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## CHILDREN AT RISK School Rankings Methodology

## | || <br> III

## Elementary and Middle School

High School

| Student <br> Achievement | Achievement <br> \& Poverty | Student <br> Growth | College <br> Readiness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

## CHILDREN AT RISK School Rankings Methodology



## C@R School Rankings Indicator Analysis:

## Statewide Performance

## Third Grade Reading

Percentage of students performing at Level III
Advanced on the STAAR Reading exam in the $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade

## Algebra I

Percentage of students performing at Level III Advanced on the STAAR Algebra I End of Course exam

## Average SAT Score

The average SAT score (reading and math only)

## C@R Graduation Rate

The highest of each campus' four-, five-, or six- year graduation rates using the
May 2015 graduating cohorts


Third - Fifth Grade
Reading + Math

Percentage of students performing at Level III Advanced on the STAAR Reading + Math exams in grades 3-5
English I + II

Percentage of students
performing at Level III
Advanced on the STAAR
English I and II End of Course exams

## College Readiness

Percentage of 2015 high school graduates who scored at or above TEA-defined criterion on either the SAT (1110 reading and math combined) or ACT (24 composite)

## children

atRisk

## School Rankings Indicator Analysis:

## Statewide Change Over Time

| Indicators | Current Year <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | Change Since <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - 1 5}$ | Change Since <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 1 4}$ | Overall Change <br> in 3 years |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3rd Grade Reading | $\mathbf{2 3 \%}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| 3rd-5th Grade Reading \& Math | $\mathbf{2 1 \%}$ | $19 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 4 \%}$ |
| Algebra I | $15 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 5 \%}$ |
| English I \& II | $7 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $\mathbf{+ 2 \%}$ |
| Average SAT Score (Reading \& Math) | 948 | 954 | 957 | $\mathbf{- 9}$ points |
| College Readiness | $24 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 1 \%}$ |
| C@R Graduation Rate | $88 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |

This analysis captures data from 250 counties
with over 959 public school districts and 127 charter districts and nearly 5.2 million students

# School Rankings Indicator Analysis: 

Comparison of the \% Change Year-Over-Year Across 5 Major Regions

| Region | \# of <br> Schools | \% Eco Dis | Reading \& Math Gr. 3-5 | Algebra I | English I \& II | Average SAT Score | College Readiness | C@R Grad Rate | Overall Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TARRANT COUNTY $\begin{aligned} + & =\text { Keller ISD } \\ \text { - } & \text { H-E-B ISD } \end{aligned}$ | 462 | 54\% | + 3\% | + 3\% | + 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | +8\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AUSTIN } \\ & \quad+=\text { Hutto ISD } \\ & \quad \text { - }=\text { Lockhart ISD } \end{aligned}$ | 438 | 48\% | + 1\% | + 2\% | + 1\% | - 1\% | 0\% | + 1\% | + 4\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SAN ANTONIO } \\ & \quad+=\text { Lackland ISD } \\ & \text { - = Marion ISD } \end{aligned}$ | 552 | 60\% | + 2\% | + 4\% | + 1\% | - 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | + 4\% |
| ```HOUSTON + = Gateway Academy - = Hardin ISD``` | 1383 | 59\% | + 2\% | + 3\% | + 1\% | - 1\% | - 1\% | 0\% | + 4\% |
| NORTH TEXAS <br> + = Forney ISD <br> = Avalon ISD | 1724 | 54\% | + 2\% | + 2\% | + 1\% | - 1\% | - 2\% | 0\% | + 2\% |

## Average SAT Scores (Reading \& Math):

## High Schools Across the State

\% Economically Disadvantaged \& Average Combined Math/Reading SAT Score


## School Grade Analysis

## 7,805 Elementary, Middle, \& High Schools


children atRisk

## Percent of Schools by Region with a CHILDREN AT RISK A or B Grade


children atRisk

## School Grade Analysis:

## Comparison of the \% of A/B Schools Across Harris County Districts


children
atRiSTK Source: CHILDREN AT RISK 2017 School Rankings. Spring 2016 data from the Texas Education Agency.

## School Grade Analysis:

Comparison of the \% of A/B Schools Across Dallas County Districts

| District | \# of Schools | \% Eco Dis | \% A/B | \% A/B Grades in 2015-16 | \% Change from 2014-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HIGHLAND PARK ISD | 7 | 82\% | 100\% |  | + 0\% |
| SUNNYVALE ISD | 3 | 76\% | 100\% |  | + 0\% |
| COPPELL ISD | 15 | 89\% | 93\% |  | - 7\% |
| RICHARDSON ISD | 52 | 18\% | 73\% |  | - 2\% |
| CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISD | 35 | 68\% | 63\% |  | + 29\% |
| GRAND PRAIRIE ISD | 33 | 0\% | 48\% |  | +5\% |
| GARLAND ISD | 66 | 76\% | 41\% |  | +5\% |
| DALLAS ISD | 224 | 77\% | 33\% |  | + 8\% |
| MESQUITE ISD | 46 | 56\% | 28\% |  | - 3\% |
| LANCASTER ISD | 10 | 78\% | 20\% |  | 0\% |
| CEDAR HILL ISD | 12 | 9\% | 17\% |  | - 13\% |
| DUNCANVILLE ISD | 16 | 70\% | 13\% |  | 0\% |
| IRVING ISD | 32 | 83\% | 9\% |  | -6\% |
| DESOTO ISD | 10 | 79\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |

## Gold Ribbon Analysis

## Example of Gold Ribbon Schools Achieving Outlier Results Despite High Poverty

Example: \% Economically Disadvantaged \& STAAR Level III Achievement


## Gold Ribbon Schools

## Number of Gold Ribbon Schools

## Gold Ribbon Characteristics

More than 75\% economically disadvantaged (high poverty)


Receive an $\mathbf{A}$ or a $\mathbf{B}$ in the CHILDREN AT RISK rankings (high performing)

## in Texas



A traditional neighborhood campus;
charter schools are not included

Top 10 Districts in Texas with the Greatest Increase in Gold Ribbon Schools

| District | Area | \# of Eco Dis Schools | \# Gold Ribbon | \% Gold Ribbon | \# of Eco Dis Schools | \# Gold Ribbon | \% Gold Ribbon | \% Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  |
| Galena Park ISD | Greater Houston | 13 | 2 | 15\% | 13 | 8 | 62\% | + 46\% |
| McAllen ISD | Rio Grande Valley | 14 | 4 | 29\% | 13 | 9 | 69\% | +41\% |
| Southwest ISD | San Antonio | 10 | 2 | 20\% | 9 | 5 | 56\% | + 36\% |
| Edinburg CISD | Rio Grande Valley | 27 | 12 | 44\% | 27 | 19 | 70\% | + 26\% |
| Harlingen CISD | Rio Grande Valley | 13 | 5 | 38\% | 14 | 9 | 64\% | + 26\% |
| Amarillo ISD | Amarillo | 20 | 5 | 25\% | 22 | 11 | 50\% | + 25\% |
| El Paso ISD | El Paso | 37 | 9 | 24\% | 40 | 18 | 45\% | + 21\% |
| Mission CISD | Rio Grande Valley | 11 | 3 | 27\% | 11 | 5 | 45\% | + 18\% |
| La Joya ISD | Rio Grande Valley | 23 | 8 | 35\% | 23 | 12 | 52\% | + 17\% |
| Cypress-Fairbanks ISD | Greater Houston | 12 | 3 | 25\% | 12 | 5 | 42\% | + 17\% |

5 of 10 districts with the most growth in \% of gold ribbon schools are concentrated in the Rio Grande Valley

## Clear school vision demonstrated by strong leadership

A focused and innovative leader who instills in staff and students that success is possible

## Data-driven instruction and teacher development

Staff meets regularly to discuss student progress measured by data and share best practices in an effort to quickly identify every single student's strengths and areas for growth

## Community and family engagement

An active presence in the community with regular events for parents to be involved in their child's education both in the classroom and at home


## School district interaction

Vertical alignment of district-wide, high quality curriculum and teacher support

## children

# Relationship Between Student Mobility \& School Rankings 

## Relationship Between Mobility and C@R Rankings at Elementary Schools

Statewide Mobility by Percentage Breakdown (Range: 0.6\% - 66.1\%)

$\square$ A B C D $\quad$ ■
In conclusion...
children atRisk

we see the majority of A's at schools with the lowest mobility rates and the majority of F's at schools with higher mobility rates

## Top 15 Districts with the Highest Mobility Rates of the 5 Major Regions

| District | Region | \# of Schools | Average <br> Mobility Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Spring ISD | Houston | 25 | 22.5 |
| Judson ISD | San Antonio | 18 | 21.7 |
| South San Antonio ISD | San Antonio | 10 | 21.3 |
| San Antonio ISD | San Antonio | 54 | 21.1 |
| Edgewood ISD | San Antonio | 10 | 21.0 |
| Alief ISD | Houston | 30 | 20.4 |
| Crowley ISD | North Texas | 14 | 20.1 |
| Dallas ISD | North Texas | 149 | 19.9 |
| Southwest ISD | San Antonio | 11 | 19.7 |
| Goose Creek CISD | Houston | 15 | 19.5 |
| Fort Worth ISD | Tarrant County | 81 | 18.6 |
| Harlandale ISD | San Antonio | 13 | 18.4 |
| Aldine ISD | Houston | 42 | 18.3 |
| North East ISD | San Antonio | 46 | 18.2 |

## 7 of the 15 districts with the highest mobility rates of the

 5 major regions are in Greater San Antonio
## Appendix

## Change in Number of Gold Ribbon Elementary Schools in North Texas

 High Performing (A or B grade) \& High Poverty (75\%+ Economically Disadvantaged)Change in Number of Gold Ribbon Elementary Schools 2016 vs. 2017

|  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# of Schools >75\% <br> Economically Disadvantaged | \# of Gold Ribbon Schools | \% Gold Ribbon Schools | \# of Schools >75\% <br> Economically Disadvantaged | \# of Gold Ribbon Schools | \% Gold Ribbon Schools | \% Increase |
| DALLAS ISD | 138 | 25 | 18\% | 135 | 39 | 29\% | +11\% |
| ARLINGTON ISD | 30 | 1 | 3\% | 31 | 4 | 13\% | +10\% |
| GRAND PRAIRIE ISD | 14 | 5 | 36\% | 13 | 5 | 38\% | +3\% |
| MESQUITE ISD | 20 | 4 | 20\% | 22 | 5 | 23\% | +3\% |
| RICHARDSON ISD | 15 | 4 | 27\% | 14 | 4 | 29\% | +2\% |
| FORT WORTH ISD | 64 | 5 | 8\% | 66 | 5 | 8\% | 0\% |
| DUNCANVILLE ISD | 9 | 2 | 22\% | 10 | 2 | 20\% | -2\% |
| IRVING ISD | 18 | 4 | 22\% | 17 | 2 | 12\% | -10\% |
| LANCASTER ISD | 7 | 2 | 29\% | 7 | 1 | 14\% | -14\% |

Additionally, only 3 gold ribbon high schools in all of the North Texas region (9 counties) - all Dallas ISD schools

## Change in \% of Gold Ribbon Schools by Harris County District

High Performing (A or B grade) \& High Poverty (75\%+ Economically Disadvantaged)

| District | \# of Eco Dis Schools | \# Gold Ribbon Schools | \% Gold Ribbon | \# of Eco Dis Schools | \# Gold Ribbon Schools | \% Gold Ribbon | $\% \mathrm{Pt}$ <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  |
| GALENA PARK ISD | 19 | 3 | 16\% | 19 | 9 | 47\% | +32\% |
| CHANNELVIEW ISD | 8 | 1 | 13\% | 8 | 3 | 38\% | +25\% |
| CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD | 14 | 3 | 21\% | 14 | 5 | 36\% | +14\% |
| ALIEF ISD | 29 | 6 | 21\% | 36 | 9 | 25\% | +4\% |
| DEER PARK ISD | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |
| HUMBLE ISD | 4 | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |
| KATY ISD | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |
| LA PORTE ISD | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |
| SPRING BRANCH ISD | 9 | 0 | 0\% | 20 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |
| HOUSTON ISD | 176 | 38 | 22\% | 185 | 39 | 21\% | -1\% |
| PASADENA ISD | 41 | 10 | 24\% | 42 | 10 | 24\% | -1\% |
| SPRING ISD | 17 | 3 | 18\% | 13 | 2 | 15\% | -2\% |
| ALDINE ISD | 39 | 4 | 10\% | 57 | 2 | 4\% | -7\% |
| GOOSE CREEK CISD | 7 | 1 | 14\% | 7 | 0 | 0\% | -14\% |
| KLEIN ISD | 7 | 1 | 14\% | 6 | 0 | 0\% | -14\% |
| SHELDON ISD | 5 | 1 | 20\% | 7 | 0 | 0\% | -20\% |
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