

Office of the Board of Education  
Board of Education Meeting of October 12, 2017

Wanda Adams, President and District IX Trustee

**SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF PROPOSED LONE STAR GOVERNANCE  
CONSTRAINT PROGRESS MEASURES**

The purpose of this agenda item is to seek approval from the Houston Independent School District (HISD) Board of Education of Lone Star Governance constraint progress measures. Approval of the constraint progress measures is required for compliance with Lone Star Governance requirements.

On August 10, 2017, the board approved Lone Star Governance constraints; these constraints are reiterated, and the proposed constraint progress measures are described, in the attachment to this request.

COST/FUNDING SOURCE(S): None

STAFFING IMPLICATIONS: None

ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS/IMPACT: This agenda item supports all six HISD goals and is aligned to all five core initiatives.

THIS ITEM DOES NOT REQUIRE CONSULTATION.

THIS ITEM DOES NOT ESTABLISH, MODIFY, OR DELETE BOARD POLICY.

RECOMMENDED: That the Board of Education approves the proposed constraint progress measures, effective October 13, 2017.

## Constraint Progress Measures

### Constraint 1

The superintendent shall not permit the district to operate without a community school and feeder pattern framework, including a definition, processes, and goals.

### Constraint Progress Measure 1.1:

The district will launch cohort one of Every Community, Every School with a minimum of 15 schools by the end of the 2017–2018 school year and will increase annually until all schools are served in 2022.

### Constraint Progress Measure 1.2:

The district will develop tools for campuses to conduct a needs assessment, to access to a provider database, a data tracker, and professional development in 2017-2018 and will increase usage annually until all campuses access the tools and training by 2022.

## Constraint Progress Measures

### Constraint 2

The superintendent shall not require teachers to administer more than two district-created assessments per semester.

### Constraint Progress Measure 2.1:

The number of district-required, district-created assessments will not exceed two per semester starting with Fall 2017.

## Constraint Progress Measures

### Constraint 3

The superintendent shall not allow achievement gaps for student groups, including African-American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged students, students receiving special education services, and English language learners (ELLs), to increase in reading, writing, and mathematics.

### Constraint Progress Measure 3.1:

The reading performance gap will decrease by 1 percentage point annually for African-American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged students, students receiving special education services, and English language learners (ELLs) ~~by~~ through 2020.

CPM: Reading		2016	2017(0)	2018(1)	2019(2)	2020(3)
White/African-American	Goal			32	31	30
	Gap	31	33	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
White/Hispanic	Goal			27	26	25
	Gap	27	28	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-Econ. Dis./Econ. Dis.	Goal			19	18	17
	Gap	19	20	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-SPED/SPED	Goal			45	44	43
	Gap	47	46	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-ELLs/ELLs	Goal			29	28	27
	Gap	28	30	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---

source: TEA-ETS STAAR 3-8 and EOC Student Data Files, 2016 and 2017

Note: First/Spring Administration Results only. STAAR Alt. 2 excluded. Results include STAAR 3-8 and English I and II EOCs.

First time testers and retesters included. Gaps calculated on Approaches Grade Level Standard.

## Constraint Progress Measures

### Constraint Progress Measure 3.2:

The writing performance gap will decrease by 1 percentage point annually for African-American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged students, students receiving special education services, and English language learners (ELLs) ~~by~~ through 2020.

CPM: Writing		2016	2017(0)	2018(1)	2019(2)	2020(3)
White/African-American	Goal			28	27	26
	Gap	28	29	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
White/Hispanic	Goal			23	22	21
	Gap	24	24	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-Econ. Dis./Econ. Dis.	Goal			21	20	19
	Gap	22	22	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-SPED/SPED	Goal			48	47	46
	Gap	50	49	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-ELLs/ELLs	Goal			22	21	20
	Gap	26	23	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---

source: TEA-ETS STAAR 3-8 Student Data Files, 2016 and 2017

Note: First/Spring Administration Results only. STAAR Alt. 2 excluded. Results include grades 4 and 7 Writing.

Gaps calculated on Approaches Grade Level Standard.

## Constraint Progress Measures

### Constraint Progress Measure 3.3:

The mathematics performance gap will decrease by 1 percentage point annually for African-American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged students, students receiving special education services, and English language learners (ELLs) ~~by~~ through 2020.

CPM: Mathematics		2016	2017(0)	2018(1)	2019(2)	2020(3)
White/African-American	Goal			26	25	24
	Gap	31	27	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
White/Hispanic	Goal			16	15	14
	Gap	19	17	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-Econ. Dis./Econ. Dis.	Goal			12	11	10
	Gap	16	13	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-SPED/SPED	Goal			43	42	41
	Gap	45	44	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---
Non-ELLs/ELLs	Goal			13	12	11
	Gap	14	14	---	---	---
	%Pt Diff			---	---	---

source: TEA-ETS STAAR 3-8 and EOC Student Data Files, 2016 and 2017

Note: First/Spring Administration Results only. STAAR Alt. 2 excluded. Results include STAAR 3-8 and Algebra I EOC.

First time testers and retesters included. Gaps calculated on Approaches Grade Level Standard.

## Constraint Progress Measures

### Constraint 4

The superintendent will not allow struggling schools to operate without highly qualified leaders and teachers in core subjects.\*

\* Struggling schools will include Improvement Required (IR) schools, formerly IR schools, and schools in danger of IR. Teacher qualification should consider certification and experience.

### Constraint Progress Measure 4.1:

The percentage of campus administrators at struggling schools rated as effective or above will increase by two percentage points annually to 73% by 2020.

Measure: Effective Campus Administrators	2015	2016	2017(0)	2018(1)	2019(2)	2020(3)
Goal			67%	69%	71%	73%
Results	47%	65%	---	---	---	---
%Pt Diff			---	---	---	---

Source: School Leader Appraisal Scorecards, 2014-15 and 2015-16

Note: A struggling campus is defined as being rated IR, formerly IR, or in danger of IR.

In danger of IR is defined as a campus within 3 index points of missing index 2, 3, or 4. Annually, new struggling schools may be add, but none removed as they make improvement to get off the list. 2017 will be used as the baseline year. Goals will be updated when data becomes available.

### Constraint Progress Measure 4.2:

The percentage of first year teachers at struggling schools will decrease by 2 percentage points annually to 4% by 2020.

Measure: First Year Teachers	2016	2017(0)	2018(1)	2019(2)	2020(3)
Goal			8%	6%	4%
Results	14%	10%	---	---	---
%Pt Diff			---	---	---

Source: HRIS Employee Roster, 11/4/2015 and 11/6/2016; teachers with zero years experience.

Note: A struggling campus is defined as being rated IR, formerly IR, or in danger of IR.

In danger of IR is defined as a campus within 3 index points of missing index 2, 3, or 4.

### Constraint Progress Measure 4.3:

The percent of core courses at struggling schools taught by teachers certified in their assigned subject areas will increase each semester until 100% is reached and maintained through 2020.