Effect Size
	All Students	43	37	86.0	6	14.0	75	70	93.3	5	6.7	7.3	1.72	0.19	0.21	0.121
	Race/Ethnicity															
	African American	14	13	92.9	1	7.1	31	29	93.5	2	6.5	0.6	0.01	0.93	1.00	0.013
	Native American	0	-	-	-	_	0	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
Victory Prep	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South HS	Hispanic	28	24	85.7	4	14.3	41	38	92.7	3	7.3	7.0	0.89	0.35	0.43	0.113
500011115	Two or More Races/Ethnicities	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	White	0	-	-	-	_	0	_	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	29	82.9	6	17.1	62	59	95.2	3	4.8	12.3	4.02	0.045*	0.07	0.204
	English Learners	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	11.4	0.17	0.68	1.00	0.120
	Students with Disabilities	0	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Sources: TEA Confidential Class of 2017 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, updated on 6/6/2019; TEA Confidential Class of 2018 Five-Year Longitudinal Summary Report, 6/4/2020

Notes: For state accountability five-year graduation rates with exclusions, a class size of 12,204 was used for HISD Class of 2017 and a class size of 12,789 was used for HISD Class of 2018. Wisdom HS results are pending. \*p<0.05; -no results reported for less than five students.

Table F-1. Background Non-Achiev Student-Le	d Characterist ve 180 Prograi vel Propensity	ics of 2019 n Students / Score Ma	–2020 A s in Com tching f	chieve 180 Pr parison Scho or 2019–2020	ogram Pa ols, Befo District-L	articipa re and a evel As	nts and After ssessments
(DLA) Perfo	ormance Analy	yses, Engli	sh Lang	juage Arts and	d Mathem	atics	
		Be	fore Mat	ching	A	After Ma	tching
	Dist	rict Learning	g Assess	sment (DLA), E	nglish Lar	nguage	Arts
				-Point			-Point
		Ν	%	Difference	Ν	%	Difference
Achieve 180 Program	Mala	19,215	52.7	1 1	7,676	52.6	0.1
Non-Achieve 180	Male	72,820	51.6	1.1	7,681	52.7	-0.1
Achieve 180 Program	Gifted/	2,067	5.7	1 0	1,251	8.6	2.0
Non-Achieve 180	Talented	10,569	7.5	-1.0	1,549	10.6	-2.0
Achieve 180 Program	SWD	3,889	10.7	1 /	1,444	9.9	0.6
Non-Achieve 180	500	13,123	9.3	1.4	1,351	9.3	0.0
Achieve 180 Program	Eco.	34,669	95.1	0.2	14,006	96.0	07
Non-Achieve 180	Disadv.	134,008	94.9	0.2	13,900	95.3	0.7
Achieve 180 Program	At Risk	30,250	82.9	0.7	11,925	81.8	-0.3
Non-Achieve 180	ATRISK	116,077	82.2	0.7	11,973	82.1	0.0
Achieve 180 Program	STAAR Mean Score	19,657	2286	129	14,584	194 1	1.0
Non-Achieve 180	(English)	61,590	2157	125	14,584	194 0	1.0
		District Lea	arning A	ssessment (DL	A), Mathe	matics	
Achieve 180 Program	Male	19,162	52.6	1.0	6,004	52.9	0.0
Non-Achieve 180	Male	72,672	51.6	1.0	6,007	52.9	0.0
Achieve 180 Program	Gifted/	2,066	5.7	-18	883	7.8	-1.0
Non-Achieve 180	Talented	10,565	7.5	-1.0	1,005	8.8	-1.0
Achieve 180 Program	SWD	3,879	10.7	1 4	1,175	10.3	1 1
Non-Achieve 180	000	13,097	9.3	1.7	1,048	9.2	1.1
Achieve 180 Program	Eco.	34,603	95.1	0.2	10,971	96.6	1.0
Non-Achieve 180	Disadv.	133,783	94.9	0.2	10,860	95.6	
Achieve 180 Program	At Risk	30,179	82.9	0.7	9,268	81.6	-0.5
Non-Achieve 180		115,844	82.2	0.1	9,328	82.1	0.0
Achieve 180 Program	STAAR Mean Score	11,360	1587	-7.0	2,091	158 7	7.0
Non-Achieve 180	(English)	39,292	1594	1.0	2,091	158 0	7.0

## Appendix F: Program Impacts on Student Achievement

Source: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; TEA-ETS summary report, January 2021, TEA-ETS 2020 Student Data Files Notes: Propensity score matching with replacement was used to match students on the identified background

characteristics (covariates), including their prior State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) performance in the related subject area for students in grades 3–8 and STAAR EOC exams for high school students (excludes STAAR Alt. 2 Tests). Green highlight shows after-match favorable results for Achieve 180 Program participants. SWD means Students with Disabilities. Eco. Disadv. means Economically Disadvantaged.

Table F-2. T-Test Results for for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA)Performance on English Language Arts and Mathematics Using Student Propensity ScoreMatching for 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program and Comparison Non-Achieve 180 SchoolStudents

			Englis	sh Langi	Jage Arts				
		N	Mean Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	% Difference Between Achieve 180 Program & Comparison	t	df	<i>p</i> Value (2- tailed)
Before	Achieve 180 Program	19,001	52.2	0.147	20.297	_4 7	24 280	11011	0.000*
Matching	Non-Achieve 180	27,863	56.9	0.127	21.166	-4.7	24.200	41911	0.000
After	Achieve 180 Program	14,584	54.2	0.164	19.755	-0.5	-2 152	29166	0.032*
Matching	Non-Achieve 180	14,584	54.7	0.169	20.38	-0.5	-2.102	23100	0.032
			Ν	<b>/</b> athema	atics				
		N	Mean Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	% Difference Between Achieve 180 Program & Comparison	t	df	p Value (2- tailed)
Before	Achieve 180 Program	15,263	43.9	0.164	20.287	6.0	24.245	25425	0.000*
Matching	Non-Achieve 180	24,634	50.7	0.145	22.779	-0.0	31.315	30130	0.000
After	Achieve 180 Program	11,360	44.8	0.187	19.952	2.0	7 504	22718	0.000*
Matching	Non-Achieve 180	11,360	42.8	0.191	20.386	2.0	7.504	22110	0.000

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; TEA-ETS summary report, January 2021, TEA-ETS 2020 Student Data Files

Notes: Propensity score matching with replacement was used to match students on the identified background characteristics (covariates), including their prior State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) performance in the related subject area for students in grades 3–8 and STAAR EOC exams for high school students (excludes STAAR Alt. 2 Tests). Green highlight shows after-match favorable results for Achieve 180 Program participants.

Table F-3. T-T (EL	est Results for Treatment E A) Performance Using Stud	ffects on ent Prop	2019–2020 ensity Score	District-Le Matching	vel Assess for 2019–2	sments (DLA) E 2020 Achieve 1	English La 80 Progra	anguage am and	Arts
Cor	nparison Non-Achieve 180	School S <sup>.</sup>	tudents by 2	2019–2020	Achieve 1	80 Program Tie	r		
	ELA	n	Mean Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	%-pt. Difference Between Achieve 180 Program & Comparison	t	df	p Value (2-tailed)
	Achieve 180 Tier 3	3,836	51.2	0.322	19.959	2.1	7 700	7960	0.000*
	Comparison-Tier 3	8,150	54.3	0.232	20.985	-3.1	1.100	1002	0.000
	Achieve 180 Tier 2	3,618	48.3	0.349	20.973	-5.6	13 552	6800	0.000*
	Comparison-Tier 2	8,084	53.9	0.231	20.755	-5.0	10.002	0030	0.000
Before	Achieve 180 Tier 1	4,552	55.7	0.286	19.325	-15	4 312	8581	0.000*
Matching	Comparison-Tier 1	13,538	57.2	0.184	21.384	1.5	4.012	0001	0.000
	Achieve 180 Area Support	3,438	49.7	0.353	20.693	-8.2	20 179	5857	0.000*
	Comparison-Area Support	11,230	57.9	0.202	21.373	0.2	20.175	5057	0.000
	Achieve 180 Light Support	3,557	55.2	0.329	19.615	-0.8	2 195	6682	0.028*
	Comparison-Light Support	9,575	56.0	0.212	20.697	0.0	2.100	0002	0.020
	Achieve 180 Tier 3	3,134	52.9	0.352	19.706	-1 4	-2 856	6266	0.004*
	Comparison-Tier 3	3,134	54.3	0.364	20.360		2.000	0200	0.001
	Achieve 180 Tier 2	2,546	50.5	0.404	20.392	-0.7	-1 257	5090	0 209
	Comparison-Tier 2	2,546	51.2	0.407	20.512	0.1	1.207	0000	0.200
After Matching	Achieve 180 Tier 1	3,675	57.0	0.312	18.930	13	2 827	7348	0 005*
, and matching	Comparison-Tier 1	3,675	55.7	0.341	20.648	1.5	2.021	7340	0.000
	Achieve 180 Area Support	2,444	52.4	0.409	20.221	-2.8	-4 745	4886	0.000*
	Comparison-Area Support	2,444	55.2	0.411	20.303	2.0	-1.1-5	-1000	0.000
	Achieve 180 Light Support	2,785	57.2	0.359	18.953	0.4	0.650	5568	0.516
	Comparison-Light Support	2,785	56.8	0.371	19.572	7.0	0.000	5500	0.010

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520 Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

Table F-4. T-T Usi Ach	est Results for Treatment Ef ng Student Propensity Score nieve 180 School Students by	fects on 2 Matchin y 2019–20	2019–2020 D g for 2019–2 020 Achieve	istrict-Lev 2020 Achie 180 Progra	el Assessi ve 180 Pro am Tier	ments (DLA) Ma ogram Tiers and	thematics and Comp	Perforn arison	nance Non-				
	Mathematics	n	Mean Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	%-pt. Difference Between Achieve 180 Program & Comparison	t	df	p Value (2- tailed)				
	Achieve 180 Tier 3	3,201	39.5	0.320	18.084	2.2	0 102	6629	0.000*				
	Comparison-Tier 3	7,255	42.7	0.231	19.704	-3.2	0.103	0020	0.000				
	Achieve 180 Tier 2	2,664	44.2	0.404	20.833	-3.3	6 661	5560	0.000*				
	Comparison-Tier 2	5,869	47.5	0.296	22.646	-5.5	0.001	5500	0.000				
Before	Achieve 180 Tier 1	4,148	46.0	0.313	20.177	-3.3	9.025	7639	0.000*				
Matching	Comparison-Tier 1	12,971	49.3	0.196	22.275	-0.0	3.023	1055	0.000				
	Achieve 180 Area Support	3,053	41.7	0.367	20.289	-10.8	25 204	5526	0.000*				
	Comparison-Area Support	11,025	52.5	0.224	23.481	10:0	20.204	0020	0.000				
	Achieve 180 Light Support	2,197	48.7	0.453	21.218	-2.6	4 972	3781	0.000*				
	Comparison-Light Support	7,739	51.3	0.261	22.966	2.0	4.072	0/01	0.000				
	Achieve 180 Tier 3	2,608	40.3	0.355	18.128	25	5 362	5214	0 000*				
	Comparison-Tier 3	2,608	37.8	0.325	16.613	2.0	0.002	0214	0.000				
	Achieve 180 Tier 2	1,814	46.1	0.480	20.439	0.9	1 191	3626	0 234				
	Comparison-Tier 2	1,814	45.2	0.539	22.961	0.0	1.101	0020	0.204				
After Matching	Achieve 180 Tier 1	3,272	46.3	0.348	19.896	3.8	7 693	6542	0.000*				
, and matching	Comparison-Tier 1	3,272	42.5	0.353	20.165	0.0	1.000	00.2	0.000				
	Achieve 180 Area Support	2,091	43.4	0.438	20.014	-1 7	-2 5814	4180	0.01*				
	Comparison-Area Support	2,091	45.1	0.465	21.242		2.0011		0.01				
	Achieve 180 Light Support	1,575	49.2	0.523	20.766	3.5	4 733	3148	0.000*				
	Comparison-Light Support	1,575	45.7	0.520	20.643	3 3.5 4.733 3148 0.0							

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520

Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. Propensity Score Matching results are used in t-test analyses to compare DLA mean scores.

2019-2020 ACHIEVE 180 PROGRAM EVALUATION, PART B

Table F-5. T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) English Language Arts (ELA)Performance Using Student Propensity Score Matching for 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tiers and and ComparisonNon-Achieve 180 School Students by 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tier and School

						%Point Difference Between Achieve			
Before			Mean		_	180 Program &			p Value
Matching	ELA	n	Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	Non-Achieve 180	t	df	(2-tailed)
	Deady MS**	626	54.2	0.832	20.822	-0.2	0.255	1104	0.799
	Comparisons_Deady MS	1,828	54.4	0.498	21.285				
	Henry MS	741	50.8	0.747	20.348	-5.0	6.122	990	0.000*
	Comparisons_Henry MS	4,889	55.8	0.298	20.838				
	Highland Heights ES	111	44.7	1.929	20.321	-4.4	2.136	150	0.034
	Comparisons_Highland Heights ES	716	49.1	0.800	21.405				
	High School Ahead Acad. MS^	152	56.6	-	-		-	_	_
	NO Comparisons_High School Ahead Acad. MS	-	-	-	_				
Tier 3	Kashmere HS	372	51.8	0.921	17.758	-2.0	1.855	631	0.064*
	Comparisons_Kashmere HS	1,466	53.8	0.521	19.960				
	North Forest HS	450	53.2	0.858	18.192	-0.6	0.596	808	0.551
	Comparisons_North Forest HS	1,466	53.8	0.521	19.960				
	Sugar Grove MS***	690	47.9	0.782	20.541	-6.1	5.338	1346	0.000*
	Comparisons_Sugar Grove MS	666	54.0	0.830	21.418	-			
	WesleyES	135	46.6	1.494	17.358	-12.8	6.477	321	0.000*
	Comparisons_ Wesley ES	272	59.4	1.291	21.297				
	Williams MS***	410	54.3	1.003	20.307	2.5	2.118	721	0.035*
	Comparisons_Williams MS	1,317	51.8	0.596	21.632		_		
After									
Watering							_		
							-		
	Doody/MS**	568	55.3	0.861	20.518	-3.7	3.014	1134	0.003*
	Comparisons Deady MS	568	59.0	0.871	20.310	-			
	Henry MS	651	52.1	0.786	20.754				
	Comparisons Henry MS	651	54.4	0.840	21.436	-2.3	1.948	1300	0.052
	Highland Heights ES	59	47.1	2 6 2 4	20.156				
	Comparisons, Highland Heights ES	59	54.2	2.588	19.876	-7.1	1.932	116	0.056
	High School Abead Acad MSA	-	04.2	-	-				
	NO Comparisons High School Ahead Acad MS	_	ł	-	_	-	-	-	-
Tier 3	Kashmere HS	294	52.7	1.036	17.764				
	Comparisons Kashmere HS	294	53.0	1.029	17.650	-0.3	0.200	586	0.841
	North Forest HS	391	54.1	0.886	17.511				
	Comparisons North Forest HS	391	51.8	0.925	18,300	2.3	1.777	780	0.076
	Sugar Grove MS***	534	50.0	0.885	20.448				
	Comparisons Sugar Grove MS	534	52.1	0.922	21.309	-2.1	1.665	1066	0.096
	Wesley ES	69	48.0	2.056	17.078				
	Comparisons Wesley ES	69	54.0	2,785	23.136	-6.0	1.712	136	0.089
	Williams MS***	339	56.5	1.047	19,284				
	Comparisons Williams MS	339	55.9	1.079	19.871	0.6	0.412	676	0.681

Table F-5. T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) English Language Arts (ELA)													
Performance Using Student Propensity Score Matching for 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tiers and and Comparison													
Non-Achieve 180 School Students by 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tier and School (Continued)													
Before			Mean			%Point Difference Between Achieve 180 Program &			p Value				
Matching	ELA	n	Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	Non-Achieve 180	t	df	(2-tailed)				
Tier 2	Attucks MS	369	57.3	1.077	20.695	9.4	6.045	748	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Attucks MS	382	47.9	1.126	22.014								
	Comparisons Blackshear ES	630	54.6	0.823	20.656	2.1	1.168	208	0.244				
	Bruce ES	171	53.8	1.501	19.630								
	Comparisons Bruce ES	743	59.5	0.810	22.070	-5.7	3.347	278	0.001*				
	C Martinez ES	137	52.8	1.523	17.827		1 207	105	0.464				
	Comparisons_C Martinez ES	1,020	55.1	.683	21.821	-2.3	1.397	195	0.164				
	Dogan ES	207	52.1	1.358	19.545	-37	2 500	286	0.013*				
	Comparisons_Dogan ES	1,401	55.8	.5787	21.661	0.7	2.000	200	0.010				
	Mading ES	173	50.3	1.600	21.042	-6.3	3.414	298	0.001*				
	Comparisons_Mading ES	505	56.6	.938	21.069								
	Thomas MS***	451	47.1	0.965	20.504	-2.5	2.049	974	0.041*				
	Washington HS	401	49.6	.762	21.635								
	Comparisons Washington HS	1 466	53.8	521	19.959	-6.8	6.574	705	0.000*				
	Wisdom HS**	1,400	36.3	0.575	18.306								
	Comparisons Wisdom HS	1,900	50.2	.434	18.926	-13.9	19.293	2132	0.000*				
	Woodson ES	167	56.4	1.666	21.525	5.0	0.000	050	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Woodson ES	719	61.4	0.822	22.036	-5.0	2.683	253	0.008*				
	Worthing HS	390	59.8	0.913	18.033	7.0	6 9 1 6	620	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Worthing HS	1,580	52.8	0.487	19.346	7.0	0.810	029	0.000				
	Yates HS	390	52.1	-	-	_	_	_	-				
	NO Comparisons_Yates HS	-	-	-	-								
After													
Matching													
Tier 2													
						9.5	5 5 4 3	612	0.000*				
	Attucks MS	307	57.6	1.164	20.394	3.5	0.040	012	0.000				
	Comparisons_Attucks MS	307	48.1	1.269	22.232								
	Blackshear ES	95	59.5	1.964	19.147	3.8	1.317	188	0.189				
	Comparisons_Blackshear ES	95	55.7	2.069	20.163		-						
	Bruce ES	105	57.2	1.909	19.564	-7.5	2.561	208	0.011*				
	Comparisons_Bruce ES	105	64.7 55 9	2.257	23.130								
	Comparisons C Martinez ES	86	56.0	2.000	21 390	-0.2	0.038	170	0.970				
	Dogan ES	130	57.4	1 641	18 715								
	Comparisons Dogan ES	130	55.5	1.762	20.087	1.9	0.786	258	0.433				
	Mading ES	109	55.1	2.083	21.751	44.5	0 700	04.0	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Mading ES	109	66.6	2.308	24.096	-11.5	3.700	216	0.000*				
	Thomas MS***	370	47.4	1.072	20.621	-0.5	0311	738	0.756				
	Comparisons_Thomas MS	370	47.9	1.043	20.071	-0.5	0.511	730	0.700				
	Washington HS	303	45.9	0.927	16.137	-7.0	5.085	604	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Washington HS	303	52.9	1.011	17.594								
		644	40.3	0.697	17.678	-5.1	5.142	1286	0.000*				
	Comparisons_vvisdom HS	644	45.4	0.706	17.911								
	Comparisons Woodson ES	93	58.3	2.3//	22.927	2.5	0.750	184	0.454				
	Worthing HS	304	59.5	1.030	17 961								
	Comparisons Worthing HS	304	52.5	0.988	17.224	6.6	4.672	606	0.000*				
	Yates HS	-		-	-								
	NO Comparisons_Yates HS	-		-	—	1 –	_	_	—				
Table F-5. T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) English Language Arts (ELA)													
---	--------------------------------------	------------	--------------	-----------	-------------------------	---	-----------	---	------------	--	--	--	--
	Performance Using Student Propensit	v Score N	latching	for 2019-	2020 Achi	ieve 180 Program	Tiers and	and Com	parison				
	Non-Achieve 180 School Students by	2019–2020	) Achiev	e 180 Pro	gram Tier	and School (Con	tinued)						
Before			Mean			%Point Difference Between Achieve 180 Program &			p Value				
Matching	ELA	n	Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	Non-Achieve 180	t	df	(2-tailed)				
	Bonham ES	237	55.5	1.419	21.853	3.3	2.183	274.203	0.030*				
	Comparisons_Bonham ES	2,836	58.8	0.397	21.136								
	Cullen MS	298	49.9	1.086	18.744	-2.0	1.294	673	0.196*				
	Comparisons_Cullen MS	382	47.9	1.126	22.014								
	Foerster ES	216	54.4	1.378	20.251	-1.7	1.086	323	0.279				
	Comparisons_Foerster ES	1,053	52.7	0.664	21.558								
	Comparing and Encode MS	510	56.1	.752	19.335	-0.8	0.617	1042	0.537				
		496	55.5	.936	21.164								
	NO Comparisons, Gragon/I incoln BK 8	400		_	_	- 1	-	-	-				
	Hilliard ES	220	50.9	1 252	20.065								
	Comparisons Hilliard ES	862	59.0	752	22.003	8.2	5.342	366	0.0000*				
Tier 1		602	55.0	812	19.923								
	Comparisons, Holland MS	2 349	55.6	.012	20.771	0.4	0.429	963	0.668				
	Lawson MS	1 173	60.7	0.557	19.061								
	Comparisons Lawson MS	3,003	56.7	383	21 012	-4.0	5.843	2343	0.000*				
	Looscan ESA	125	53.7	1.674	18 717								
	Comparisons Looscan ES	909	57.5	716	21 578	3.8	2.074	173	0.040*				
	Madison HS	902	52.1	548	16.451								
	Comparisons Madison HS	809	64.9	716	20.350	12.8	14.128	1554	0.000*				
	Pugh ES	118	62.7	1,800	19 560								
	Comparisons Pugh ES	1 950	57.4	0.483	21.313	-5.3	2.847	134	0.005*				
	Wheatley HS	301	50.5	1.118	19.398								
	Comparisons Wheatlev HS	1.466	53.8	0.521	19.959	3.3	2.660	440	0.008*				
After													
Matching													
	Bonham ES Comparisons, Bonham ES	<u>106</u>	56.2 63.4	2.086	<u>21.475</u> 21.957	-7.2	2.416	210	0.017*				
	Cullen MS	245	50.6	1.174	18.370								
	Comparisons Cullen MS	245	49.9	1.296	20.283	0.7	0.430	488	0.668				
	Foerster ES	126	56.5	1.812	20.335								
	Comparisons Foerster ES	126	57.0	1.987	22.307	-0.5	0.204	250	0.839				
	Forest Brook MS	550	57.2	0.813	19.078	0.1	0.070	1000	0.040				
	Comparisons_Forest Brook MS	550	57.1	0.827	19.394	0.1	0.072	1098	0.943				
	Gregory⊡incoln PK-8	-		-	-			323         1042         -         366         963         2343         173         1554         134         440         210         488         250         1098         -         270         1004         2128         160					
	NO Comparisons_Gregory⊡Lincoln PK-8	1		-	1	_	_						
Tior 1	Hilliard ES	136	55.9	1.728	20.146	3.0	1 2 2 5	270	0 222				
neri	Comparisons_Hilliard ES	136	58.9	1.804	21.038	-3:0	1.225	270	0.222				
	Holland MS***^	503	56.6	0.880	19.742	1.0	0.811	1004	0.417				
	Comparisons_Holland MS	503	55.6	0.901	20.206	1.0	0.011	1004	0.417				
	Lawson MS	1,065	61.0	0.582	19.001	8.1	9 4 7 3	2128	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Lawson MS	1,065	52.9	0.617	20.124	0.1	5.475	2120	0.000				
	Looscan ES^	81	54.3	2.156	19.403	-7.6	2 362	160	0.019*				
	Comparisons_Looscan ES	81	61.9	2.405	21.642	7.0	2.002	.50	0.013				
	Madison HS	779	53.1	0.566	15.805	-3.9	4,137	1556	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Madison HS	779	57.0	0.750	20.925	0.0			0.000				
	Pugh ES	84	67.1	1.984	18.181	4.7	1.521	166	0.130				
	Comparisons_Pugh ES	84	62.4	2.372	21.737								
	Wheatley HS	229	51.2	1.350	20.425	-0.1	0.060	456	0.952				
	Comparisons_Wheatley HS	229	51.3	1.223	18.501		2.300						

Table F-5. T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) English Language Arts (ELA)													
Performance Using Student Propensity Score Matching for 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tiers and and Comparison													
	Non-Achieve 180 School Students by	2019–202	0 Achiev	e 180 Pro	gram Tier	and School (Con	tinued)						
Before Matching	ELA	n	Mean Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	%-Point Difference Between Achieve 180 Program & Non-Achieve 180	t	df	р Value (2-tailed)				
	Codwell ES***	173	52.7	1.550	20.391	-1.2	0.628	312	0.531				
	Comparisons_Codwell ES	433	53.9	.964	20.067	-1.2	0.020	512	0.551				
	Cook ES	268	53.2	1.193	19.537	-8.9	6.043	552	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Cook ES	692	62.1	0.851	22.375								
	Edison MS	616	54.3	0.860	21.333	-1.4	1.454	1028	0.146				
	Comparisons_Edison MS	1,839	55.7	0.482	20.659								
	Comparisons Fondren ES	605	53.9	0.885	21 771	2.1	1.069	186	0.287				
	Key MS	551	54.5	0.805	18 910								
	Comparisons Key MS	892	52.1	.731	21.846	2.4	2.143	1290	0.032*				
	Liberty HS	168	30.7	_	_								
	NO Comparisons Liberty HS	_		-	-	-	-	-	-				
Area	Marshall ES***^	363	47.0	1.097	20.896	-15.2	13 2/1	440	0.000*				
Support	Comparisons_Marshall ES	3,567	62.2	.353	21.064	-15.2	13.241	440	0.000				
	Montgomery ES^	220	51.1	-	-	_	_	_	_				
	NO Comparisons_Montgomery ES	-		-	-								
	Sharpstown HS	773	39.5	.693	19.274	-13.1	13.968	1480	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Sharpstown HS	713	52.6	.634	16.918								
	Sherman ES****	190	54.5	1.502	20.703	-2.4	1.521	241	0.130				
	Stevens ESA	1,579	50.9	.542	21.529								
	Comparisons Stevens ES	1 671	56.8	534	21.808	-6.1	4.659	362	0.000*				
		2,365	60.9	-	-								
	NO Comparisons TCAH	_,		-	_	- 1	-	-	-				
	Young ES	133	52.1	1.595	18.394	7.0	2 5 5 2	200	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Young ES	272	59.4	1.291	21.297	-7.3	3.553	299	0.000*				
After													
Matching													
	Codwoll ES***	106	57 1	1 062	20.208								
	Codwell ES	100	57.1	1.903	20.208	1.1	0.431	210	0.667				
	Comparisons Codwell ES	106	56.0	1.807	18.602								
	Cook ES	153	56.4	1.488	18.405	111	6.077	204	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Cook ES	153	70.5	1.681	20.794	-14.1	6.277	304	0.000				
	Edison MS	551	56.0	0.895	21.016	0.7	0.543	1100	0.587				
	Comparisons_Edison MS	551	55.3	0.885	20.781	0.7	0.040	1100	0.007				
	Fondren ES^	58	57.6	2.174	16.556	-5.0	1.493	114	0.138				
	Comparisons_Fondren ES	58	62.6	2.577	19.624								
	KeyMS	473	55.3	0.878	19.104	2.2	1.746	944	0.081				
Area	Liborty HS	473	53.1	0.893	19.411								
Support	NO Comparisons Liberty HS	_		_	_	-	-	-	-				
Cappon	Marshall ES***^	194	49.5	1.494	20.803								
	Comparisons Marshall ES	194	57.9	1.431	19.927	-8.4	4.020	386	0.000*				
	Montgomery ES^	-		-	-								
	NO Comparisons_Montgomery ES	-		_	—		_	_	_				
	Sharpstown HS	565	42.9	0.767	18.241	-6.3	5.835	1128	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Sharpstown HS	565	49.2	0.755	17.936	0.0	0.000		0.000				
	Sherman ES***^	122	60.5	1.715	18.942	3.5	1.468	242	0.144				
	Comparisons_Sherman ES	122	57.0	1.681	18.571								
	Compariagna Stavana ES	147	52.1	1.616	19.598	-7.0	2.866	292	0.005*				
			59.1	1.831	22.195								
	NO Comparisons TCAH	_		_	_		-	-	-				
	Young ES	75	55.8	2.111	18.278		a ( - :						
	Comparisons_Young ES	75	56.4	2.353	20.373	-0.6	0.194	148	0.846				

Table F-5. T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) English Language Arts (ELA)													
Performance Using Student Propensity Score Matching for 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tiers and and Comparison													
	Non-Achieve 180 School Students by	2019-2020	0 Achiev	e 180 Pro	gram Tier	and School (Con	tinued)						
Before	FLA	n	Mean	Std Frr	Std Dev	%Point Difference Between Achieve 180 Program & Non-Achieve 180	+	df	p Value (2-tailed)				
matering	Belfort ECC	_	00010	-	-		•	u.					
	NO Comparisons Belfort ECC	-		_	-		-	-	-				
	Gallegos ES	108	56.3	1.898	19.720		0 5 4 7	120	0 5 9 5				
	Comparisons_Gallegos ES	1,253	55.2	0.603	21.362	-1.1	0.547	130	0.585				
	Kashmere Gardens ES	191	54.9	1.436	19.839	0.4	0 222	294	0.824				
	Comparisons_Kashmere Gardens ES	894	54.5	.686	20.514	-0.4	0.222	204	0.024				
	Lewis ES	288	58.3	1.205	20.451	0.2	0 1 2 5	367	0.901				
Light	Comparisons_Lewis ES	2,314	58.5	.437	21.001	0.2	0.120	507	0.501				
Support	Milby HS	1,117	55.0	.554	18.513	-11	1 587	2335	0 1 1 3				
	Comparisons_Milby HS	1,298	53.9	0.498	17.929		1.587         2335           0.822         1326						
	Reagan PK-8***	632	57.6	.839	21.092	-1.0	0.822	1326	0.411				
	Comparisons_Reagan PK-8	713	56.6	0.796	21.264								
	Shearn ES***^	167	57.3	1.652	21.351	3.1	1.794	201	0.074				
	Comparisons_Shearn ES	1,480	60.4	0.526	20.252								
	Westbury HS	1,054	52.7	.584	18.964	1.0	1.536	1788	0.125				
	Compansons_westbury HS	3,578	53.7	0.332	19.853								
Aftor													
Matching													
inatornig													
	Belfort ECC	-		_	_	-	_	_	_				
	NO Comparisons_Belfort ECC	-		_	_	1							
	Gallegos ES	68	60.8	2.442	20.135	0.2	0.045	124	0.064				
	Comparisons_Gallegos ES	68	61.0	2.641	21.777	-0.2	0.045	134	0.904				
	Kashmere Gardens ES	108	60.6	1.899	19.736	20	0 749	214	0 454				
	Comparisons_Kashmere Gardens ES	108	58.6	1.857	19.302	2.0	0.1 10	211	0.101				
Light	Lewis ES	151	63.1	1.637	20.122	0.5	0.198	300	0.843				
Support	Comparisons_Lewis ES	151	62.6	1.768	21.723								
	Milby HS	987	56.4	0.557	17.491	-0.2	0.267	1972	0.789				
	Comparisons_Milby HS	987	56.6	0.596	18.712								
	Reagan PK-8***	458	61.2	0.986	21.106	1.0	0.756	914	0.450				
	Comparisons_Reagan PK-8	458	60.2	0.899	19.240								
		107	62.5	2.047	21.170	-1.9	0.680	212	0.497				
	Westbury HS	006	52.9	0.505	17.006								
	Comparisons Westhury HS	906	53.0	0.595	10.362	0.6	0.775	1810	0.439				
		300		0.043	19.000	L							

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520

Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. \*Indicates statistical significance (p<0.05). \*\*Indicates a one-year Achieve 180 Program participant in 2019–2020. \*\*\*Indicates a two-year Achieve 180 Program participant in 2018–2019 and 2019–2020. ^Indicates Non-TSL Grant participant. A one-year program participant in 2017–2018 only, Victory Preparatory South HS, closed and is not listed. Green highlight indicates gap reduction or closure.

Table F-6. T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) Mathematics Performance Using Student Propensity Score Matching for 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tiers and and Comparison Nep Achieve 180													
	Student Propensity Score Matching for	r 2019–20	20 Achie	eve 180 Pi	rogram Tie	ers and and Comp	oarison N	on-Achiev	e 180				
	School Students by 2019–2020 Achiev	e 180 Pro	aram Tie	er and Sch	hool								
			J			Г Т		[]					
						%Point Difference							
						Between Achieve							
Before	Marth		Mean			180 Program &		-16	<i>p</i> Value				
Matching	Matn	n 640	Score	Sta. Err.	5td. Dev.	Comparison	τ	ατ	(2-tailed)				
	Comparisona DeaduMS	042	37.2	0.823	16.745	2.1	2.874	1179	0.004*				
		741	39.3	0.390	16.715								
	Comparisons Henry MS	1 894	41.3	0.260	18 161	6.3	9.994	1063	0.000*				
	Highland Heights ES	109	46.5	2 294	23 954								
	Comparisons, Highland Heights ES	716	46.0	0.802	21.456	-0.5	0.185	136	0.853				
	High School Abead Acad MSA	148	39.9	-	-								
	NO Comparisons, High School Ahead Acad, MS	_	00.0	_	_	-	-	-	-				
	Kashmere HS	189	38.3	1,199	16,487								
Tier 3	Comparisons Kashmere HS	744	47.2	0.848	23.117	8.9	6.060	398	0.000*				
	North Forest HS	208	48.2	1.380	19.902	4.0	0.045	070	0.500				
	Comparisons_North Forest HS	744	47.2	.848	23.117	-1.0	0.615	378	0.539				
	Sugar Grove MS***	626	38.1	0.681	17.046	0.0	0.000	4070	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Sugar Grove MS	657	40.3	0.654	16.756	2.2	2.280	1276	0.023				
	WesleyES	133	42.6	1.643	18.946	20.0	0.729	294	0.000*				
	Comparisons_ Wesley ES	277	62.6	1.237	20.590	20.0	9.730	201	0.000				
	Williams MS***	414	42.3	0.867	17.647	-5.8	5 773	707	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Williams MS	1,121	36.5	.502	16.808	-0.0	5.775	101	0.000				
After													
Matching						1							
							-						
						-1.9	2.005	1164	0.045*				
	Deady MS**	583	37.7	0.665	16.059								
	Comparisons_Deady MS	583	39.6	0.658	15.893								
	Henry MS	651	35.4	0.623	15.892	-1.8	2.034	1300	0.042*				
	Comparisons_Henry MS	651	37.2	0.590	15.059								
	Comparisona, Highland Heights ES	57	54.0	3.256	24.582	13.5	3.168	112	0.002*				
	High School Abood Acod MSA	57	40.5	2.730	20.059								
	NO Comparisons High School Aboad Acad MS			_	_	-	-	-	-				
Tier 3	Kashmere HS	143	30.3	1 3 1 5	15 731								
	Comparisons Kashmere HS	143	35.5	1.723	20.609	3.8	1.751	284	0.081				
	North Forest HS	171	48.4	1.566	20.480								
	Comparisons North Forest HS	171	36.2	1.539	20.121	12.2	5.564	340	0.000*				
	Sugar Grove MS***	478	40.0	0.795	17,383	<u> </u>	0.6-1		0.0551				
	Comparisons Sugar Grove MS	478	36.3	0.609	13.324	3.7	3.671	954	0.000*				
	WesleyES	70	42.3	2.076	17.372		0.040	400	0.004				
	Comparisons_ Wesley ES	70	53.4	2.660	22.259	-11.1	3.310	138	0.001^				
	Williams MS***	340	43.2	0.951	17.529	6.7	E 226	679	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Williams MS	340	36.5	0.868	15.997	0.7	5.220	070	0.000				

Table F-6.	. T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) Mathematics Performance Using
	Student Propensity Score Matching for 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tiers and and Comparison Non-Achieve 180
	School Students by 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tier and School (Continued)

						%-Point Difference Between Achieve			
Before			Mean			180 Program &			ø Value
Matching	Math	n	Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	Comparison	t	df	(2-tailed)
	Attucks MS	351	44.9	1.059	19.831	44.7	0.004	005	0.000*
	Comparisons_Attucks MS	363	33.2	0.822	15.652	-11.7	8.681	665	0.000*
	Blackshear ES	635	51.3	0.902	22.735	13	2 217	210	0.029*
	Comparisons_Blackshear ES	139	55.6	1.738	20.495	4.3	2.217	219	0.028
	Bruce ES	172	47.8	1.593	20.891	7.6	4 260	275	0.000*
	Comparisons_Bruce ES	736	55.4	.843	22.878	7.8	4.200	275	0.000
	C Martinez ES	164	50.9	1.517	19.423	0.0	0.0210	242	0.075
	Comparisons_C Martinez ES	1,026	50.9	.722	23.114	0.0	0.0319	243	0.975
	Dogan ES	209	45.8	1.454	21.017	67	4 229	285	0.000*
	Comparisons_Dogan ES	1,398	52.5	0.605	22.608	0.7	4.223	205	0.000
	Mading ES	173	48.7	1.658	21.810	19	0.960	323	0 338
Tier 2	Comparisons_Mading ES	507	50.6	1.059	23.847	1.3	0.300	323	0.550
1101 2	Thomas MS***	426	34.3	0.767	15.835	15	1 4 1 1	965	0 1 5 9
	Comparisons_Thomas MS	624	35.8	.694	17.340	1.5	1.411	566	0.100
	Washington HS	208	43.8	1.192	17.194	34	2 330	438	0.020*
	Comparisons_Washington HS	744	47.2	.848	23.117	0.4	2.000	400	0.020
	Wisdom HS**	481	37.1	0.993	21.780	-0.3	0 231	742	0.817
	Comparisons_Wisdom HS	1,042	36.8	.509	16.428	0.0	0.201	742	0.011
	Woodson ES	165	48.7	1.597	20.514	7.5	4 1 1 3	271	0.000*
	Comparisons_Woodson ES	730	56.2	.872	23.565				0.000
	Worthing HS	176	57.3	1.328	17.623	-87	5 479	342	0.000*
	Comparisons_Worthing HS	718	48.6	0.870	23.322	0.7	0.475	042	0.000
	Yates HS	174	37.7	-	-		_	_	_
	NO Comparisons_Yates HS	-		-	-				
After									
Matching									
						6.3	3.781	592	0.000*
	Attucks MS	297	44.9	1.150	19.827				
	Comparisons_Attucks MS	297	38.6	1.206	20.789				
	Blackshear ES	98	58.3	1.886	18.672	1.8	0.611	194	0.542
	Comparisons_Blackshear ES	98	56.5	2.077	20.562	_		-	
	Bruce ES	107	50.4	1.964	20.314	-12.7	4.625	212	0.000*
	Comparisons_Bruce ES	107	63.1	1.902	19.672				
	C Martinez ES	96	53.2	2.031	19.896	-0.3	0.093	190	0.926
	Comparisons_C Martinez ES	96	53.5	2.089	20.465				
	Dogan ES	130	46.6	1.785	20.349	-5.6	2.139	258	0.033
	Comparisons_Dogan ES	130	52.2	1.940	22.114				
Tier 2	Mading ES	109	48.6	2.102	21.948	-17.9	5.963	216	0.000*
	Comparisons_Mading ES	109	66.5	2.140	22.346				
		352	34.8	0.847	15.896	-0.4	0.332	702	0.740
	Compansons_Inomas MS	352	35.2	0.886	16.615				
		157	46.0	1.294	10.214	12.4	6.225	312	0.000*
		241	33.0	1.307	10.878				
	Comparisons Wisdom HS	241	44.5	1.479	19 545	8.4	4.408	480	0.000*
		241	52.1	2,120	20.229				
	Comparisons Woodson ES	91	60.9	2.120	21.220	-8.1	2.611	180	0.010
	Worthing HS	136	56.6	1 476	17 215				
	Comparisons Worthing HS	136	52.9	2 1 3 1	24.852	3.7	1.415	270	0.158
	Vates HS	-	52.9	2.131					
	NO Comparisons, Yates HS	_		-	-	4 –	-	-	-

Table F-6.       T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) Mathematics Performance Using													
	Student Propensity Score Matching fo	r 2010_20	20 Achie	avo 180 P	rogram Ti	ers and and Com	arison N	on-Achiev	a 180				
	Student Propensity Score Matching to	2013-20											
	School Students by 2019–2020 Achiev	'e 180 Pro	gram Lie	er and Sci	hool (Con	tinued)							
			I	T	T	1							
						%Point Difference							
Pofero			Meen			Between Achieve							
Matching	Math	n	Score	Std Frr	Std Dev	Comparison	+	df	(2-tailed)				
Matering	Bonham ES	240	51.3	1.447	22.418	Comparison	•		(2 tuneu)				
	Comparisons_Bonham ES	2,783	58.2	0.447	23.597	6.9	4.575	287	0.000*				
	Cullen MS	304	35.8	.839	14.623	2.6	2 21 1	657	0.027*				
	Comparisons_Cullen MS	363	33.2	.822	15.652	-2.0	2.211	037	0.027				
	Foerster ES	236	50.8	1.479	22.725	2.7	1.662	354	0.097				
	Comparisons_Foerster ES	1,039	53.5	0.716	23.095								
	Forest Brook MS	664	44.9	0.764	19.692	-7.6	7.219	1150	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Forest Brook MS	497	37.3	0.722	16.090								
	Gregory Lincoln PK-8	486	51.3	_	_		-	-	-				
	Hilliard ES	223	119	1344	20.067								
	Comparisons, Hilliard ES	865	57.1	778	22.892	12.2	7.896	385	0.000*				
Tier 1	Holland MS***^	589	44.6	0.823	19.982								
	Comparisons_Holland MS	2,345	40.1	0.354	17.136	-4.5	5.020	818	0.000*				
	Lawson MS	1,162	45.7	.584	19.922	16	2 2 2 0	2055	0.021*				
	Comparisons_Lawson MS	2,993	44.1	0.353	19.922	-1.8	2.320	2055	0.021				
	Looscan ES^	123	54.2	2.046	22.686	-1.3	0.618	158	0.538				
	Comparisons_Looscan ES	879	52.9	0.764	22.657	1.0	0.010		0.000				
	Madison HS	465	46.8	0.831	17.918	-1.3     0.618     158       -1.3     0.618     158       -1.0     0.583     166       -6.2     2.831     189	0.000*						
	Comparisons_Madison HS	374	35.0	.848	16.402								
	Pugn ES	142	56.3	1.711	20.389	-1.0	0.583	166	0.561				
	Wheatley HS	139	53.4	2 029	23.922								
	Comparisons Wheatley HS	744	47.2	0.848	23.117	-6.2	2.831	189	0.005*				
				0.010	20.111								
After													
Matching													
							-						
						-15.3	4.868	212	0.000*				
	Bonham ES	107	50.2	1.904	19.697								
	Comparisons_Bonham ES	107	65.5	2.493	25.790								
	Cullen MS	247	35.8	0.950	14.925	1.7	1.268	492	0.205				
	Companisons_Culien MS	125	50.9	1.924	14.519								
	Comparisons Foerster ES	125	65.2	1.900	22.204	-14.4	5.126	248	0.000*				
	Forest Brook MS	555	46.0	0.850	20.014								
	Comparisons Forest Brook MS	555	36.2	0.615	14.499	9.8	9.350	1108	0.000*				
	Gregory⊡incoln PK-8	-		-	-								
	NO Comparisons_Gregory Lincoln PK-8	-		-	-	_	-	-	-				
Tier 1	Hilliard ES	140	50.2	1.547	18.310	-7.8	3 343	278	0.001*				
ner i	Comparisons_Hilliard ES	140	58.0	1.774	20.993	7.5	0.040	270	0.001				
	Holland MS***^	502	45.5	0.902	20.213	7.6	6.393	1002	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Holland MS	502	37.9	0.766	17.161								
	Lawson MS	1,056	45.8	0.613	19.917	1.9	2.224	2110	0.026*				
		1,056	43.9	0.588	19.094								
	Comparisons Looscan ES	79	55.9	2.022	22.303	-2.5	0.702	156	0.484				
	Madison HS	375	47.5	0.906	17 539								
	Comparisons Madison HS	375	33.7	0.820	15.879	13.8	11.304	748	0.000*				
	Pugh ES	86	60.8	2.080	19.286	12	1 407	170	0.101				
	Comparisons_Pugh ES	86	56.5	2.265	21.005	4.3	1.407	170	0.161				
	Wheatley HS	115	55.7	2.159	23.151	20.0	7 084	228	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Wheatley HS	115	35.7	1.820	19.513	20.0	7.004	220	0.000				

Table F-6.       T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) Mathematics Performance Using													
	Student Propensity Score Matching fo	r 2019_20	120 Achie		rogram Ti	ers and and Com	arison N	on-Achiev	a 180				
	Och a al Officiante has 0040, 0000 A altier												
	School Students by 2019–2020 Achiev	ve 180 Pro	gram He	er and Sci	nool (Con	tinuea)							
			1	1	1	%-Roint Difference		1					
						Between Achieve							
Before			Mean			180 Program &			<i>p</i> Value				
Matching	Math	n	Score	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	Comparison	t	df	(2-tailed)				
	Codwell ES***	177	51.7	1.637	21.784	-7.0	3.616	319	0.000*				
	Cook ES	445	44.7	1.015	21.413								
	Comparisons Cook ES	705	58.5	0.911	24.193	15.4	9.912	564	0.000*				
	Edison MS	615	42.7	.809	20.052	-1.8	1 955	038	0.051				
	Comparisons_Edison MS	1,848	40.9	.403	17.334	-1.8	1.900	930	0.031				
	Fondren ESA	88	61.4	2.064	19.362	-13.6	6.015	123	0.000*				
	Key MS	562	39.4	724	17 167								
	Comparisons Key MS	860	35.6	.547	16.028	-3.8	4.134	1141	0.000*				
	Liberty HS	47	26.3	_	-	_	_	_	_				
	NO Comparisons_Liberty HS	-		-	-								
Area	Marshall ES***^	374	40.1	1.089	21.062	22.1	19.201	471	0.000*				
Support	Montgomery ES <sup>A</sup>	216	56.8	-	-								
	NO Comparisons_Montgomery ES	_		-	-	-	-	-	-				
	Sharpstown HS	342	27.6	0.809	14.967	11.1	8.855	700	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Sharpstown HS	371	38.7	0.957	18.438								
	Sherman ES****	223	45.0	1.373	20.501	9.1	6.153	303	0.000*				
	Stevens ES^	259	46.0	1.216	19.572								
	Comparisons_Stevens ES	1,799	54.4	0.541	22.927	8.4	6.294	368	0.000*				
	TCAH^	1,674	52.0	-	-	_	_	_	_				
	NO Comparisons_TCAH	-	45.4	-	-								
	Comparisons Young ES	277	45.1 62.6	1.480	20.590	17.5	9.109	327	0.000*				
	companyone_reang 20		02.0	1.201	20.000								
After													
Matching													
	Codwell ES***	109	55.2	2.031	21.201	4.9	1.601	216	0.111				
	Comparisons_Codwell ES	109	50.3	2.273	23.729								
	Cook ES	151	47.6	1.656	20.349	-17.3	6.545	300	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Cook ES	151	64.9	2.052	25.216								
	Comparisons Edison MS	552	43.5	0.866	20.355	3.3	2.944	1102	0.003*				
	Fondren ES^	58	60.3	2.505	19.074	7.0	2.086	111	0.020*				
	Comparisons_Fondren ES	58	53.1	2.380	18.129	1.2	2.086	114	0.039				
	Key MS	484	40.0	0.789	17.356	3.7	3.491	966	0.001*				
	Liborty HS	484	36.3	0.705	15.502								
Area	NO Comparisons Liberty HS	_			_		-	-	-				
Support	Marshall ES***^	194	40.1	1.383	19.265	-116	5 610	386	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Marshall ES	194	51.7	1.538	21.418	-11.0	5.010	380	0.000				
	Montgomery ES^	-		—	-		-	-	-				
	NO Comparisons_Montgomery ES	176	30.5	-	-								
	Comparisons Sharpstown HS	176	35.6	1.373	18.216	-5.1	2.838	350	0.005*				
	Sherman ES***^	129	50.3	1.764	20.032	-0.5	0 189	256	0.851				
	Comparisons_Sherman ES	129	50.8	1.893	21.506	-0.5	0.109	230	0.001				
	Stevens ESA	153	47.1	1.652	20.435	-6.3	2.503	304	0.013*				
		153	53.4	1.871	23.142								
	NO Comparisons_TCAH	-		_	-	1 - 1	-	-	-				
	Young ES	85	45.8	1.875	17.286	-14.5	4 898	168	0.000*				
	Comparisons_Young ES	85	60.3	2.287	21.081	14.5	4.550	100	0.000				

HISD Research and Accountability\_\_\_\_\_\_183

Table F-	Table F-6. T-Test Results for Treatment Effects on 2019–2020 District-Level Assessments (DLA) Mathematics Performance Using           Student Propensity Score Matching for 2019–2020 Achieve 180 Program Tiers and and Comparison Non-Achieve 180													
	Student Propensity Score Matching to School Students by 2010, 2020 Achiev	or 2019–20	20 Achie	eve 180 Pl	rogram Ti	ers and and Com	barison No	on-Achiev	e 180					
	School Students by 2019-2020 Achiev		yran ne			unueu)								
						%Point Difference								
Defens			Maan			Between Achieve			n Malua					
Matching	Math	n	Score	Std Err	Std Dov	Comparison	+	df	(2-tailed)					
Waterning	Math		30010		Std. Dev.	companison			(z-tailed)					
	Belfort ECC	-		-	-	-	-	-	-					
	NO Comparisons_Belfort ECC	-		-	-									
	Gallegos ES	109	50.1	2.037	21.269	3.1	1.440	130	0.152					
	Comparisons_Gallegos ES	1,240	53.2	0.630	22.198									
	Kashmere Gardens ES	187	43.2	1.557	21.297	7.1	4.087	279	0.000*					
	Comparisons_Kashmere Gardens ES	906	50.3	.749	22.549		-							
Light	Lewis ES	295	56.0	1.211	20.800	-1.0	0.724	398	0.470					
Support	Comparisons_Lewis ES	2,253	55.0	0.493	23.424									
	Milby HS	424	51.3	0.907	18.677	-13.4	11.675	880	0.000*					
	Comparisons_Milby HS	635	37.9	0.710	17.900		0.770	1050	0.000*					
	Reagan PK-8***	598	52.6	.886	21.662	-3.3	2.773	1259	0.006*					
	Comparisons_Reagan PK-8	708	49.3	0.797	21.219	6.5	2.014	225	0.000*					
	Comparing on Shoorn ES	179	51.4	1.705	22.805	0.0	3.614	225	0.000					
	Wostbury HS	1,440	26.1	0.602	22.091	6.1	6.490	722	0.000*					
	Comparisons Westbury HS	403	42.2	0.486	20.416	0.1	0.480	122	0.000					
	Compansons_westburyne	1,702	72.2	0.400	20.410									
After														
Matching														
						-	-	-	-					
	Belfort ECC	-		-	-									
	NO Comparisons_Belfort ECC	-		-	-									
	Gallegos ES	69	51.9	2.452	20.370	3.3	0.964	136	0.337					
	Comparisons_Gallegos ES	69	48.6	2.502	20.783		-							
	Kashmere Gardens ES	104	49.1	1.932	19.707	-9.8	3.495	206	0.001*					
	Comparisons_Kashmere Gardens ES	104	58.9	2.012	20.517									
Light	Lewis ES	149	60.4	1.607	19.620	3.2	1.293	296	0.197					
Support	Comparisons_Lewis ES	149	57.2	1.823	22.248									
	Milby HS	340	50.4	0.967	17.836	11.6	8.267	678	0.000*					
	Comparisons_Milby HS	340	38.8	1.021	18.824	0.1	0.000		0.000*					
	Reagan PK-8***	452	53.5	1.012	21.510	9.1	6.880	902	0.000*					
	Comparisons_Reagan PK-8	452	44.4	0.854	18.156	1.2	0.412	224	0.691					
		113	52.5	2.129	22.032	-1.2	0.412	224	0.081					
	Westbury HS	3/8	36.2	2.000	∠1.903 16.217	-6.1	4 4 4 7	694	0.000*					
	Comparisons Westbury HS	240	42.2	1.059	10.217	-0.1	4.447	094	0.000					
	Compansons_weswury no	340	42.3	1.058	19./30				l					

Sources: Fall PEIMS 2019, ADA>0; DLA December 2019 data REV 0520

Notes: English version DLA results. Mean score represents average percentage of correct test items divided by total test items. \*Indicates statistical significance (p<0.05). \*\*Indicates a one-year Achieve 180 Program participant in 2019–2020. \*\*\*Indicates a two-year Achieve 180 Program participant in 2019–2020. ^Indicates Non-TSL Grant participant. A one-year program participant in 2017–2018 only, Victory Preparatory South HS, closed and is not listed. Green highlight indicates gap reduction or closure **Appendix G: Fidelity of Program Implementation** 

Table G-1.	Table G-1. Achieve 180 Program Implementation Dashboard, 2019–2020																																	
						Tie	er 3										Tie	er 2										٦	lier 1					
Pillar a	and Support Focus	Highland Heights ES	Wesley ES	Deady MS	Henry MS	HS Ahead MS	Sugar Grove MS	Williams MS	North Forest HS	Kashmere HS	Wheatley HS	Blackshear ES	Bruce ES	Dogan ES	Mading ES	C Martinez ES	Woodson ES	Attucks MS	Thomas MS	Washington HS	WorthingHS	Wisdom HS	Yates HS	Bonham ES	Foerster ES	Hilliard ES	Looscan ES	Gregory- Lincoln K-8	Pugh ES	Cullen MS	Holland MS	Lawson MS	Forest Brook MS	Madison HS
	Leadership Team Structure	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
	Professional Learning Communities	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	1.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
Leadership	Demonstration Principal (Lead)	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0		3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5						2.5		3.0	2.0		3.0		3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0		
Excellence	Campus Culture	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	1.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Community of Practice Visits	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	1.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0
	Data Driven Instructional Specialist	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Teacher Effectiveness Data	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
Teacher Excellence	Dedicated Associate Teachers	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Model Classrooms	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
	Teacher Leaders	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5
	Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Data Analysis	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0
Instructional Excellence	Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Reading Specialist	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
	Renaissance 360	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	1.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5
	Intervention and Extension System for All Students	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5
	Data Driven Instructional Coaching	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Wednesday Extended Day PD	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
	Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs*	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
Och and Danima	Imagine Learning	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5
School Design	Imagine Math	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	IAT Manager	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5
	College and Career Readiness (High Schools)								2.5	2.5	3.0								1.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0										2.5
	Schoolwide Behavior Support System	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
Social and Emotional	Wraparound Resource Specialist or Community in Schools (CIS)	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.0
Support	Essential Position: Nurse	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Essential Position: Counselor	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Family and	FACE Specialist	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Community	Parent Communication	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	1.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Linpetretinent	Family/ Community Events	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0
9	School Average	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.3	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.3	1.8	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.9
																<u> </u>	-	Key																
											N	on-e	camp	DIE	1		Exar	nple	aabb	2	Sti	rong I	xam	pie	3									
															,		Not-	Appli	cable		,			, .										

Table G-1.	Achieve 180 Progra	m I	mp	lem	ent	atio	n D	ash	nboa	ard,	201	9–2	020	) (Co	onti	nue	d)						
							Are	ea Su	pport								L	ight S	Suppo	rt			ge
Pillar i	and Support Focus	Codwell ES	Cook ES	Fondren MS	Montgomery ES	Marshall ES	Sherman ES	Stevens ES	Young ES	Edison MS	Key MS	Liberty HS	Sharpstown HS	Texas Connections	Bellfort ECC	Gallegos ES	Kashmere Gardens ES	Lewis ES	Sheam ES	Reagan K-8	Milby HS	Westbury HS	Support Avera
	Leadership Team Structure	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.6
	Professional Learning Communities	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.4
Leadership	Demonstration Principal (Lead)		3.0			2.0	2.0		2.0						3.0	2.0				2.0			2.5
Excellence	Campus Culture	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.4
	Community of Practice Visits	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.7
	Data Driven Instructional Specialist	3.0		3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0		1.0	3.0			3.0	3.0		3.0	2.8
	Teacher Effectiveness Data	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0		2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.3
Taaabar Eyaallanaa	Dedicated Associate Teachers	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0		3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.7
reacher Excellence	Model Classrooms	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0		2.0	2.0		3.0					1.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0		2.0	2.2
	Teacher Leaders	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0		2.0		3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.7
	Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.3
	Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	1.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.6
	Data Analysis	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.8
Instructional Excellence	Essential Positions: Librarian/Interventionist					2.0		2.0	1.0							1.0							2.6
	Reading Specialist																						2.7
	Renaissance 360	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.7
	Intervention and Extension System for All Students	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.6
	Data Driven Instructional Coaching	3.0		3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0	3.0		3.0	2.8
	Wednesday Extended Day PD			3.0		2.0									_								2.7
	Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs*	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0		2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.7
School Design	Imagine Learning	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.6
ochoor beargh	Imagine Math	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	1.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.8
	IAT Manager	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.6
	College and Career Readiness (High Schools)	2.0	3.0									2.0	2.0	1.0							2.0	3.0	2.6
	Schoolwide Behavior Support System			3.0		2.0									3.0								2.6
Social and Emotional	Wraparound Resource Specialist or Community in Schools (CIS)	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.7
Support	Essential Position: Nurse	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0		1.0	3.0	3.0	3.0			2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.9
	Essential Position: Counselor	3.0	3.0	3.0		2.0	3.0	3.0		2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0			2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.8
Family and	FACE Specialist	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0			2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.8
Community	Parent Communication			3.0		3.0									2.0								2.8
Empowerment	Family/ Community Events			3.0		3.0									2.0								2.9
:	School Average	2.7	2.8	2.3	2.2	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.0	2.2	2.7	2.7	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.6
												Key								l			
					N	on-e	kamp	le	1		Exar	nple		2	St	rongl	Exam	ple	3	l			
	-										Not-	Appli	icable	2									

Source: Achieve 180 Program Administrators, 2019–2020

Appendix G:

**Relationships Between** 

**Program Implementation Fidelity** 

and

**Educator and Student Outcomes** 

Table G-2.	Correlation Results for Implementation Fidelity Component of Support for Achieve 180 Program	Ratings and	d Educator a 2019–2020	and Student	Outcomes by	Program Pill	ar and
		Principal Effectiveness	Teacher Effectiveness		Student P	erformance	
Strength of Asso (Positive/Nega	bociation htive)	School Leader	% of Teachers	% of Items	% of Items	% of Items	% of Items
Very Weak		Scorecard	Effective or	Correct	Correct	Correct	Correct
Moderate 0	.3 - <0.5	Rating	Effective on	in ELA (English)	in ELA (Spanish)	in Math (English)	in Math (Spanish)
Strong	0.5 - 1.0 Independent Variable		TADS				
	Leadership Team Structure	-0.0912	0.2533 *	0.1119	0.4664 *	0.1915	0.1576
Dilar I	Domonstration Principal (Load)	0.0552	0.2009	0.1679	0.7137	0.2002	0.0977
Leadershin	Campus Culture	0.0066	0.1323	-0.0212	0.3560	-0.0356	0.2937
Excellence	Community of Practice Visits	-0.0910	0.2635 *	0.2009	0.1121	0.2864 *	0.0038
	Data Driven Instructional Specialist	-0.0225	0.0353	0.3973 *	-0.2817	0.3725 *	-0.1856
	Average Pillar Rating	-0.0369	0.2831 *	0.2157	0.4210	0.2300	0.1699
	Teacher Effectiveness Data	0.0705	0.1862	0.3002 *	0.0838	0.4057 *	0.1903
Pilar II	Dedicated Associate Teachers	0.1366	0.0167	0.1542	0.1622	0.0793	0.3107
Teacher	Model Classrooms	0.1581	0.2873 *	0.3535 *	0.3193	0.2538 *	0.2338
Excellence	Teacher Leaders	-0.1742	0.1689	0.2084	0.3562	0.2686 *	0.1166
	Average Pillar Rating	0.0349	0.2500 *	0.3102 *	0.3211	0.3194 *	0.2846
	Curriculum Assessments, Planning & Delivery	-0.0449	0.4265 *	0.3498 *	0.0615	0.2398 *	-0.1375
	Pacing & Formative Assessment Calendar	-0.2716 ^	0.2118	0.1058	0.1567	0.2327 *	-0.0603
Bilor III	Data Analysis Eccontial Positions: Librarian/Interventionist	-0.1023	0.1911	0.1381	0.0217	0.3306 *	0.1853
Instructional	Reading Specialist	0.0262	0.4909	-0.0552	-0.4404	0.4340	-0.3508
Excellence	Renaissance 360	0.0817	0.3584 *	-0.0347	-0.0670	-0.0740	-0.0206
	Intervention and Extension System for All Students	-0.0232	0.0698	0.0795	0.1792	0.2002	0.2581
	Data Driven Instructional Coaching	0.0744	0.3408 *	0.1270	-0.4757 *	0.2680 *	-0.2767
	Average Pillar Rating	-0.1686	0.4023 *	0.1430	0.0892	0.3082 *	0.1017
	Wednesday Extended Day PD	-0.0855	0.2572	0.0076	-0.4490	0.2327	-0.2079
	Master Schedule Aligned to Student Needs	-0.0970	0.3859 *	0.1602	0.0256	0.2809 *	0.0974
Pilar IV	Imagine Learning	-0.0751	0.0095	0.0532	0.3442	0.0536	0.2551
School Design	Imagine Math	-0.2497 *	-0.0457	0.1196	0.3017	0.2095	0.1233
-	IAT Manager	0.0540	-0.0837	-0.0394	0.1072	0.1531	0.3325
	College and Career Readiness (Fight Schools)	-0.3250	0.1209	-0.0083	0 18/3	0.1596	0.6590
	Schoolwide Behavior Support System	0.1542	0.1234	0.1250	0.1043	0.2349	0.2189
Pilar V	Wraparound Resource Specialist or Community in Schools (CIS)	-0.1396	0.0999	-0.2223	0.6790 *	0.0520	0.5698 *
Social and	Essential Position: Nurse	-0.0531	-0.0570	-0.0952	0.3485	-0.0966	0.1066
Emotional	Essential Position: Counselor	-0.0615	0.2475 *	-0.0094	0.2707	-0.0175	0.1209
Support	Average Pillar Rating	-0.0559	0.1850	-0.0981	0.6385 *	0.0498	0.3777
Pilar VI	FACE Specialist	-0.0105	0.2391 *	0.1200	0.1335	0.1879	0.3076
Family and	Parent Communication	0.0924	0.3061 *	0.1781	0.5782	0.2710	0.6403 *
Community	Family/ Community Events	0.0278	0.3426 *	0.1943	0.7492 *	0.3290 *	0.8620 *
Empowerment	Average Pillar Rating	0.0042	0.3879 *	0.1220	0.4022	0.2530 *	0.4760 *

\*Indicates statistically significant at p-value <= 0.1. In theory, p-value<=0.05 or <=0.1 is acceptable to determine significance. Given the small sample sizes in this study, 0.1 is used.