ITEM A.2

What lead to the decrease in amount of students taking BOY 2019? (Pg. 12)
Student Assessment continues to work with Renaissance 360 and campuses to ensure we are assigning this formative assessment to students accurately. This includes high school students who have not met standards on the English I and II EOC assessments. It also includes ensuring the appropriate screener for our beginning readers in grades K and 1st, where progress in the Early Literacy screener indicates the student is ready to be assessed with the regular Renaissance 360 screener. As campuses identify these students in the early elementary grades, fluctuation in the numbers occur.

EOY 2019 to BOY 2019 is a significant decrease, what are we doing different this year so that doesn’t happen again? (Pg. 12)
The decrease can be attributed to several factors including the effects of summer slide and a change in the student groups represented in the data as outlined in question 1. One of the strategies HISD has embarked on during Spring 2020 is the Literacy by 3 Reboot training for teachers in grades K-3. A strong district-wide focus on effective and systematic teaching of literacy skills and comprehension in the spring will foster stronger reading instruction in the classroom, in small group instruction, and improved use of data with our youngest learners. Reading intervention courses in the middle and high schools are designed to improve students’ reading skills and a deeper comprehension of texts. During the summer of 2020, we will offer a variety of fun and engaging programs that are intended to lessen the effects of summer slide. Examples of summer school offerings include: STEM based camps, Rising 2nd Graders Camp, Fine Arts Camps, Summer camp for immigrant students and other opportunities for students to strengthen their literacy skills.

Was there a drop in a certain at-risk group, if so which one? (Pg. 12)
In alignment with the board monitoring calendar, Universal Screener MOY results by race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged students, English learners, and students receiving special education services will be provided to the board during the April board meetings.

What are we doing different than before to ensure we are going to meet our goal? (Pg. 12)
In addition to strategies outlined in question number 2, Teacher Development Specialists have been leveraged differently this year. TDS, beginning in the fall of 2019, supported campuses, teachers and students by modeling through co-teaching, providing small group support, and partnered with teachers in lesson planning. Additionally, more campuses across the district had access to and support from data driven instructional specialists, wrap around specialists and increased efforts in the district’s mentorship programs (ATM, ROSES, Project Launch, etc.)
ITEM A.2 (CONTINUED)

Is “N” total amount of students tested or those above the 40th Percentile? (For all graphs on pg. 12)
For the graphs referenced, “N” denotes the total amount tested.

Can a target line be added to all graphs like on pg. 12? (Pg. 13)
The target lines represent the Board’s goals and progress measures as set by policy. Additional graphs, such as the one on page 12, are presented to provide trustees with a disaggregated view of the results. No separate targets are set for these additional graphs.

There is a 5% point drop in BOY 18 to 19, What is this attributed to? What are we doing about this so that it does not happen again? (Pg. 14)
Similar our native English speakers’ data, the decrease from BOY 18 to BOY 19 can be attributed to the effects of summer slide, as well as a different cohort of students reflected in the data. For this group, possible factors likely include students who recently arrived to US schools, students in dual language programs for whom Spanish is not their native tongue and possibly students of Spanish decent who have not attended school. Strategies and programming outlined in question 2 of page 12 also apply to our bilingual and dual language students. During summer, the district offers PK and K summer school for English Language Learners at all elementary campuses offering summer school.

Graph says all students- does that include all grade? Or only grades that test in Spanish? (Pg. 14)
All students that took the Spanish version of the Universal Screener are included – regardless of grade.

Are Dual Language students who are dominant in English included? (Pg. 14)
Yes, all students that took the Spanish version of the Universal Screener are included

What is happening at the identified campuses that is helping them grow? (Pg. 18)
The highlighted campuses have both systemic, effective instructional practices that occur with consistency, which are known as “best practices”. They engage in student-centered professional learning communities to plan lessons, analyze data and respond to student needs. They also work collaboratively with the various academic departments to address the needs of their students such as the Multilingual and Special Education Department. Additionally, the teacher turn-over rate (5-year average) at four of the five highlighted campuses is lower than the district’s five year average.

Why are these campuses noted vs other campuses? Is it random? (Pg. 18)
Campuses that made the largest gains from the BOY to the MOY benchmark were highlighted.
ITEM A.2 (CONTINUED)

Non Achieve 180 schools are making 4-5 percentage points of progress vs 0-3 percentage points for the achieve 180 campus over the past 2/3 years. What is this attributed to, considering there are more supports are achieve 180 campus? (Pg. 17)

The tiering of A180 campuses is an ever-changing process. Campuses move up in tiers based on student achievement and growth. As campuses move to higher tiers, new campuses move into lower tiers, which causes the data to reflect limited to no movement of the lowest tiers. Academic needs will always be greater in the lowest performing A180 campuses as compared to non A180 based on the tiering system.

What is being done differently than in 17/18 and 18/19 at Achieve 180 campuses? (Pg. 17)
The Achieve 180 program continues to adapt to meet the needs of struggling campuses. Community of Practice visits are more focused with targeted district support and timelines. Teacher Development Specialist focus more to tier one instruction for the purpose of increasing student achievement and teacher capacity. Data Driven Instructional Specialists were added to each campus to help support data driven instruction. Intervention blocks have been scheduled with the Interventions Team.

What is the plan to reach the goal? The students at A180 schools are significantly less likely to take an AP or IB course, what is the long-term for our A180 schools with respect to this? And students with disabilities, is this part of students IEPs? (Pg. 17)
The district is working closely with campus leadership to ensure students at Achieve 180 campuses have access to opportunities to earn college credit while in high school (Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Dual Credit/Dual Enrollment). For example, Yates High School was recently authorized to offer the IB Diploma Programme and will expand its offerings of college level coursework in the coming school year. Similarly, at Worthing High School, the campus is expanding its Dual Credit offerings as part of its early college designation and is on track to be authorized to offer the IB Career-related programming in 2020-21. Additionally, the district has launched initiatives such as Saturday AP Academies to help set teachers and students up for success in these courses. Master AP Teachers from across the district convene to a central location and teach AP lessons and strategies to succeed on the AP exams. Novice AP teachers are also invited and encouraged to observe the lessons and use resources from the experienced AP teachers. The district also continues to centrally fund the cost of AP/IB Exams for all students, and centrally purchases dual credit textbooks and materials so that there are no costs to students and families. The district also funds Laying the Foundation Training and AP Summer Institute Training for all AP teachers. The district works with the Office of Special Education to ensure special educations students receive the appropriate accommodations in their advanced courses.
ITEM A.2 (CONTINUED)

The trend that goes down in 2018 I keep seeing over and over again. What is this attributed to? (Pg. 23)
When comparing BOY to BOY yearly, the effects of summer slide and changes in enrollment are always factors in data obtained at the start of any given school year. It does, however, indicate that students overall are not retaining basic reading and comprehension skills when direct instruction stops.

What were we doing before? What are we doing different now to get on track? (Pg. 24)
Efforts to improve collaboration between the schools’ office, campuses and the Academics team has changed how school administrators and teachers are supported. Community of Practice, once only practiced in Achieve 180 schools, is now implemented in various non-Achieve 180 campuses. The district offers more inclusive training for teachers of EL and Special Education students. The Multilingual department, as an example, has tiered support for campuses based on 2019 TELPAS data. The IAT process has become more stable on campuses over the last 3 years, and students are progress monitored using a variety of data points. This year, a PK 3 curriculum was implemented to align with the development of young learners and with the PK4 curriculum. TDS are focusing on tier 1 instruction with more fidelity and the district has invested more professional development in our Tier 2 leaders (assistant principals, campus specialists, deans, campus teacher leaders, etc.)

Who/ where did the ranges of “urgent” “intervention” “on watch” and “at or above” come from? (Pg. 24)
The ranges were provided by Renaissance 360, the Universal Screener vendor.

Why are there more students being motioned during MOY than BOY? (Pg. 24)
All students are required to test during the BOY, MOY, and EOY assessment windows. Progress monitored students (as identified on the BOY assessment) are also required to be assessed during the formal progress monitoring testing window.

Why has there been no change? (Pg. 26)
These are the students with the greatest need particularly in reading. While our special education teacher and specialist have always monitored the progress of the special education students, collaboration was limited in the past. Additionally, we have seen an increase in social, emotional and behavioral needs among our students, thus requiring additional supports specific to these needs for both students and teachers.
ITEM A.2 (CONTINUED)

What was being done before? Is it working? Has it had enough time to work? (Pg. 26)
Special Education, over the last two years, have made a concentrated effort to allocate more time and attention to instruction, pedagogy and inclusion for teachers and students. Preliminary findings are positive as special education teachers are working with regular education teachers more often in planning first instruction, analyzing data and making instructional decisions. As a district, we are moving toward cross-functional teams in how we support teachers and students. Over time, it our anticipation that these efforts will lead to better student outcomes.

What needs to change in order to there to see progress? (Pg. 26)
These are the students with the greatest need particularly in reading. While our special education teachers and specialists have always monitored the progress of the special education students, collaboration was limited in the past. Additionally, we have seen an increase in social, emotional and behavioral needs among our students, thus requiring additional supports specific to these needs for both students and teachers.

Bush Elementary has a significant increase in MOY results. Is this because a reporting failure in BOY results? Or what is happening instructionally on this campus to explain the 78 point increase? (Pg. 30)
The difference seen can be attributed to a difference in how students were tested, targeted, data-driven interventions, and one-on-one corrective reading interventions for students in greatest need.

- **Difference in testing:** Instead of testing in the previous arrangement on laptops in computer labs, the campus purchased IPads and were able to do the assessments in classrooms with higher degree of supervision. Thus, students spent more time on the test instead of clicking through it to finish quickly.
- **Targeted, data-driven interventions:** The campus dug deeply into data from the BOY and created more targeted interventions. They dug down to individual students and individual skills needed. Imagine Literacy was a tool used in interventions in each classroom.
- **One-on-One Interventions for Students With Highest Need:** Teacher Assistants pulled students with greatest need for one on one intervention utilizing the Corrective Reading method, as well as Region IV Reading Kits were used.

This is 2 years of increase in the amount of students being progress monitored. Is there a certain group that is decreasing performance more than another? (Pg. 34)
Information on student group performance will be provided during the April board meeting. Specifically, the universal screener middle-of-year (MOY) results by race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, English learners and special education student groups will be presented.
ITEM A.2 (CONTINUED)

GPM 1.1 sets a spring 2020 target of 44% of students reading on grade level as measured by the universal screener, whereas Goal 1 sets a spring 2020 target of 46% of students reading on grade level as measured by STAAR. Do we believe the former is predictive of the latter and why? That is, if we achieve the GPM 1.1 44% target, do we think we will achieve the Goal 1 46% target?

We believe the universal screener is predictive of STAAR, but the alignment is not perfect. In general, students who score higher on the screener will score higher on STAAR, and campuses (or the district) will see higher percentages of students reaching the Meets Grade Level standard on STAAR as a higher percentage of students reach the grade level benchmark on the screener. Preparedness as evidenced on the screener translates to preparedness on STAAR. Reviewing screener results has demonstrated that the grade level benchmark represents a slightly lower level of performance than the STAAR Meets Grade Level standard. The administration is working with the vendor and investigating more appropriate cut points for the screener for use in the revised progress measures that will align with the Board’s revised goals for 2020 and beyond. If past patterns of improvement between the MOY screener and actual STAAR assessment hold, then we will fall short of the 46% goal for this year.

Can you please disaggregate the data for GPM 1.1 by grade level?
Yes, we can, but this is a very involved request as we would need to go back to prior years and re-run each data set to incorporate the grade levels. Currently, our data tables are not set up that way since the GPM does not state the need. This will take several weeks given the current case load of staff. Administration requests that all data sets be discussed while setting up the new goals so these requests can be met on the front end by pre-programming. Campus leaders look at the data through their systems by grade level to track instructional changes that need to occur down to the classroom and student levels.

For GPM 1.1, can you please disaggregate the data for F-rated high school campuses between English 1 and English 2?
We are working with the test vendor to see what is possible. Because some students are in both courses, and many are in neither course (i.e. STAAR retesters), this is a more complex process.

For GPM 3.1, can you please disaggregate the reading data for F-rated high school campuses between English 1 and English 2? We are working with the test vendor to see what is possible. Because some students are in both courses, and many are in neither course (i.e. STAAR retesters), this is a more complex process.
ITEM A.2 (CONTINUED)

What is/are the primary causes of the decrease we see by grade in students reading and doing math on grade level? Student mobility (students entering HISD from other districts and/or students exiting HISD for other districts)? Summer slide? Quality of instruction during the school year? Lack of basic skills hampering students access to more advanced skills? Other?

Student Assessment continues to work with Renaissance 360 and campuses to ensure we are assigning this formative assessment to students accurately. This includes high school students who have not met standards on the English I and II EOC assessments. It also includes ensuring the appropriate screener for our beginning readers in grades K and 1st, where progress in the Early Literacy screener indicates the student is ready to be assessed with the regular Renaissance 360 screener. As campuses identify these students in the early elementary grades, fluctuation in the numbers occur. The decrease can also be attributed to several factors including the effects of summer slide.

ITEM D.1

Is the IMAT new (after HB3)?

No, it’s not new. Houston ISD’s IMAT (Instructional Materials Allotment Team) is the name HISD has given to its leadership team convened in response to Board Policy EFAA(LOCAL) Instructional Materials: Selection and Adoption. The district’s IMAT reviews the recommendations made by the district teacher review committees and approves the adoption of instructional materials board item for submission to the Board of Trustees. The current EFAA(LOCAL) policy was issued on 10/15/2013. Membership includes the Chief Academic Officer and her leadership team (including Special Education Services, Multilingual Services, and Advanced Academics), the Chief Technology Officer, and the Business Logistics and Purchasing Officer.

Are these curriculum materials completely new? Has the district used them before or are have some been used?

Most of the materials being recommended for adoption are new materials that publishers submitted to the State Board of Education (SBOE) in response to TEA’s Proclamation 2020 and were adopted by the SBOE at its November 2019 meeting. The standards (TEKS) for high school English Language Arts are new for school year 2020-2021, so publishers had to create instructional materials that aligned to those new standards. For example, the materials recommended for English I-IV have a 2021 copyright. Although the TEA called for materials for secondary ESL courses (with new standards as of 2017), no publisher submitted materials for those courses. Therefore, our HISD teacher review committees evaluated other new or current materials that are aligned to the 2017 standards and were created specifically to support instruction for English learners. All the materials being recommended to the Board were carefully evaluated by highly effective teacher reviewers against a standard rubric and identified as top choices by consensus.
ITEM D.1(CONTINUED)

Do we have data or surveys that demonstrate the validity of this curriculum?
As part of its instructional materials adoption process, TEA convenes state review panels of experienced teachers and other experts to review instructional materials. The commissioner of education appoints the review panel members from nominations submitted by educational organizations, educators, academic experts, parents, and SBOE members. Panel members review materials and report their results to the commissioner of education. Then the SBOE conducts a public hearing and finally determines by majority vote whether materials are adopted or rejected. Most of the materials HISD is recommending for district adoption are materials that TEA adopted for Proclamation 2020 (e.g., English I-IV, College Readiness and Study Skills, Communications Applications, Debate I-III, and Journalism). For Reading I-III, our committee recommended an off-list title because the state-adopted title did not adequately address the needs of district students. For other ESL courses for which no state-adopted materials were available, our teacher reviewers engaged extensively with the actual materials and reviewed the documentation and research provided by the publishers before making their recommendations.

Can you please provide evidence that this curriculum is racially equitable?
As part of the district’s review of proposed materials, teacher-reviewers evaluated each title for the degree to which it supported “a student-centered approach to learning.” Included in that section were the following criteria:

- Acknowledges and respects diversity, models cultural awareness, and encourages principles of self- and mutual respect; welcomes learners from all backgrounds
- Supports various methods of instruction and learning opportunities to accommodate multiple learning styles and preferences
- Uses technology and instructional strategies to allow students to explore, discover, and investigate ideas of their own choosing
- Employs principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to maximize accessibility to instructional materials and activities
- Differentiates instruction for students with disabilities
- Differentiates instruction for English language learners
- Differentiates instruction for students (including gifted students) ready to extend their learning
- Materials that did not systematically and comprehensively reflect inclusivity, respect, and authentic and diverse voices were not recommended
ITEM D.1(CONTINUED)

Will this curriculum help us reach the goals set for our students? Please provide evidence.
The teacher-reviewers selected engaging materials with a tight alignment to state standards that reflected effective instructional strategies and practices appropriate to the students in HISD. In their reviews, the district reviewers made specific mentions of the degree to which recommended programs aligned vertically from grade to grade, supported all students and learning styles across every level of achievement, provided useful supplementary materials, benefited both new and experienced teachers, reflected contemporary and authentic voices, and — in the case of English learners — were designed specifically to address second language instruction for secondary students.

ITEM H.1

Was this part of the original bond budget for this specific school?
No. This work will be accomplished using Board-approved re-aligned funds budgeted for Lawson Middle School.

Are the funds to maintain the track built into the budget after year 1?
There are no additional funds added to the Facilities Maintenance & Operations budget to maintain this improvement. Any cost will be absorbed by the existing Maintenance budget.

How does the approval of this contract help us reach the goals set for our students? Please provide evidence.
This item supports one or more departmental goals established by the Coordinated School Health/Secondary Curriculum and Development Department. Multiple studies, including a 2005 report published in the Journal of Pediatric (titled “Evidence-based Physical Activity for School Age Youth”), have confirmed that health benefits are associated with physical activity, including cardiovascular and muscular fitness, bone health, psychosocial outcomes, and cognitive and brain health. Additionally, at least 11 correlational studies of physical activity during the school day demonstrate a positive relationship to academic performance. Another source of data on this subject is a 2011 report, “The Association Between School-based Physical Activity, including Physical Education, and Academic Performance: A Systematic Review of the Literature” authored by C.N. Rasberry et al., published in Preventive Medicine Journal. The National Institute of Health, the Center for Disease Control, universities, and several non-profit organizations have also published research information on this subject.
ITEM H.2

Was this part of the original bond budget for this specific school?
Yes, it was.

How does the approval of this contract help us reach the goals set for our students? Please provide evidence.
This item supports the goals set for our students by allowing the school to accommodate multiple physical education and sports activities at the campus during late fall and early spring without impacting the earlier part of the academic day. Multiple correlational studies demonstrate a positive relationship between physical activity and academic performance. One source of evidence on this matter is a 2011 report, “The Association Between School-based Physical Activity, including Physical Education, and Academic Performance: A Systematic Review of the Literature” authored by C.N. Rasberry et al., published in Preventive Medicine Journal. Another 2005 report published in the Journal of Pediatric (titled “Evidence-based Physical Activity for School Age Youth”), confirmed that numerous health benefits are associated with physical activity, including cardiovascular and muscular fitness, bone health, psychosocial outcomes, and cognitive and brain health. Additionally, the National Institute of Health, the Center for Disease Control, universities, and several non-profit organizations have also published research information on this subject.

ITEM H.3

Are these schools self-selected?
No. Each year, the Executive Director of the SPARK program selects schools (usually 4 to 6 campuses) from around the Houston area to receive a new SPARK Park or a re-SPARK improvement of an existing SPARK park.

ITEM I.1

94 - 18-01-05: What was the original amount? How much is the increase?
The original amount is $900,000. This increase request is for $180,000, which will take us through August 2022.

95 - 18-04-10: What was the original amount? How much is the increase?
The original amount is $320,000. This increase request is for $64,000, which will take us through November 2022.
ITEM I.1

How does the approval of this contract help us reach the goals set for our students? Please provide evidence.
This contract is for an armored car service to pick up all cash from campuses and take the funds to be deposited in the bank. This is for the overall safety of the staff. This protects our staff from any type of armed encounter (i.e., being robbed at gunpoint).

Can you please provide evidence that these programs/vendors are effective?
There have not been any robberies of staff related to cash being deposited at the bank for several years.

What data/metrics are you using to measure this?
There have been no crimes recently reported related to this issue.

ITEM I.3.A

If grant began in January of 2019, why is this on there again? Has there been a change?
The Confucius Institute, which is an organization affiliated with the Government of China, operates on a different fiscal cycle than our school district. This is the pre-deposit amount for 2020, because our disbursement is usually mid-year. The funding agency requires a budget proposal by the Confucius Institute (CI) Manager – HISD district employee for each year of funding.