TEA Strategic Priorities

Every child, prepared for success in college, a career or the military.

Strategic priorities:
- Recruit, support, and retain teachers and principals
- Build a foundation of reading and math
- Connect high school to career and college
- Improve low-performing schools

Enablers:
- Increase transparency, fairness and rigor in district and campus academic and financial performance
- Ensure compliance, effectively implement legislation and inform policymakers
- Strengthen organizational foundations (resource efficiency, culture, capabilities, partnerships)
Assessment
Assessment

- Federally Required
- State Required
- Locally-driven decisions (LEA’s, Schools, Classrooms)
## Assessment: Current Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>4-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAAR 3-8</strong></td>
<td>$33,963,491</td>
<td>$42,169,532</td>
<td>$62,292,426</td>
<td>$49,637,384</td>
<td>$182,959,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAAR EOC</strong></td>
<td>$25,069,033</td>
<td>$26,003,054</td>
<td>$28,783,444</td>
<td>$23,280,124</td>
<td>$101,738,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAAR Total</strong></td>
<td>$68,918,215</td>
<td>$78,604,370</td>
<td>$98,230,497</td>
<td>$83,360,190</td>
<td>$326,310,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10,479,082 tests;~$7/student)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAAR Alt-2</strong></td>
<td>$3,665,163</td>
<td>$3,671,074</td>
<td>$5,784,583</td>
<td>$5,837,492</td>
<td>$18,958,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TELPAS</strong></td>
<td>$7,119,603</td>
<td>$8,233,618</td>
<td>$9,522,347</td>
<td>$8,571,575</td>
<td>$33,447,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKS</strong></td>
<td>$2,758,774</td>
<td>$2,498,995</td>
<td>$247,683</td>
<td>$253,875</td>
<td>$5,759,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment: Cost Breakdown and Potential Savings

INCLUSIVE COST OF ASSESSMENT

- Costs vary widely by district and campus, pending staffing structure and local policies
- Assume 1 District Testing Coordinator per district (% time), 1 FTE per campus for 4-8 weeks per year (pending grade band), testing proctors, some supplies [min. requirements]

POSSIBLE SAVINGS

- Eliminate non federally mandates assessments (8th gr Soc. Studies, Alg II EOC, Eng III EOC)
  - $3.3M SAVINGS
- Eliminate the SSI Administration
  - $3.5M SAVINGS
- Add SAT/ACT in lieu of EOCs
  - Reduction in EOC costs of ~$24M (Spring only – excludes fall and summer admins)
  - Increase of universal SAT/ACT costs of ~$24M incl. writing (Juniors only)
  - Decrease in district and/or parent out-of-pocket expenses (varies, min. $20M+ savings statewide)
Early Childhood
Student Achievement and Attainment Summary

Kindergarten Readiness: 59% (Fall 2016 - Based on local district reading assessments)

3rd Grade Reading: +3% (Spring 2017 - STAAR “Meets” Grade Level or Above)

3rd Grade Math: +5% (Spring 2017 - STAAR “Meets” Grade Level or Above)

8th Grade Reading: +3% (Spring 2017 - STAAR “Meets” Grade Level or Above)

8th Grade Math and EOC: +5% (Spring 2017 - STAAR “Meets” Grade Level or Above)

SAT/ACT Passing: 89% (2016 Cohort Attaining College Ready Score)

High School Completion: 56% (2016 Cohort graduating within 4 years)

College Enrollment: 24% (2015 Cohort Enrolled within 1-yr at a Texas IHE)

Postsecondary Completion: 0% (2007 Cohort 2-or-4-year TX Postsecondary Completion within 6 years)

No Change:

- Kindergarten Readiness: -1%
- 3rd Grade Reading: +3%
- 3rd Grade Math: +5%
- 8th Grade Reading: +3%
- 8th Grade Math and EOC: +5%
- SAT/ACT Passing: 89%
- High School Completion: 56%
- College Enrollment: 24%
- Postsecondary Completion: 0%

Notes:
- Spring 2016
- Texas Education Agency
On average, economically disadvantaged students who attended high-quality public Pre-K in 2010 scored higher on the 2015 3rd Grade STAAR Reading assessment than economically disadvantaged students who did not attend public Pre-K or who attended lower quality public Pre-K. (Children At Risk, 2016)

The benefits of quality Pre-K produce even greater benefits when followed by quality K-3rd grade instruction. Quality full-day Pre-K produced even stronger results than quality half-day Pre-K.

Students living in poverty who don’t receive high quality ECE are:
- 25% more likely to drop out of school
- 60% less likely to attend college
- Significantly more likely to end up incarcerated

Kindergarten Readiness is the Strongest Predictor of 3rd Grade Reading

Odds of Meeting Standard on 3rd Grade STAAR if Kindergarten Ready

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Ready</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-low income</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of Ready.Set.K! and data at the Education Research Center at UT Austin; odds ratios from model with income, ELL, gender, ethnicity, Kinder ready status as predictors; Kindergarten in 2011-12
Figure 1: Percentage of Student Populations by Pre-K Attendance

- Total Students (N = 1,046,956): 73.2% Eligible and Attended Pre-K, 26.8% Eligible and Did Not Attend Pre-K
- Promoted Students (N = 1,016,976): 73.5% Eligible and Attended Pre-K, 26.5% Eligible and Did Not Attend Pre-K
- Retained Students (N = 29,980): 65.0% Eligible and Attended Pre-K, 35.0% Eligible and Did Not Attend Pre-K

Public Pre-K Enrollment Trends
Figure 2: Retention Rates by Pre-K Attendance

- Kindergarten: Eligible and Attended Pre-K = 1.8, Eligible and Did Not Attend Pre-K = 4.0
- Grade 1: Eligible and Attended Pre-K = 4.2
- Grade 2: Eligible and Attended Pre-K = 2.6, Eligible and Did Not Attend Pre-K = 3.2
- Grade 3: Eligible and Attended Pre-K = 1.6, Eligible and Did Not Attend Pre-K = 1.9
- Grades K-3: Eligible and Attended Pre-K = 2.5, Eligible and Did Not Attend Pre-K = 3.7
# Public Prekindergarten Enrollment Trends

| Full or Half-Day Program | ADA Eligible | | Not ADA Eligible | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|---|-----------------|---|
| Age 3                    |              |         |         |          |          |         |
| Full-day                 | 10,644       | 11,616  | 13,857  | 531      | 590      | 689     |
| Half-day                 | 12,556       | 12,974  | 12,454  | 588      | 599      | 588     |
| Total                    | 23,200       | 24,590  | 26,311  | 1,119    | 1,189    | 1,277   |
| Age 4                    |              |         |         |          |          |         |
| Full-day                 | 94,180       | 96,791  | 100,600 | 6,279    | 6,589    | 6,897   |
| Half-day                 | 90,539       | 87,071  | 84,508  | 4,351    | 4,410    | 4,521   |
| Total                    | 184,719      | 183,862 | 185,108 | 10,630   | 10,999   | 11,418  |
| Total                    | Total        | 207,919 | 208,452 | 211,419  | 11,749   | 12,188  | 12,695  |
Current Public Prekindergarten Enrollment Trends and Universal Prekindergarten Estimates

• **Non ADA Eligible Enrollment:** For 2016-2017, non ADA eligible students make up ~5.6% of public prekindergarten enrollment

• **Percent of Eligible Students Enrolled:** 67% of eligible 4-year-old students attended public prekindergarten in 2016-2017, while only 10% of eligible 3-year-old students attended in 2016-2017

• **Enrollment Estimates:** Given these numbers, we would assume additional growth each year if we moved to universal Pre-K. This would vary based on space constraints (capital investments) and participation rate in demand with current non-eligible students.
Funding Universal Prekindergarten

Estimate

- The cost for full day universal prekindergarten for 4 year-olds would be $1.7B
- This would reduce existing costs for LEAs who currently provide Pre-K, freeing up those resources for additional K-2 activities
- $784 million for extending the currently eligible students to full day and another $954 million to provide full-day prekindergarten to all the other currently non-eligible students
## Funding Universal Prekindergarten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost 1: All Pre-K to full day</td>
<td>$784,535,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost 2: Additional eligible 4 year olds at full-day as all now eligible (assume 70% of all 4 year olds will participate)</td>
<td>$954,577,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost 3: Additional 4 year olds at half-day as all now eligible (assume 80% of all 4 year olds will participate)</td>
<td>$515,211,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost 4: 3 year-olds to 50% of eligible Full Day</td>
<td>$726,811,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost 5: 3 year-olds to 50% of eligible Half-Day</td>
<td>$363,405,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost 6: Existing 3 year-olds full-day (included in Cost 1)</td>
<td>$48,819,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost 7: Additional ADA by making districts offer Pre-K even if less than 15</td>
<td>$11,816,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This projections assumes enrollment based on current 2017 levels
- This estimate does not include non-ADA costs, such as additional state costs to the Teacher Retirement System for districts that hire new teachers as well as some level of local costs associated with the construction or acquisition of additional classroom facilities
Post Secondary Completion
SAT/ACT Participation

- White Students
- Hispanic Students
- Black Students
- Econ. Dis.
- Not Econ. Dis.
SAT/ACT Performance By Socioeconomic Status
1996 - 2015

% Above "Passing" on SAT/ACT

Non Economically Disadvantaged

Economically Disadvantaged

All Students In Texas

+ 6.4 pts
(32% Increase)

+ 2.0 pts
(50% Increase)
SAT/ACT Performance Among Student-Populations
1996 - 2015

% Above Passing on SAT/ACT

- White Students
- All Students In Texas
- Hispanic Students
- African American Students

5/4/2018 Texas Education Agency
## Individual Graduation Committee (IGC Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IGC Graduates</th>
<th>IGC Assigned</th>
<th>% of IGC Assigned</th>
<th>All Graduates</th>
<th>% of All Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>11,422</td>
<td>14,735</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>334,416</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>42,129</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>14,035</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>9,869</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>164,428</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>105,766</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>8,697</td>
<td>11,118</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>166,989</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner (EL)</td>
<td>4,479</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>17,632</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry Certifications and Endorsements
House Bill 5, 83rd Texas Legislature

?”A school district shall ensure that each student, on entering ninth grade, indicates in writing an endorse**ment** under Subsection (c-1) that the student intends to earn. A district shall permit a student to choose, at any time, to earn an endorsement other than the endorsement the student previously indicated."

House Bill 22, 85th Texas Legislature

“He commissioner shall evaluate school district and campus performance and assign each district and campus an overall performance rating of”

- A
- B
- C
- D
- or
- F

Includes **industry certifications** for accountability
Foundation HS Program Students Pursuing or Completing Endorsements

Note. Results are based on the last campus a student attended, as reported in the Public Education Information Management System. A student pursuing or completing more than one endorsement is included in the results for each endorsement pursued or completed.

*Results include Foundation High School Program (FHSP) students who did not pursue endorsements. In addition, FHSP students pursuing or completing more than one endorsement are included only once. *Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. *Economically disadvantaged. *English language learner. *A student receiving special education services is not eligible for an endorsement if he or she receives a modified curriculum in any course required for an endorsement or fails to perform satisfactorily on the required state assessments, as established in the Texas Education Code, Chapter 39 (19 TAC §89.1070(c)).
# Connect High School to Career and College: CCMP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify | Identify & Verify Industry Certifications | • Create process for identification and verification  
• Utilize industry certifications to backwards design rigorous and relevant coherent sequences of courses |
| Identify | Identify and Refine Pathways | • Review Labor Market Information (LMI) and identify in demand and high wage occupations  
• Operate under existing Tri-Agency efforts  
• Create new statewide industry advisory councils to advise |
| Identify | CTE Programs | • CTE statewide evaluation  
• Alignment of secondary offerings to LMI and postsecondary programs in Texas  
• Program of study process and link to industry certifications |
| Models and Courses | College and Career Readiness Models | • Outcome Based Measures for models  
• Blueprint and applications for planning and designation for all College and Career Readiness Models  
• Dual credit taskforce |
| Models and Courses | Work-Based Learning | • Identify and review existing best practices and WBL models to build statewide framework for WBL  
• Establish a flexible statewide framework inclusive of externships, internships, and apprenticeships |
Connect High School to Career and College: CCMP Timeline

- Winter 2018: Industry recognized Industry-Valued Third-party Provider
- Spring 2018: Updated College and Career Readiness Models Processes
- Summer 2018: Industry Advisory Councils
- Fall 2018: New CTE Program of Study Process
- Winter 2019: Industry Certification Revisions

- Summative/Capstone Attainable by HS students Transferable
Industry Recognized Certifications Data

Industry Certifications for Accountability

• Initial list of 73 certifications for accountability published **August 2017**
• Initial certifications **data reported for 2016-2017 school year** thus no longitudinal data
• Current half credit in accountability for 85 existing courses aligned to industry certifications

Current Endorsement Data

• 2018 is first graduating class of students with full endorsements and first year of data collection
• Partnership with AIR and IES and will likely have first post-secondary achievement data in 4-5 years
• Initial students earning industry recognize **certifications** for 2016-2017 as reported in the fall **10,840**
Mapping Labor Marking Need

Texas Labor Market Information

Labor Market Information pulled from Texas Workforce Commission Projections and triangulated by regional WDA and real time labor data.
Industry Certifications and Labor Market Alignment

Most Attained Certifications 16-17

- Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA): 1,554
- Cosmetology: 1,106
- American Welding Society (AWS) D1.1 Structural Steel: 849
- Microsoft Office Word: 647
- National Center for Construction Education and Research (NCCER) Core: 618
- Pharmacy Technician: 442

Highest Growth Occupations

- Health Care
- Construction
- Information Technology (IT)
- Agriculture
- Business, Marketing and Finance

Texas occupations with median wage >$35,339 AND growth >17% from TWC growth projections matched with real time labor data

Note. Results are based on the last campus a student attended, as reported in the Public Education Information Management System. A student pursuing or completing more than one endorsement is included in the results for each endorsement pursued or completed.
Target Occupations Education Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data from Local Workforce Development Areas (LWDA); 1,067 total references across 28 LWDAs</th>
<th>Target Occupation References</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS or Less</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized Industry Credential</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s or higher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Current and projected employer needs require recognized industry credential or post-secondary
- Recognized industry credentials include certifications earned by high school students as well as Level I and Level II certifications earned at Institutions of Higher Education
Special Education: Dyslexia
Special Education: Dyslexia
(Income and Special Education Identification)
TEA Strategic Plan
If the agency leads efforts to excite students in K-12 and college about the **rigors and rewards of being an educator**, in order to raise the perceptions of the profession held by students and their influencers,

...and if the agency leads change efforts to increase the number of high quality new teachers through **improving the effectiveness of pre-service educator preparation programs**,  

...and if the agency, in partnership with ESCs and external providers, supports teachers and principals through changes to in-service support, including **instructional feedback, leadership and the use of outcomes-based professional learning**,  

...and if the agency ensures an educator certification system which is designed to drive **continuous improvement through rewarding effective in-service support**,  

...and if the agency ensures the safety of all students and upholds the **integrity of the profession**...

...then district and campus leadership will have the tools to be able to recruit, support, and retain teachers and principals.
Build a foundation of math and reading

If the agency **supports the State Board of Education** to facilitate a process that identifies **rigorous standards** for student learning…

and if the agency **increases the availability of coherent, aligned curricular resources and integrated formative assessments**…

and if the agency **ensures effective professional supports** to educators in early childhood and primary grades…

and if the agency **supports effective programmatic efforts, resource allocation, and school partnerships** to support effective implementation…

and if the agency **ensures the availability of tools to fully empower parents** as the child’s first teacher…

…then the agency **will enable educators to provide the children of Texas with a foundation of math and reading**
Strategic Priority 3 Theory of Action

If the agency and its partners, through the work of the Tri-Agency Workforce Commission, identify current and future career opportunities in Texas...

and if the agency and its partners collaborate to identify the pathways that prepare for successful entry in these careers...

and if the agency creates, supports, and incentivizes the implementation of innovative and rigorous school models and courses for these pathways...

and if the agency provides supports for families, educators, and partners to help students choose their desired pathway...

and for those students choosing a pathway that includes college, if the agency provides resources to ensure successful collegiate entry and completion...

...then the agency will empower educators to connect high school to career and college.
Strategic Priority 4 Theory of Action

Maintains a tiered campus performance framework to assist school systems in analyzing student outcomes.

Supports school boards to govern with a focus on student outcomes,

Supports the development of district capacity to implement coherent curriculum and assessment strategies and fill school-level talent gaps,

Supports district-level campus oversight including school improvement efforts and school transformation actions...

And...

We will foster conditions to provide families with access to more A & B campuses and reduce number of D & F campuses.

If the agency...

Then...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase transparency, fairness and rigor in district and campus academic and financial performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the agency establishes quantifiable and fair metrics for how schools and districts will be held accountable…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if the agency measures progress and proficiency through valid and reliable indicators…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if the agency includes performance data in all areas, including finance…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if the agency partners with external stakeholders to solicit feedback on the proposed indicators…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if the agency creates the resources and consultation needed to support the agency and the field…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and if the agency develops tools to make the system actionable instead of only informative…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…then the agency will accurately identify the performance of schools and districts in the state, providing them with the appropriate rewards and tools to maintain or improve student achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>