Chapter 10—Identification of Schools for Improvement

Overview

To align identification of schools for improvement with the state's accountability system, TEA utilizes the Closing the Gaps domain performance to identify comprehensive, targeted, and additional targeted support and improvement schools.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement Identification

The Closing the Gaps domain scaled score is used to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement. TEA rank orders the scaled domain score for all campuses. The lowest five percent of campuses that receive Title I, Part A funds are identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

Additionally, if any Title I or non-Title I campus does not attain a 67 percent four-year federal graduation rate for the all students group, the campus is identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Non-Title I campuses are not eligible for comprehensive support grant funding.

Any Title I campus identified for targeted support and improvement for three consecutive years for the same student group(s) is identified for comprehensive support and improvement the following school year.

Any campus identified for comprehensive support and improvement that has fewer than 100 students enrolled as reported in October snapshot is not required to implement interventions associated with the identification. If a campus chooses not to implement interventions, it is not eligible for comprehensive support grant funding. Choosing not to implement interventions does not exit the campus from comprehensive support and improvement identification.

Example Title I Campus Identified for Targeted Support and Improvement for Three Years

When Identified	SY 2019-20	SY 2020-21	SY 2021-22
August 2019	\mathbf{TS}^{1}		
August 2020		TS	
August 2021			CS ²

¹TS stands for targeted support and improvement.

²CS stands for comprehensive support and improvement.

Example Non-Title I Campus Identified for Targeted Support and Improvement for Three Years

When Identified	SY 2019-20	SY 2020-21	SY 2021-22
August 2019	TS		
August 2020		TS	
August 2021			TS

Targeted Support and Improvement Identification

TEA uses the Closing the Gaps domain to identify campuses that have consistently underperforming student groups. A student group that misses the targets in at least the same **three** indicators, for three consecutive years, is considered "consistently underperforming." Any campus not identified for comprehensive support and improvement that has at least one consistently underperforming student group is identified for targeted support and improvement. Campuses are evaluated annually for identification.

Minimum Size

In order to be considered when evaluating campuses for targeted support and improvement identification, student groups must meet the following minimum size requirements. When a student group is not evaluated because it does not meet minimum size, the count of consecutive years resets for that student group.

The all students group must have 10 reading *and* 10 mathematics assessment results for evaluation in the Academic Achievement component. Each remaining student group must have 25 reading *and* 25 mathematics assessment results for evaluation in the Academic Achievement component. If a student group does not meet minimum size in Academic Achievement, it is not considered when evaluating the campus for identification. The following student groups are not evaluated to identify campuses for targeted support and improvement: former special education; continuously enrolled; and non-continuously enrolled.

Academic Achievement Reading 2017 N N Y N Y 2018 N N -2 N N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N Mathematics 2017 N Y N N Academic Growth Reading 2017 N - N N Academic Growth Reading 2017 N - N N 2017 N - N N Adatematics 2017 N N N - Adatematics 2017 N N N - STAAR Only Component N N N N N		All Students	White	Two or More Races ²	Special Education	English Learners		
2017 N Y N Y 2018 N N -2 N N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N Y N N N 2018 N N -2 N N 2018 N N -2 N N 2019 Y N Y N N 2017 N - N N N 2018 N N - - N 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y <td< th=""><th></th><th>Academic Ach</th><th>ievement</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>		Academic Ach	ievement					
2013 N N -2 N N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N Y N N N 2018 N N -2 N N 2018 N N -2 N N 2019 Y N Y N N 2019 Y N Y N N 2017 N - N N N 2018 N N - - N 2017 N N N - - 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N N N 2017 N N N N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y		Reading						
2010 N N N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N Y N N N 2018 N N -2 N N 2019 Y N Y N N 2019 Y N Y N N 2019 Y N Y N N 2017 N - N N N 2018 N N - - N 2018 N N - - N 2017 N N N N - 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y	2017	N	Ν	Y	Ν	Y		
Mathematics N N N N 2017 N Y N N N 2018 N N -2 N N 2019 Y N Y N N 2019 Y N Y N N Academic Growth Reading 2017 N - N N N 2018 N N - - N N 2019 N Y N N N N N 2018 N N - - N N 2017 N N N Y Y Y 2019 Y N N N N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2018 N N - N N 2018 -	2018	Ν	Ν	_2	Ν	Ν		
2017 N Y N N N 2018 N N -2 N N 2019 Y N Y N N 2019 Y N Y N N Academic Growth Reading N N N 2017 N - N N N 2018 N N - - N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N N N N N 2017 N N N N - 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2017 - - - N N 2018 - - - N N <	2019		Y	N	Ν	Ν		
2018 N N -2 N N 2019 Y N Y N N Academic Growth Reading N N N 2017 N - N N N 2018 N - N N N 2018 N N - - N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N N N N N 2017 N N N N - 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y Y Y Y Y 2018 N N - N N 2017 - - - N N 2018 - - - N N <		Mathematics						
2010 N N N N N 2019 Y N Y N N Academic Growth Reading Academic Growth N N N 2017 N - N N N 2018 N - N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N N - - N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N N N - - 2018 N N - - N 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N N N N 2018 N Y Y Y Y 2018 - - - N N 2019 - - - N N	2017	Ν	Y	Ν	Ν	Ν		
Academic Growth Reading 2017 N - N N N 2018 N N - - N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N N N - - 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N Y Y 2017 N N N - N 2019 Y N N Y Y 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2018 - - - N N 2019 - - - N N 2019 - -	2018	Ν	Ν	_2	Ν	Ν		
Reading 2017 N - N N 2018 N N - - N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N N N N - 2018 N N - N 2019 Y N N Y Y 2019 Y N N Y Y 2017 N N N N N 2019 Y N N N N 2018 N N Y Y Y 2017 - - - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2018 - - - N N </th <th>2019</th> <th>Y</th> <th>Ν</th> <th>Y</th> <th>Ν</th> <th>Ν</th>	2019	Y	Ν	Y	Ν	Ν		
2017 N - N N N 2018 N N - - N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N Mathematics Mathematics 2017 N N N - 2018 N N - - N 2017 N N N N Y 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2018 - - - Y Y 2018 - - - N N 2019 - - - N N <th></th> <th>Academic Gro</th> <th>owth</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>		Academic Gro	owth					
2018 N N - - N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2019 N Y N N N 2017 N N N N - 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N - - 2019 Y N N Y Y 2017 N N N N N 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N Y Y Y English Language Proficiency (ELP) - - N N 2018 - - - N N 2019 - - - N N 2019 - - - N N		Reading						
2019 N Y N N N Mathematics Mathematics N N N N 2017 N N N N - - N 2018 N N - - N N - 2019 Y N N - - N N 2019 Y N N N Y Y STAAR Only Component N N N N N 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2018 - - - N N 2018 - - - Y Y 2019 - - - N N 2019 - - - N	2017	Ν	-	Ν	Ν	Ν		
Mathematics N N N N 2017 N N N N - 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N - N 2019 Y N N Y Y STAAR Only Component N N N N 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2017 - - N N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2017 - - - N N 2018 - - - Y Y 2019 - - - N N Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years N N N N <th>2018</th> <th>Ν</th> <th>Ν</th> <th>-</th> <th>-</th> <th>Ν</th>	2018	Ν	Ν	-	-	Ν		
2017 N N N N - 2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N Y Y STAAR Only Component 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y English Language Proficiency (ELP) 2017 - - - N 2017 - - - N 2017 - - - N 2018 - - - N 2019 - - - N Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years M N	2019	Ν	Y	Ν	Ν	Ν		
2018 N N - - N 2019 Y N N Y Y 2019 Y N N Y Y STAAR Only Component 2017 N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2017 - - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y 2017 - - - N N 2017 - - - N N 2018 - - - - N 2019 - - - N N Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years X X X X		Mathematics						
2019 Y N N Y Y STAAR Only Component STAAR Only Component N N N 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y English Language Proficiency (ELP) English Language Proficiency (ELP) N N 2018 - - - N 2018 - - - Y 2019 - - - N 2018 - - - N 2019 - - - N	2017	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	-		
2017 N N N N 2017 N N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y English Language Proficiency (ELP) - - N N 2017 - - - N 2017 2017 - - - N 2018 - - N 2019 - N 2019 - N N 2019 - N N 2019 - - N <	2018	Ν	Ν	-	-	Ν		
2017 N N N N 2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y English Language Proficiency (ELP) 2017 - - N 2018 - - - N 2019 - - - N 2019 - - N N	2019	Y	Ν	Ν	Y	Y		
2018 N N - N N 2019 N Y Y Y Y English Language Proficiency (ELP) - - N N 2017 - - - N N 2018 - - - Y Y 2019 - - - N N 2018 - - - Y Y 2019 - - - N N Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years - - -		STAAR Only O	omponent					
2019 N Y Y Y English Language Proficiency (ELP) 2017 - - N 2018 - - - Y 2019 - - - N 2018 - - N 2019 - - N	2017	N	N	N	N	N		
2019 N I	2018	N	Ν	-	Ν	Ν		
2017 - - N 2018 - - - Y 2019 - - - N Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years	2019	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		
2018 - - - Y 2019 - - - Y Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years		English Language Proficiency (ELP)						
2019 - - N Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years	2017	-	-	-	-	N		
Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years	2018	-	-	-	-	Y		
	2019	-	-	-	-	N		
		Count of Indic	ators Missed fo	or Three Consec	utive Years			
3 1 0 2 2		3	1	0	2	2		

Example Campus Identified for Targeted Support and Improvement¹

¹ While 14 student groups are evaluated in the Closing the Gaps domain, this example has five groups with data.

² The two or more races student group is not evaluated when identifying the campus for targeted support and improvement as it did not meet minimum size in both reading and mathematics in Academic Achievement for 2018.

Additional Targeted Support Identification

Any campus that is not identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement is identified for additional targeted support if an individual student group's percentage of evaluated indicators met is at or below the percentage used to identify **that campus type** for comprehensive support and improvement. Identification occurs on an annual basis.

For example, in 2018 the scaled Closing the Gaps cut point for comprehensive identification at the bottom five percent of Title I campuses was a scaled score of 47. Unscaling the 47 equated to a 13 elementary raw score and a 6 middle/high school raw score. Those raw scores were then set as the percentage of indicators a student group must meet (by campus type). Any elementary campus that had a student group that met fewer than 13 percent (middle/high school 6 percent) of evaluated indicators was identified for additional targeted support.

Minimum Size

In order to be evaluated for additional targeted support, student groups must meet the following minimum size requirements. The all students group must have 10 reading *and* 10 mathematics assessment results for evaluation in the Academic Achievement component. Each remaining student group must have 25 reading *and* 25 mathematics assessment results for evaluation in the Academic Achievement component. If a student group does not meet minimum size in Academic Achievement, it is not considered when evaluating the campus for identification.

Example Minimum Size for Additional Targeted Support

Year	2019		2019
CTG Indicator	Eco Dis		English Learners
Academic Achievement			
Reading	-		-
Math	-	0.0	-
Academic Growth		OR	
Reading	-		-
Math	-		-
ELP	-		Ν
STAAR Component	Y		Ν
Percentage of Targets Met	Not evaluated		Not evaluated

Example Campus Identified for Additional Targeted Support

	All Students	African American H	lispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EL (Current & Monitored)+	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continu- ously Enrolled	ously
Additional Targeted Support											\sim			
Target	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Indicators Met	60%	0%	60%	20%	-	-	-	0%	60%	50%	0%	· ·	-	-
# Indicators Met	3	0	3	1	-	-	-	0	3	1	0	· ·	-	-
# Indicators Evaluated	5	1	5	5	-	-	-	1	5	2	2		-	-

This campus is identified for additional targeted support as the special education student group met minimum size in reading and mathematics for Academic Achievement and missed the target for both indicators.

Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

Campuses that do not rank in the bottom five percent of the Closing the Gaps domain for two consecutive years *and* have increased a letter grade (for example, from *F* to *D* or from *D* to *C*) on the Closing the Gaps domain are considered as having successfully exited comprehensive support and improvement status.

Campuses identified as comprehensive support and improvement based solely on a graduation rate below 67 percent must have a four-year federal graduation rate of at least 67 percent for two consecutive years to exit comprehensive support and improvement status.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement Examples

To exit comprehensive support, a campus must not rank in the bottom five percent and have an improved Closing the Gaps domain letter grade for two consecutive years.

	Bottom 5% CTG* Score	CTG Grade	Identification
2018	Yes	F	CS
2019	No	D	CS
2020	No	D	EXIT

*CTG stands for Closing the Gaps.

A campus identified based on the four-year federal graduation rate must have a four-year federal graduation rate of at least 67 percent for two consecutive years to exit.

	Graduation Rate	SY 2019-20	SY 2020-21	SY 2021-22	SY 2022-23
2018	Below 67.0%	CS	-	-	-
2019	At or above 67.0%	-	CS	-	-
2020	At or above 67.0%	-	-	Exit	-
2021	Below 67%	_	-	-	CS

When a campus identified for comprehensive support does not meet minimum size for Closing the Gaps evaluation the year following identification, the campus must meet the exit criteria in the following year. If a campus does not meet minimum size for evaluation for two consecutive years following identification, it will be exited.

	Bottom 5% CTG Score	CTG Grade	Identification
2018	Yes	F	CS
2019	Not Rated	-	CS
2020	No	D	EXIT

	Bottom 5% CTG Score	CTG Grade	Identification
2018	Yes	F	CS
2019	Not Rated	-	CS
2020	Not Rated	-	EXIT

Exit Criteria for Additional Targeted Support Schools

To exit additional targeted support status, the student group(s) that triggered the additional targeted support status must meet the targets for the Academic Achievement component in both reading and mathematics.

CTG Indicator	2018	2019		2019		2019
Academic Achievement						
Reading	Ν	Y		Ν		Y
Math	Ν	Ν		Y		Y
Growth			OR		OR	
Reading	Ν	Y	UK	Y	UK	Y
Math	Ν	Ν		Y		Ν
ELP	-	-		Ι		-
STAAR Component	Ν	Ν		Y		Ν
Identification	ATS*	ATS		ATS		EXIT

*ATS stands for additional targeted support.

In 2018 campuses were identified for additional targeted support without regard to minimum size criteria in the Academic Achievement component. If those campuses don't meet the criteria for additional targeted support identification in 2019, they are exited.

CTG Indicator	2018	2019
Academic Achievement		
Reading	-	-
Math	_	-
Grad Rate	-	-
ELP	-	-
CCMR	Ν	Ν
Percentage of Targets Met	0%	not evaluated
Identification	ATS	EXIT