MEMORANDUM

- TO: Michael Love Assistant Superintendent, Major Projects-Career Readiness
- FROM: Carla Stevens Assistant Superintendent, Research and Accountability

SUBJECT: CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION: PREVALENCE, STUDENT PERFORMANCE, AND PROGRAM OUTCOMES, 2017–2018

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine the trends in CTE enrollments in HISD and to analyze CTE students' performance relative to their peers who did not participate in the program using the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) End-of-Course (EOC) examinations results. The study was guided by four questions and used descriptive statistics and trend data to answer the questions. Finally, multiple regression analyses were used to predict students' performance on the STAAR Algebra I, Biology, English I, and II, and U.S. History EOC exams using selected predictors.

Key findings include:

- While the number of students who were not enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses declined, the number of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses increased by 10.8 percent from the 2016–2017 to the 2017–2018 academic year.
- Higher percentages of at-risk (76.9 v. 68.0%) and economically disadvantaged (73.9 v. 70.7%) students were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compared to their peers who were enrolled in the HISD population in grades 6-12.
- A higher percentage of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I and U.S. History EOC exams compared to their peers who were not enrolled in any CTE courses during the 2017–2018 academic year.
- Overall, 91. 5 percent of CTE students received an industry certification during the 2017–2018 academic year.
- There was a 20.1 percent increase in the number of CTE graduates between 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 compared to a 3.8 percent increase for the district for the same period.
- The 2017 annual school dropout rate for CTE students stood at 2.7 percent compared to 4.1 percent for HISD.
- Being identified as G/T was a positive predictor of CTE students' performance on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I, Biology, English I, English II, and U.S. History EOC exams.
- Being identified as at-risk, an English language Learner, economically disadvantaged or receiving special education services were adverse predictors of students' performance on the 2018 STAAR EOC exams.



Further distribution of this report is at your discretion. Should you have any further questions, please contact me at 713-556-6700.

Carla Atening CJS

Attachment cc: Noelia Longoria Rick Cruz



HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

RESEARCH Educational Program Report

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION REPORT, 2017-2018

HISD Research and Accountability ANALYZING DATA, MEASURING PERFORMANCE.



2018 BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rhonda Skillern-Jones President

Jolanda Jones First Vice President

Anne Sung Second Vice President

Sergio Lira Secretary

Holly Maria Flynn Vilaseca Assistant Secretary

Wanda Adams Diana Dávila Susan Deigaard Elizabeth Santos

Grenita Lathan, Ph.D. Interim Superintendent of Schools

Carla Stevens Assistant Superintendent Department of Research and Accountability

Ted D. Serrant, Ph.D. Senior Research Specialist

Venita Holmes, Dr.P.H. Research Manager

Houston Independent School District

Hattie Mae White Educational Support Center 4400 West 18th StreetHouston, Texas 77092-8501

www.HoustonISD.org

It is the policy of the Houston Independent School District not to discriminate on the basis of age, color, handicap or disability, ancestry, national origin, marital status, race, religion, sex, veteran status, political affiliation, sexual orientation, gender identity and/or gender expression in its educational or employment programs and activities.

Career and Technical Education: Prevalence, Student Performance, and Program Outcomes, 2017–2018

Executive Summary

Section 29.182 of the Texas Education Code (TEC) makes provision for all students in the State of Texas to participate in Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs. CTE programs incorporate competencies that lead to the attainment of academic and technical skills, industry recognized certificates, licenses, and credentials for employment as well as provide opportunities for students to earn college credit for completed coursework (State of Texas, 2013). The Houston Independent School District (HISD) offers non-coherent and coherent-sequence of CTE courses with rigorous content in 16 high school programs.

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine trends in CTE course enrollment in HISD, and to analyze students' performance relative to their peers who did not participate in the program using the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) End-of-Course (EOC) examination results. The study was guided by four questions and used descriptive statistics and trend data to answer these questions. Finally, multiple regression analyses were used to predict students' performance on the STAAR Algebra I, Biology, English I, English II, and U.S. History EOC exams using selected demographic and educational predictors.

Key Findings

- While the number of students who were enrolled in a non-coherent sequence of CTE courses declined by 6.2 percent, the number of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of courses increased by 10.8 percent between the 2016–2017 and the 2017–2018 academic years.
- Higher percentages of at-risk (76.9 v. 68.0%) and economically disadvantaged (73.9 v. 70.7%) students were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compared to their peers who were enrolled in the HISD population in grades 6–12.
- Compared to their peers who were not enrolled in any CTE courses, a higher percentage of students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I and U.S. History EOC exams.
- Overall, 91.5 percent of the 6,170 CTE students who took an industry certification exam received an industry certification during the 2017–2018 school year.
- There was a 19.5 percent increase in the number of CTE graduates compared to a 4.2 percent increase for the district between the Class of 2016 and the Class of 2017.
- The CTE class of 2017 graduation rate of 88.4 percent exceeded the district rate of 78.8 percent by nearly 10 percentage points.
- The 2017 annual grades 9–12 school dropout rate for CTE students was 2.7 percent compared to 4.6 percent for HISD.
- Being identified as gifted and talented (G/T) was a positive predictor of the performance of students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses on the 2018 STAAR EOC exams for Algebra I, Biology, English I, English II, and U.S. History. Being identified as at-risk, economically



disadvantaged, or receiving special education services were adverse predictors of students' performance on the five STAAR EOC exams included in this study.

Recommendations

- Since HISD data on graduates beyond high school follow a one-year lag, further studies should focus on CTE graduates' enrollment in higher education or the extent to which graduates are able to find employment in their related coherent sequence of courses or certification and to better determine the longer-term outcomes of CTE.
- Based on the results of this study, the CTE Department and schools should build on relevant instructional strategies and support services that address the adverse performance of at-risk CTE students.
- STAAR EOC exams may not be designed to get a valid measure of students' CTE performance. It may be necessary to identify more appropriate ways to measure students' CTE performance that are compatible with the nature of program.
- Given the adverse impact that CTE workload can have on the acquisition of academic skills and the CTE students' performance on the 2018 STAAR EOC exams relative to their peers, the CTE Department should review CTE enrollment to ensure that there are no adverse effects between students' CTE workload and the acquisition of academic skills required to meet standards on STAAR or in preparation for postsecondary education.



Introduction

Section 29.182 of the Texas Education Code (TEC) provides for the opportunity for all secondary students to participate in Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs in the State of Texas. These CTE programs incorporate competencies that lead to academic and technical skill attainment, industry-recognized licenses, credentials, and certificates, and provide opportunities for students to earn college credit for their coursework (State of Texas, 2013). CTE programs may be developed and delivered with assistance from contracted local businesses or institutions of higher education (Section 28.187b).

CTE programs provide coherent and rigorous content in a sequence or cluster of courses. This content is aligned with academic standards that are challenging and provide technical knowledge and skills that are relevant in preparing students for higher education and careers in current or emerging professions (Texas Education Agency, 2018). There are sixteen CTE career clusters. The CTE Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) that guide CTE instruction became effective during the 2017–2018 school year (Texas Education Agency, 2018).

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) offers sixteen CTE programs at several high school locations (HISD, 2017). These are grouped as follows: (1) Agricultural; (2) Architecture, Construction, Manufacturing, and Transportation; (3) Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM); (4) Communications and Information Technologies; (5) Business Operations, Management, and Hospitality; (6) Human and Social Services; and (7) Health Science. Each program consists of a career pathway that provides a coherent, articulated sequence of rigorous academic and CTE courses. CTE enrollment can commence in the ninth grade and leads to an associate degree, baccalaureate degree, industry recognized certification, and/or licensure related to the sixteen career clusters (HISD, 2017). These clusters are grouped to organize educational programs and curricula according to occupations and common knowledge skills (HISD, 2017). **Appendix A**, **Table A1**, p. 19–21 lists the programs and the HISD schools where they were offered during the 2017–2018 school year, the associated certifications, and areas of potential employment.

An overview of CTE research called for "overlapping studies of diverse efforts…each with a slightly different lens and methods" (Castellano, Stringfield & Stone III, 2003, p. 263). Studies should be longitudinal and employ mixed methods and naturally occurring experiments…with effects that include standardized test scores, graduation rate, postsecondary transition rates, and labor market participation (Castellano, Springfield & Stone III, 2003). Diverse studies are also required to capture students' perceptions and outcomes, classroom processes, school and district leadership, and micro and macro political perspectives (op. cit, pp 263–264).

The purpose of this evaluation was to describe HISD students' enrollment in a coherent sequence of CTE courses, and analyze these students' performance, relative to their peers who were not enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses or in any CTE course. The evaluation was guided by the following questions:

- 1. What were the 2009–2010 through 2017–2018 enrollment trends and the 2017–2018 demographic characteristics of students who were enrolled in HISD CTE programs?
- 2. What were the key CTE program initiatives implemented in HISD during the 2017–2018 academic year?
- 3. How did the performance of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compare with their Non-CTE peers on the 2018 STAAR EOC assessments?



4. What were the longitudinal graduation and annual dropout rates for students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compared to HISD students districtwide and students who graduated in the class of 2016 and 2017?

Literature Review

CTE studies undertaken in the last few years appear to focus on CTE's association with college enrollment (Dougherty, 2016a); secondary school outcomes, high school graduation, college graduation, employment, and wages (Dougherty, 2016b; Hart, 2017); postsecondary education (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, 2017; Betts, Zou, McAdams & Dotter, 2014); math performance and dropout prevention (Bozick & Dalton, 2013). CTE research has also focused on variations in courses offered and high school academic achievement (Betts, Zou, McAdams & Dotter, 2014). Researchers also looked at CTE impacts on postsecondary outcomes in a large urban district (Neild & Brynes, 2014) as well as trends in Texas high school student enrollment in math, science, and CTE-STEM courses.

Various analytic methods have been used in research regarding CTE students' achievements. Quasiexperimental studies used regression models with covariates related to students' CTE participation and completion (Dougherty, 2016a). Covariate-adjusted regression models controlled for key demographic, academic, attendance and discipline factors, instrumental variables, and applied propensity score matching on three cohorts of high school graduates (Dougherty, 2016b). Yet another study used lottery admission based on three analytical methods (Neild & Brynes, 2014). Studies were also descriptive using two cohorts of public and private high school graduates and their transcripts. Another study used correlational data of 8th grade students and their subsequent high school transcripts and postsecondary attainment eight years after graduating in 1992 and 2004 (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, 2017). Mean scores for grades 9-12 math, science and CTE enrollment data from Texas disaggregated by key demographic characteristics between 2008 and 2013 were also used to analyze CTE achievement (Yoon & Strobel, 2017). One study used two-stage sampling, surveys, and math and reading cognitive assessments of private and public high school students as well as surveys of related principals, parents, teachers, and librarians (Bozick & Dalton, 2013). The Betts, Zou, McAdams & Dotter's (2014) study used exploratory models and confirmatory analysis of instrumental variables to determine causal links between CTE enrollments and postsecondary outcomes and achievement. Finally, one study was a comparative analysis of graduation rates for 36 CTEspecific and comprehensive high schools in 21 New Jersey (NJ) counties using graduation data published on the NJ Department of Education website between 2011 and 2014 (Hart, 2017).

The findings from these studies vary. Dougherty's (2016a) study found higher probabilities of college enrollment for graduates of CTE concentrators¹ versus non-concentrators, particularly outside of rural areas in Arkansas. Dougherty (2016b) found that most CTE concentrators were identified as White or female and there was a positive relationship between the number of CTE courses students took and their education and labor outcomes. Findings indicated that high school graduation increased by 3.2 percent for every additional CTE course and quarterly wages were boosted by \$28. Concentrators were 21 percent more likely to graduate high school. Males and low-income students experience the largest benefit of concentrating (Dougherty, 2016b). Using national data, the U.S. Department of Education (2017) found that postsecondary enrollment was lower among CTE concentrators (82%) compared to non-concentrators (91%). Concentrators had three or more credits in an occupational area (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). The department also found that postsecondary enrollment was higher among more recent graduates (89% in 2004) compared to 83 percent in 1992 particularly among those who earned more credits (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Taking more occupational and less academic courses in the last two years

HISD Research and Accountability _

🖌 للاستشار ا

¹ Concentrators are a coherent sequence of CTE courses, and non-concentrators are a non-coherent sequence of CTE courses.

of high school limits students' acquisition of advanced academic skills and concepts (Bozick & Dalton, 2013). Black and Asian students benefit more from occupational courses than White kids (Bozick & Dalton, 2013).

In a San Diego, California study, Betts, Zou, McAdams and Dotter (2014) found that 80 percent of CTE courses were occupationally-focused, 30 percent were community-college, and 4 percent were in engineering or STEM courses, and that variations were related to school size. They found that the average effect of taking one additional CTE course was about 0.12 years increase in postsecondary attendance during the first four years after high school graduation. CTE-specific high schools were shown to have higher graduation rates (94.8%) compared to comprehensive high schools (88.7%) in NJ and the difference was statistically significant (p =.006) (Hart, 2017). Nationally, CTE schools had a positive effect on postsecondary enrollment, according to Neild and Brynes (2014), however, the effects across cohorts were inconsistent and CTE had no significant impact on postsecondary outcomes. In the case of Texas, there were wide variations in CTE-STEM enrollment trends by types of courses, gender, and race/ethnicity (Yoon & Strobel, 2017). Yoon and Strobel (2017) found that the gender gap in CTE-STEM courses increased at a rate greater than in advanced math and advanced science courses across the years, 2008–2013.

The positive effects of CTE on high school graduation and postsecondary enrollment are evident in these studies and are also evident among minority students who tend to benefit most from enrollment in CTE. Further, CTE participation showed positive outcomes for boosting income. Few studies, however have focused on the employment or career outcomes of CTE graduates or controlled for the courses, particularly occupational courses that may not require postsecondary qualifications for employment. This study disaggregated results by key demographic and educational variables.

Method

This study used descriptive data to determine the association between CTE course enrollment and student performance, graduation, CTE certification, and annual dropout rates. HISD students enrolled in CTE courses were identified in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) and the Cognos data warehouse. Cognos is an IMB business intelligence and performance management software suite. PEIMS data were collected in the fall of 2017. Students enrolled in a non-coherent sequence of courses were coded 1 and those who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of courses were coded 2 in PEIMS and the data warehouse. PEIMS key demographic and educational data for these students, including gender, ethnicity and race, economic status, gifted and talented (G/T) status, and at-risk² status were also used in the analysis.

The 2018 State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) End-of-Course (EOC) exams scores were used as the outcome data. All students who had a score on Algebra I, Biology, English I, English II, and U.S. History STAAR EOC exams Spring administration, 2018 were included in the study along with their met-standards status on these exams. Only regular STAAR was included. STAAR is a state-mandated criterion reference test that measures student academic performance and achievement. Retesters were not included in the study due to over exposure to both the program and outcome measures.

Students' STAAR data used in this study were retrieved from Cognos. The dataset was cleaned and organized for analyses. Non-CTE students were coded 0; students enrolled in a non-coherent sequence of

HISD Research and Accountability _

للاستشا

² At risk indicates whether a student is currently at-risk for dropping out of school using state-defined criteria only. The student must be less than 21 years old and experiencing one or more of 13 criteria including unsatisfactory academic performance, retained in a grade, is pregnant or a parent, homeless, and prior expulsion (Texas Education Agency, 2015).

courses were coded 1, and those enrolled in a coherent sequence of courses were coded 2 to facilitate the analyses of program associations (**Table B1**, **Appendix B**, p. 22).

Descriptive analyses were used to compare the CTE group composition relative to the district by key demographic and educational data. Further analyses were conducted to determine the extent to which students in the study met STAAR standards based on the scale scores students attained on these EOC tests. The 2017–2018 standard were classified as follows:

- 1. Does not meet grade level.
- 2. Approaches Grade Level Standard at the students' performance standard.
- 3. Meets Grade Level standard.
- 4. Masters Grade Level standard.

Standards 2 to 4 above reflect passing standards on STAAR EOC exams. Students who attained Masters Grade Level Standard would have also attained Approaches Grade Level Standard at the students' performance standard and Meets Grade Level standard.

Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted on each of the STAAR EOC rests in this evaluation to predict student performance regressed on selected demographic and educational factors, notably English language learners, economic status, G/T, special education, and at-risk status using Stata version 15. Stata is a StatsCorp LLC statistical software used to analyze quantitative data. The data used in this study met conditions of homoscedasticity, normality, and collinearity using Shapiro-Wilks test, the Normal Q-Q plot, and the Detrended Normal Q-Q plot. Missing data cases were treated to pairwise exclusions on the IBM Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

Data for students' CTE industry certification were retrieved from the HISD Chancery Ad Hoc data warehouse through Cognos. Graduation data from the Research and Accountability Microsoft Access data files and CTE and HISD longitudinal graduation rates obtained from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) 2017 Accountability Completion, Graduation and Dropout Summary Report were also used in the analyses. The evaluation study also used the TEA 2016–2017 Annual Dropout Summary Report for CTE and HISD annual dropout rates.

Limitations

- It is assumed that all HISD 6–12th-grade students had the option and opportunity for CTE enrollment, although they may not have had similar motivations. Therefore, students who were not enrolled in CTE courses were included in the data analyses. This may create interpretation issues and may affect the external validity of the findings.
- Students' self-selection into the CTE program made it challenging to find a comparable group of students with similar motivation for enrollment but who did not enroll, restricting the external validity of the results to only those students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses.
- STAAR EOC tests were administered after courses were completed. Although there are retesters, prior scores for those courses are unavailable. This restricts the robustness of the analyses that could be undertaken.
- CTE courses are designed to prepare students for college and careers. By the preparation date of this
 report, college enrollment or career decision data were not available as legitimate outcomes from which
 to measure the effectiveness of CTE course enrollment. However, CTE enrollment and enrollment
 completion are used as measures of postsecondary school readiness as part of Texas Education

HISD Research and Accountability _

Agency (TEA) school accountability system and are being treated in this report as a proxy, along with graduation data, to determine program impact.

• CTE is not an intervention in traditional academic programs. The use of STAAR results may not be a valid measure of CTE impact.

Results

What were the 2009–2010 through 2017–2018 enrollment trends and the 2017–2018 demographic characteristics of students who were enrolled in HISD CTE programs?

Figure 1 shows the comparative enrollment of CTE students in HISD between the 2009–2010 and 2017–2018 academic year, inclusive.





Source: PEIMS fall 2017 (Department of Research and Accountability database); HISD Report 2016–2017. Note: CTE flags were revised in 2016–2017 to 0, 1 and 2 (See Appendix B, Table B1, p. 22); Figures from 2016–2017 reflect only Code 2 after the use of code 3 was discontinued. ADA-Eligibility code "0" has been excluded from the enrollments for 2017–2018.

- Overall, the number of students enrolled in CTE courses increased by 9,018, from 33,634 in 2009–2010 to 42,652 in 2017–2018.
- Figure 1 shows an increase of 1,672 students (4.1%) for all CTE course enrollment groups, from the 2016–2017 to the 2017–2018 academic year.
- The number of students enrolled in non-coherent sequence of courses (CTE 1) declined by 1,004, from the 2016–2017 to the 2017–2018 academic year.
- The number of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of courses (CTE 2) increased by 10.8 percent from the 2016–2017 to the 2017–2018 school year, from 24,694 to 27,370 students.



Figure 2 shows the demographic composition of students enrolled in CTE courses during the 2017–2018 school year.





Source: PEIMS Fall 2017 (Department of Research and Accountability Access Database), HISD SIS Ad Hoc data warehouse Note: Fem. = Female; Seq. = Sequenced; Hisp. = Hispanic; SpEd = Special Education; G/T = Gifted and talented; Span.= Spanish; Eng.= English. The total CTE Enrollment was N = 42,652, CTE Sequence enrollment was 27,370; and HISD 6th – 12th grade enrollment was 95,126

- Fewer limited English proficiency (LEP) (15.7 %) and G/T (13.6%) students were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compared to their 6th through12th–grade peers in HISD (18.6% and 18.9%, respectively).
- Fewer Asian (2.4 v. 3.8%) and White (5.6 v. 9.5%) students were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compared to their 6th through 12th grade peers in the HISD population.
- More at-risk (76.9 v. 68.0%) and economically-disadvantaged (73.9 v. 70.7%) students were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compared to their 6th through 12th-grade HISD peers.

What were key CTE program initiatives implemented in HISD during the 2017–2018 academic year?

Under the umbrella of the Career Readiness department, HISD provided career awareness and technical education experiences to students in the 2017–2018 school year. Some key initiatives included: Broadening Work-Based Learning Opportunities through Business Partnerships, Providing Career Awareness to Elementary Students, Increasing Career Exploration Experiences for Middle School Students, and increasing the number of CTE programs offering industry certifications.

In addition to these key initiatives, the Career Readiness department offered a variety of programs through Career and Technical Education (CTE) coursework from which students could select a career pathway of study. Career pathways guide students in course selection regardless of their abilities, talents, or desired levels of education. By taking CTE courses, students are given opportunities to participate in hands-on training within their career pathway of interest. As such, HISD students engage in opportunities to explore career options and prepare for the workforce and/or post-secondary education. Additionally, several campuses offered dual credit courses to enhance their CTE pathways. The initiatives ensure that all CTE students develop career awareness within their selected course of study and receive exposure to

HISD Research and Accountability

professional experiences to develop mastery, confidence, and leadership skills. The following provides additional details regarding key initiatives in Career Readiness:

Broadening Work-Based Learning Opportunities through Business Partnerships:

Business partnerships provide students with enriching learning experiences, including one-on-one mentoring and real-world work opportunities. CTE students are invited to participate in field trips, site visits, and internships at local businesses. These businesses recognize the need to expose local students to various aspects of the world of work and the importance of on-the-job training experiences. Such experiences in 2017–2018 included interning at several major hotel chains and offering an apprenticeship like program through Texas Masonry Council. HISD business partners, including Gilbane Building Company, Century AC, Merrick Brothers Construction, San Jacinto Junior College, and many hospital affiliations continue to partner with district high schools to provide assistance such as paid and unpaid internships for students, classroom speakers, facility tours, and teacher externships.

Expansion of Industry-Based Certifications Offered

Students engaged in Career and Technical Education programs across the district are afforded the opportunity to take an Industry Based Certification (IBC) intended to increase, enhance, and demonstrate knowledge and skills associated with each pathway of courses. In 2017–2018, the number of students earning TEA recognized industry-based certification, as part of the College, Career, and Military Readiness indicator for accountability, increased by 68%. Implementation of supplemental curriculum, credentialing, and accreditation of labs has increased to support the delivery and attainment of IBCs across the district.

Providing Career Awareness to Elementary Students:

HISD elementary school students are exposed to career exploration presentations to increase their career awareness and peak interest in various careers within the local labor market. The Career Ready Wagon provides students with interactive, hands-on demonstrations with information about various professions. Students also participate in activity stations and hands-on demonstrations that help them begin to develop connections between their skills, interests, and future career choices. In 2017–2018 year, the Career Cowboy visited 34 Elementary Schools and engaged over 10,000 students in the Career Ready Wagon, a converted school bus filled with hands-on interactive stations in career exploration.

Increasing Career Exploration Experiences for Middle School Students:

In 2017–2018, HISD encouraged middle school enrollment in three hybrid courses: Professional Communications, Principles of Information Technology, and Principles of Applied Engineering. The courses are designed to provide high school level credit in Information Technology or Engineering, while at the same time providing a specific curriculum that allows students to explore their own interests and aptitude as related to careers. Students are then able to make more informed decisions about their high school and endorsement choices.

Providing Print and Online Resources for Students and their Families:

The Career Readiness Department maintains an engaging and up-to-date online platform (website) and provides printed and online career program materials (Career Program booklet) to better inform students, parents, teachers, and business partners about career programming throughout the district. The website presence is audience-driven and targets three audience groups through key functions: PLAN (Students and Families), PREPARE (Teachers), and Partner (Businesses). The site can be visited at the following link: http://www.hisdcareerreadiness.org. Information regarding descriptions of Career and Technical Education Programs of study available can be found at the following link: http://www.hisdcareerreadiness.org/plan/programs/

HISD Research and Accountability _

🖌 للاستشار ا



Career and Technology Student Organizations (CTSO)

CTE students are encouraged to join student organizations that are directly related to their selected career pathway. These organizations offer students opportunities to develop leadership and teamwork skills that help prepare them for the workforce and/or for postsecondary education and training. HISD has developed several partnerships with local, regional, and national professional organizations to allow school-level student organizations to participate fully in related activities of these organizations and to benefit from their professional memberships. Some of these organizations include the Business Professionals of America (BPA), Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA), Family, Career and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA), Health Occupations Students of America (HOSA), Skills USA, and the Technology Student Association (TSA). In the 2017–2018 school year, 2,966 students participated in district CTE student organization activities.

How did the performance of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compare with their Non-CTE peers on the 2018 STAAR EOC assessments?

Figure 3 and **Figure 4** display the performance of ninth through twelfth-grade CTE students on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I, Biology, English I, English II, and U. S. History EOC exams. **Table C1**, **Appendix C** (p. 23) shows the counts of test-takers for each of the EOC exams by evaluation group and **Table C2**, Appendix C (p. 24) shows CTE students' performance disaggregated by selected demographic and educational attributes for each of the EOC exams.

Figure 3. Comparative Percentage of HISD 9th- Through 12th-Grade Non-CTE and CTE Students Who Met or Surpassed Approaches Grade Level Standard on the 2018 STAAR EOC Exams



Source: HISD Student 2017–2018 PEIMS (Department of Research and Accountability Access database): STAAR EOC Spring Test Files, 2017–2018.

Note: Data are based on first-time testers. Only regular STAAR EOC testers was used.

 The highest percentage of students who performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I (77.7%), Biology (85.1%), English II (68.4%), and U.S. History (89.2%) EOC exams were enrolled in a non-coherent sequence of CTE courses.



- The percentage of students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses and who performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR EOC exams ranged from a high of 88.9 in U.S. History to a low of 60.0 in English I.
- Regardless of CTE enrollment status, the proportion of students who performed at or above Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR EOC exams was lowest for English I (60.0%) and English II (62.3%).
- A higher percentage of students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compared to non-CTE students performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I (73.8% v. 73.5%) and U.S. History (88.9 v. 87.8) EOC exams.

Figure 4. Comparative Percentage of HISD 9th- Through 12th-Grade Students by CTE Enrollments Status, who Performed at or Above the Approaches Grade Level Standards on the 2017 and 2018 STAAR EOC Assessments



Source: HISD PEIMS (Department of Research and Accountability) Access Database, 2016 and 2017 and STAAR EOC assessment results data files, 2017 & 2018.

Note: Data include first-time testers and regular STAAR EOC testers only. Data was based on the 2017 and the 2018 Approaches Grade Level Standard.

- There was a negligible increase in the percentage of students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses who performed at or above Approaches Grade Level standard between 2017 (59.8%) to 2018 (60.0%) on the STAAR EOC English I exam (Figure 4).
- The percentage of students who were not enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses and who performed at or above Approaches Grade Level standard on the STAAR EOC exams either increased or remained unchanged between 2016–2017 and 2017–2018, except for Algebra I (82.8 v. 77.7%).

The following information refer to the disaggregated performance data in Table C2, Appendix C (p. 24) for students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses. The performance of their non-CTE peers was provided for comparative purposes.

According to Table C2 (p. 24), at least 72.5 percent of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses, regardless of demographic characteristics, performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the STAAR U.S. History exam. The only exception was among students receiving special education services.

HISD Research and Accountability

- Except for at-risk students and students receiving special education, more than 57.0 percent of students in the demographic subgroups enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR Biology EOC exam.
- At least 50 percent of the subgroups, except males, at-risk students, students receiving special education, and African American students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I EOC exam.
- A consistently high percentage (at least 94.1%) of G/T students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I, Biology, English I, English II, and U.S. History EOC exams.

CTE Student Certification

Students could receive an industry certification, license, or Occupational Competency Assessment on successful completion of their CTE courses or programs. **Appendix D** (p. 25) describes the certifications. Students can also earn a performance acknowledgement on their high school diplomas for earning a nationally or internationally recognized business or industry certification or licensure (Houston ISD, 2017).

Data provided by the Career Readiness Department showed that 5,648 CTE certifications were earned among students in 34 HISD schools. **Table D1**, Appendix D (p. 26) shows the type and distribution of certificates by schools. Of these schools, 91.5 percent of students who took a certification exam passed the exam in 2017–2018. **Figure 5** shows the distribution of these certificates by school for students enrolled in the HISD CTE courses.



Figure 5. HISD CTE Certification Distributed by School, 2017–2018

Source: Source: HISD Chancery Ad hoc Data Warehouse, retrieved using IBM Cognos on 5/25/2018. Note: *Data for schools with less than five students.

- Overall, 91.5 percent of the CTE students who took an industry certification exam received an industry certification during the 2017–2018 school year, compared to 71.9 percent in 2016–2017 (Houston ISD, 2017). Nine schools had certification rates that were below the overall average of 91.5 percent. Table DI, Appendix D (p.26) provides details.
- At least 50 percent of students in each school, except for one school, passed CTE certification assessments for the 2017–2018 school year.

HISD Research and Accountability

 One hundred percent of CTE students from nine schools who took an industry certification exam received an industry certification during the 2017–2018 school year. Seven schools had less than five students who were assessed for certifications.

What were the longitudinal graduation and annual dropout rates for students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses compared to HISD students districtwide, and students who graduated in the Class of 2016 and 2017?

Longitudinal Graduation Rates

Figure 6 displays the 2017 longitudinal four-year graduation count for CTE students in 9th through 12th grades in HISD along with the four-year graduation rate. The four-year rate included students who followed a coherent sequence of CTE courses that led to an industry certificate. These students would have graduated on time, that is, within four years.





Source: TEA 2016 and Class of 2017 Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report. Note: No statutory exclusions were applied. Data align to State Performance Based Monitoring Analysis System. Graduation rates are in parentheses

- The number of CTE students who graduated increased by 19.5 percentage points, from 3,163 in 2015–2016 to 3,780 students in 2016–2017. This increase is nearly five times that of HISD districtwide, which increased by 4.2 percentage points.
- CTE graduation rate decreased from 89.4 percent for the Class of 2016 to 88.4 percent for the Class of 2017 but still exceeded the district graduation rate (federal calculation) by nearly 10 percentage points.

Annual Dropout

A dropout is a seventh- through twelfth-grade public school student, in a given year, who does not return the following fall, and who has not been expelled, has not graduated, has not received a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, has not continued school outside the public-school system, had not begun college, or died (see TEA, 2018, September). The annual dropout rate, therefore, is the percentage of students who dropped out of grades 7–8, grades 9–12, or grades 7–12 during a school year. **Figure 7** shows comparative dropout rates for students in grades 9–12 enrolled in CTE courses and for HISD, overall, for the 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 school years (TEA, 2016). Published dropout data have a one-year lag.



Figure 7. CTE and HISD Annual Dropout Rates Ninth Through Twelfth Grade, 2015–2016 and 2016– 2017

Source: TEA 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 Annual Dropout Summary Report

Note: No statutory exclusions were applied. Data align to PBMAS

- The annual dropout rate for CTE (2.5 and 2.7%) was substantially lower than the district's (4.5 and 4.6%) in 2015–2016 and 2016–2017, respectively.
- The dropout rate increased by 0.2 percentage points for CTE students and increased by 0.1 percentage points for the district from 2015–2016 to 2016–2017.

Graduation Diplomas

Based on the level and quality of credits acquired during high school, twelfth-grade students could have earned one of five types of diplomas for 2016 and 2017. These are completion of Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Regular/Minimum, Recommended, Distinguished Achievement, and Foundation High School Program (**Table E1**, **Appendix E**, p. 27). District data were included for comparative purposes.

 Based on Table E1, most students enrolled in CTE courses graduated with Recommended Diplomas (76.4%) in 2017. This was 0.3 percentage points higher than in 2016 (76.1%). There were increases as well from 2016 to 2017 for CTE students who graduated with a Completed Individualized Education Plan Diploma (1.08 percentage-points increase) (.02 to 1.1%, respectively), Foundation High School

HISD Research and Accountability

Program Diploma (1.9 percentage-points increase) (5.5 to 7.4%, respectively). Comparative district data are provided.

• The percentage of CTE students who graduated with Distinguished Achievement Diploma decreased between 2016 and 2017 by 0.6 percentage points (7.5 to 6.9%, respectively). Similarly, there was a decrease in the percentage of CTE students who graduated with a Regular/Minimum Diploma (0.3 percentage points) (8.5 to 8.2%, respectively).

Performance Predictors

Multiple regression analyses were conducted on the five STAAR EOC exam results used in this study to predict the performance of students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE course. The results were regressed on five key demographic variables: English language learners, economic status, special education, at risk, and gifted and talented (G/T) identification. The results are presented in **Table F1**, **Appendix F**, p. 28.

- The regression model predicted 17 percent of the variance in students' scale scores for the 2018 STAAR Algebra I EOC exam, with a statistically significant (p<.001) constant or mean of 3958.8 scale score points (ssp) (Table F1, p. 28). Being identified as gifted and talented (G/T) explained 27.9 percent in the scale score variance for Algebra I, followed by special education (18.3%), at risk (15.8%), and economically disadvantaged (5.0%). All four predictors were statistically significant (p<.001), but only G/T was a positive predictor. G/T students would, on average, score above the mean or constant scale score.
- The overall regression model predicted 33.0 percent of the variance in the 2018 STAAR Biology EOC exam scale scores, with a statistically significant (p<.001) constant scale score of 4156.9. Being identified as G/T explained 42.9 percent of the variance in the Biology I scale score, followed by economically disadvantaged (15.6%), special education (14.6%), and at-risk (14.1%). The four predictors were statistically significant (p<.001). Only G/T was a positive predictor.
- The regression model for English I predicted 34.0 percent of the variance in students' scale scores for the 2018 STAAR English I EOC exams, with the statistically significant (p<.001) constant scale score of 4010.6. Being identified as G/T predicted 41.9 percent of the variance in the English I EOC exam results, followed by special education (18.2%), at-risk (17.3%), and economically disadvantaged (12.7%). The results were statistically significant (p<.001). Only G/T identification was a positive predictor.
- The overall regression model for English II predicted 34.0 percent of the variance in the 2018 English II EOC scale scores, with a statistically significant (p<.001) constant or mean scale score of 4024.7. Being identified as G/T predicted 41.3 percent of the variance in the English II exam result, followed by special education (19.1%), at-risk (16.8%), and economically disadvantaged (11.3%). All four predictors were statistically significant (p<.001). G/T was the only positive predictor.
- Overall, the regression model predicted 26.0 percent of the variance in the 2018 STAAR U.S. History Exam results, with a statistically significant (p<.001) constant or mean scale score of 4301.7. Being identified as G/T predicted 32.3 percent of the variance in the U.S. History scale score, followed by atrisk (22.0%), special education (13.9%), economically disadvantaged (10.6%), and an English language learner (2.9%). All predictors were statistically significant (p<.001). G/T was the only positive predictor.

HISD Research and Accountability

للاستشا

Discussion

This evaluation sought to determine CTE enrollment trends, analyze STAAR EOC performance of students enrolled in CTE, and compare their performance relative to their peers who were not enrolled in CTE courses. The number of students enrolled in CTE course increased over the last school year. That increase was attributed to students who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses. The number of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses in HISD were male rather than female, and Blacks and Hispanic rather than White. Black and Hispanic students were represented in higher proportions in the evaluation sample who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of course as compared to their peers in the general HISD 6th–12th-grade population. The evaluation sample also had a higher proportion of at-risk, economically disadvantaged, and fewer students identified as G/T compared to the HISD 6th–12th-grade population for the 2017–2018 school year.

Compared to their non-CTE counterparts, a higher percentage of HISD students enrolled in a coherentsequence of CTE courses met the Approaches Grade Level standard on the 2018 STAAR Algebra I and U.S. History EOC exams. There was a slight increase in the percentage of students enrolled in a coherentsequence of CTE courses who met the Approaches Grade Level standard between 2017 and 2018 on the STAAR English I EOC exam. Bozick and Dalton (2013) found that taking more occupational and less academic courses in the last two years of high school limits students' acquisition of advanced academic skills and concepts. Using STAAR EOC exams, which are purely academic, to measure CTE students' performance may be masking students' real performance in a coherent sequence of CTE courses. CTE certification may be a more useful measure.

Overall, 91.5 percent of 6,170 CTE students who took an industry certification exam were successfully certified during the 2017–2018 school year, with nine schools performing below the overall average and one school performing below the 50 percent mark. Based on the longitudinal four-year graduation rate for 9th–12th-grade students, there was a higher percentage increase in the number of HISD CTE students who graduated compared to the number who graduated across the district. Additionally, the graduation rate for CTE students exceeded that of the district by nearly 10 percentage points. According to Dougherty (2016b), high-school graduation increased by 3.2 percent for every additional CTE course a student took. A higher percentage of CTE students compared to the district were awarded Recommended graduation diplomas. The percentage of CTE students who graduated with Distinguished Achievement Diploma decreased by 0.6 percent. There was a slight increase of 0.2 percent in the percentage of CTE high school students in grades 9–12 who dropped out compared to an increase of 0.1 percent for the district, although the annual dropout rate for CTE students (2.7%) was less than the district's rate (4.6%). CTE specific high schools were shown to have higher graduation rates compared to comprehensive high schools in New Jersey (Hart, 2017).

G/T identification was the only positive predictor of students' performance on the STAAR Algebra I, Biology, English I and II, and U.S. History EOC exams. Students who were identified as G/T were predicted to perform above average on these EOC tests. On the other hand, students who were identified as economically disadvantaged, at-risk for school dropout, who were English language learners (only for U.S. History) or enrolled in special education were predicted to perform below average on the STAAR EOC exams.

Analysis of the performance of CTE demographic subgroups found that fewer than 50 percent of students enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE course receiving special education services met Approaches Grade Level standard on all five EOC exams in the study. Similar trends were observed for at-risk students in four of the EOC exams and in three of the EOC exams for males and African American students. Dougherty

HISD Research and Accountability

للاستشاراه

(2016b) determined that males and low-income students experienced the largest benefits of concentrating or enrolling in CTE coherent-sequence courses. HISD data does not fully support this trend. As mentioned earlier, STAAR EOC results may not be an appropriate measure of CTE students' performance. Disaggregated certification data may be more appropriate for measuring CTE students' performance.

Additionally, Betts, Zou, McAdams, and Dotter, (2014) found that the effects of taking an additional CTE course was equivalent to about 0.12 years increase in postsecondary attendance during the first four years after high school graduation. This study did not analyze the link between CTE graduation and postsecondary enrollment, but nationally, the research literature (Neild & Brynes, 2014) supports the link. This may require additional research in the HISD to determine the extent to which CTE students enroll in postsecondary education.

Recommendations

- Since HISD data on graduates beyond high school follow a one-year lag, further studies should focus on CTE graduates' enrollment in higher education or the extent to which graduates are able to find employment in their related coherent sequence of courses or certification and to better determine the longer-term outcomes of CTE.
- Based on the results of this study, the CTE Department and schools should build on relevant instructional strategies and support services that address the adverse performance of at-risk CTE students.
- STAAR EOC exams may be designed to get a valid measure of students' CTE performance. It may be necessary to identify more appropriate ways to measure students' CTE performance that are compatible with the nature of program.
- Given the impact that CTE workload can have on the acquisition of academic skills and the CTE students' performance on the 2018 STAAR EOC exams relative to their peers, the CTE Department should review CTE enrollment to ensure that there are no adverse effects between students' CTE workload and the acquisition of academic skills required to meet standards on STAAR or in preparation for postsecondary education.

References

- Betts, J. R., Zou, A., McAdams, J., & Dotter, D. (2014). *Career and technical education in San Diego: A statistical analysis of course availability, student coursetaking patterns and relationships with high school and high school and postsecondary outcomes.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Bozick, R., & Dalton, B. (2013). Career and technical education and academic progress at the end of high school: Evidence from the Education Longitudinal Study of 2012. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Under Secretary, Policy and Program Studies Service.
- Castellano, M., Stringfield, S., & Stone III, J. R. (2003). Secondary career and technical education and comprehensive school reform: Implications for research and practice. *Review of Educational Research* 73 (2), 231–272.
- Dougherty, S. M. (2016a). *High school career and technical education participation and initial college enrollment: Evidence from Arkansas.* SREE Spring 2016 Conference.



- Doughterty, S. M. (2016b). *Career and technical education in high school: Does it improve student outcomes?* Washington, DC: Thomas B Fordham Institute for Advancing Educational Excellence.
- Hart, C. (2017). *The effects of career and technical education in high school graduation in New Jersey.* Theses and Dissertation 2534. Retreived from http://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/2435.
- Houston ISD. (2017). Career and technical education: Prevalence, student performance, and program outcomes, HISD, 2016–2017. Houston: HISD Research and Accountability.
- Neild, R. C., & Brynes, V. (2014). Impact of CTE on postsecondary outcomes: A case study of a large urban district. Baltimore, MD: School of Education Center for Social Organization of Schools, John Hopkins University.
- State of Texas. (2013). Education Code Title 2: Public Education, Subtitle C, Chapter 12. Austin. http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.12.htm#12.001: State of Texas.
- Texas Education Agency. (2015). 2015–2016 PEIMS standards section 4: Description of codes, post addendum version. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.
- Texas Education Agency. (2016, August). *Annual dropout data, 2014–2015*. Retrieved from http://tea.texas.gov/acctres/drop_annual/1415/level.html
- Texas Education Agency. (2018). Career and technical education. Retrieved from http://tea.texas.gov/cte/
- Texas Education Agency. (2018, September). Secondary school completion and dropouts in Texas public schools, 2016–2017 (Docment No. GE19 601 01). Austin, TX: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Career and technical education coursetaking and postsecondary education enrollment and attainment: High school classes of 1992 and 1994, Data Point BCES 2016-109. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2017). *Participation in high school career and technical education.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences.
- Yoon, Y. S., & Strobel, J. (2017). Trends in Texas high school student enrollment in mathematics, science, and CTE-STEM courses. International Journal of STEM Education 49; Open Access, DOI 10.1186/s40594-017-0063-6, 1–23.



Appendix A: CTE Pathways

CTE Pathwave	High School Where Offered	East-Growing Career	Certifications and
GIE Falliways	ingi school where Onered	Opportunities	Licensures
	Austin	Veterinary Technicians	Certified Veterinary
	Bellaire	-	Assistant (CVA Level 1)
	Booker T. Washington	Agricultural Inspectors	Texas Floral Design- Level 1
Agriculture feed and	Chavez	-	Certification
Agriculture, tood and	Harper Alternative School	Forest and	
natural resources	Lamar	Conservation Workers	
	Madison		
	North Forest		
	Worthing		
	Barbara Jordan	Construction management	NCCER - Construction
	Booker T. Washington	-	Technology
	Furr	Civil Engineers	
	Houston MTSC		NCCER – HVAC
	Jones Futures	Heating and Cooling	
Architecture and	Jordan	Technicians	NCCER- Plumbing
Construction	Lamar		
	Milby		AutoCAD - Certified
	Scarborough		Associate
	Waltrip		
	vvisaom		
	Chause		Associate (USWA)
		Audio/VISUAL Lechnicians	
	FUII Heighte	Multimodia Antistand	(ACA) video communication
		Animaters	Adoba Contified Associate
	Juluali Kashmara	Animators	
Arts A/V Technology P	Nasiiiileite Lamar	Technical Writers	Communication
Communication	Milby		Communication
	Northside		Apple Final Cut Pro
	Sharpstown		
	Waltrip		
	Westside		
	Yates		
	Austin	Human Resource Specialist	Microsoft Officer Certified
	Bellaire		Master
	Heights	Sales Agents and Managers	
	Houston Academy of	<u>.</u>	A*S*K Business Fundamental
Destination Management 6	International Studies	Market Research Analvst	
Business Management &	Lamar	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	NOCTI-Business
Administration	Liberty		
	North Houston Early College		Sales Force
	Sterling		
	Westside		
	Wisdom		
	Austin	Teacher	Early Childhood Education
//			Assessment and Certification
Education and Training		Coaches and Recreation	
Services		Instructors	Pre-protessional Certification
			In Education Fundamental
		Social Workers	

Table A1 CTE Pathways Career Opportunities Certification and Licensures Available to HISD

HISD Research and Accountability______19

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION REPORT, 2017-2018

CTE Pathways	High School Where Offered	Fast-Growing Career	Certifications and
	Dolloiro	Opportunities	Licensures
	Dellaire Heights	Accountants and Financial	QUICKBOOKS CERTIFIED USE
	High School for Law and	Analyst	A*S*K Finance
	Justice	Loan Clerks and Bank	
Finance	Lamar	Officers	
	Liberty		
	Sharpstown	Financial Advisors	
	Westbury		
	Westside	Fundamente Officer	
	High School for Law and	Foreign Service Officer	
Government and Public	Jusice	Political Science Teacher	
Administration			
		Paralegal	
	Chavez	Dental Assistant	Certified Clinical Medical
	DeBakey		Assistant (CCMA)
	Jones Futures	Biomedical Technician	Phlebotomy Technician
Health Science	Heights	De sistere d Nivers	Certification (CPT)
	Long Futures	Registered Nurse	Certified patient Care
	Milby		
	Sharpstown		Pharmacy Technician
	Waltrip		Trainee
	Westbury		Nursing Assisting
	Westside		Assessment (CNA)
			National Entry Level Dental
			Assistant (NELDA)
	Harper Alternative	Hotel manager	ServSafe Food Handlers
	Jordan		
	Lamar	Chef and Head Cook	
Hospitality and Tourism	Milby	Feed and Deverage Comise	
	Westside	Worker	
	Wheatley	Worker	
	Worthing		
	Jordan	Massage Therapist	Texas Cosmetology Operato
Human Services	Houston MTSC	5	License
	Milby	Spa Manager	
	Austin	Computer Programmers	BISCI- Cabling Installation
	Bellaire		
	Booker I washington	Computer Engineers	CompTIA – Strata, A+,
	Heights	Database Administrators	Network+ Security+
	High School for Law and	Database Authinistrators	Adobe Certified Associate-
	Justice		Web Authoring Interactive
	High School for the		Media
	Performing and Visual Arts		
Information Technology	Houston MTSC		CIW–Web Design Specialis
	Lamar		Web Security Associate,
	Madison		Internet Business Associate
	Mickey Leland		
	Milby		STARS Certification
	North Forest		
	NORINSIDE		SPACE Certification
	Scarborougn		ESPI toobaical Cartification
	South Farly		ESRI lecinical Certification-
	Waltrin		Deskton
	Westbury		MOS Wordz Excel
	Westside		PowerPoint, Access
	Wisdom		
	Wheatley		
	Worthing		

HISD Research and Accountability _ للاستشارات

Δ

20

Table A1. CTE Pathway	s, Career Opportunities,	Certification and Licensu	ures Available to HISD
	Students, 2017–2018 (coi	ntinued)	
CTE Pathways	High School Where Offered	Fast-Growing Career Opportunities	Certifications and Licensures
Law, Public Safety, Corrections and Security	Chavez High School for Law and Justice North Forest Sterling Waltrip Westbury Wisdom	Emergency Medical Technician Police Officer Paralegal	Texas Commission on Fire Prevention Certificate State Emergency Medication (EMT) Certification
Manufacturing	Houston MTSC Jordan Madison Milby Wisdom	Welder Machinist Technician	Autodesk Certified User Certified SOLIDWORKS Associate (CSWA) NCCER–Welding AWS Certification
Marketing Sales and Service	Bellaire Jordan Heights Scarborough Westbury	Sales Agents and Managers Merchandisers Retail Salespeople	A*S*K–Marketing Fundamentals A*S*K Entrepreneurship National Retail Federation Customer Service and Sales
S.T.E.M.	Austin Chavez Booker T. Washington Eastwood Academy Energy Institute Furr Heights Houston MTSC Kashmere Lamar Madison Mickey Leland Milby Reagan South East Early College Waltrip Westbury Westside Young Women's College Prep Academy	Geological Technician Geoscientist Engineer	Certified Clinical Medical Assistant (CCMA) Autodesk Certified User Certified SOLIDWORKS Associate (CSWA)
Transportation, Distribution & Logistics	Austin Heights Houston MTSC Jordan Madison North Forest Sterling Waltrip Westbury Wheatley Yates	Merchant Mariner Auto/Diesel Technician Airline Pilot	ASE-Brakes, Electronic/Electrical Systems, Heating and A/C, Engine Repair CLA CLT GLA



4

Appendix B: CTE Codes

Table B1. Descrip Standar	tion of Career and Technical Educ ds, 2017–2018	ation Codes, Texas Educ	cation Data	
Code Table ID	Name	XML Name	Date Issued	Date Updated
C142	CAREER-AND-TECHNICAL-ED- INFO-CD	TX-CareerAnd TechnologyEdType	3/3/1993	3/1/2016
Code	Translation			
	When assigning the Career and enrollment in all Career and Tec of course funding weight	Technical Indicator Code hnical Education (CTE) c	e, include ourses, reg	gardless
0	Not Enrolled in a CTE Course			
1	Enrolled in A CTE Course A stude of the fall snapshot date or comple A student in grades 9-12 who is ta or completed a CTE course by the year plan of study does not outline	nt in grades 6-8 who is tak ted a CTE course by the e king a CTE course as of th end of the school year, an a coherent sequence of co	ing a CTE c nd of the sc e fall snaps d the stude ourses in C ⁻	ourse as hool year. hot date nt's 4- FE
	The following code is for studen 4-year plan to take a coherent se more credits) of courses in CTE semester of CTE course(s), whic of courses. If a student's 4-year from a code 2 to a 0 or 1 in a sub	its who on the fall snapsl equence (2 or more CTE , and (b) are enrolled in o ch are part of their CTE c plan changes, then the s psequent school year	not date: (a courses foi or have com oherent see tudent cou) have a r 3 or ppleted a quence Id go
2	Participant in A Coherent Sequence enrolled in a sequential course of s skills, and competencies relating to have a 4-year plan of study to take	e of Courses A student in study, which develops occu o a CTE program of study. a 2 or more CTE courses for	grades 9-12 upational kn The studen or 3 or more	2 who is owledge, t must credits

Source. 2017–2018 Texas Education Data Standards, Section 4 Description of Codes, p. 4.118



Table C1. Nu Sp	umber of ST pring 2017 ar	AAR Students	Tested by EO	C Subject and I	Evaluation Grou	ps, HISD,
Subject -	Non	-CTE	CTE Non- Cor	Sequenced urses	CTE Sequen	ced Courses
Subject	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018
Algebra I	5,310	4,882	2,932	2,858	4,687	5,837
Biology	3,845	3,295	2,838	2,735	5,866	7,460
English I	4,120	3,161	2,881	2,687	6,006	7,384
English II	2,824	2,921	2,701	2,588	6,888	7,444
U.S. History	2,766	2,471	2,451	1,862	6,004	7,069

Appendix C: STAAR Performance

Source: HISD Student 2017-2018 PEIMS; STAAR EOC Spring Test Files, 2016-2017.

Note: Data are based on first-time testers. The data exclude STAAR Alternative 2.



CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION REPORT, 2017-2018

2018 STA	AR EOC Exams,	Disaggreg	ated by	Demogra	phic and E	ducational A	Attributes				
Demographic and Educa	tional Attribute			NON-CT	E			CTE	-Coherent S	equenced	
		Algebra I	Biology	English I	English II	U.S. History	Algebra I	Biology	English I	English II	U.S. History
Fema	le	76.8	75.8	54.8	54.3	81.9	59.4	68.5	44.3	47.7	85.4
Male)	67.2	64.6	35.6	40.3	77.6	46.7	57.0	30.3	35.7	82.4
Economically	No	80.0	80.8	63.7	64.3	85.6	53.7	72.5	48.7	50.8	88.1
Disadvantaged	Yes	68.8	65.2	38.0	40.7	77.0	51.8	60.3	34.2	38.9	83.8
At Diak	No	79.4	78.0	54.6	57.1	86.2	60.5	70.3	47.7	52.7	89.2
AL-RISK	Yes	46.2	50.1	25.5	28.2	64.5	35.3	40.8	17.4	22.3	72.5
Special Education	No	75.7	73.9	40.1	50.3	82.3	57.0	67.1	40.9	44.8	86.3
Special Education	Yes	29.8	38.4	12.4	14.9	40.1	24.0	27.3	9.2	8.9	48.8
Cifted and Talented	No	62.4	64.8	38.2	40.0	74.6	50.1	58.0	31.5	35.8	80.9
Gined and Talented	Yes	99.1	99.2	97.6	98.1	100	96.1	98.6	94.5	94.1	99.8
	African American	62.5	66.1	35.5	39.0	75.7	49.3	65.9	33.9	39.3	82.2
Ethnicity	Asian	96.2	92.0	83.7	76.8	92.7	70.3	76.0	68.5	61.8	90.1
Ethnicity	Hispanic	69.8	64.0	38.4	40.0	75.4	51.8	60.1	34.5	38.7	83.1
	White	81.5	89.7	77.0	79.7	94.5	72.7	80.1	69.1	74.0	95.2

Table C2. Percentage of HISD Non-CTE and CTE Coherent-Sequenced Students Who Met Approaches Grade Level Standard on the 2018 STAAR EOC Exams. Disaggregated by Demographic and Educational Attributes

Note: The shaded green highlights subgroups where 50 percent or more students performed at or above the Approaches Grade Level standard.



HISD Research and Accountability _____

Appendix D: CTE Certifications

Industry Certification

An industry certification is a credential that validates the ability to perform certain basic tasks essential to a specific industry. These certifications are usually created by a specific company such as ACA (Adobe Certified Associate).

License

A license is a Texas government issued certificate which indicates completion of a training program with a minimum number of hours and successful acquisition of basic skills essential for specific trades or professions. Examples would be a state issued Cosmetology license or a Licensed Pharmacy Technician Trainee.

Occupational Competency Assessment

An occupational competency assessment is a technical skills assessment created by groups such as the A*S*K Business Institute, which contends that the student has mastered job-ready technical knowledge. Examples include the A*S*K Business Fundamentals test (basic skills in Human Resources) and NCCER Welding.

Note: Other Houston ISD approved program specific certifications, which are administered early for safety reasons or are needed to advance to end of program certifications, are also available such as: ServSafe; NCCER-Core; CPR- infant and adult; OSHA; MOS and so on.



Table D1. HISD CTE Certification Results Distributed by School, 2017–2018							
Campus	Failed	Passed	Total	Passed			
-	n	n	n	%			
Eastwood Academy Charter High School	0	483	483	100			
High School for Law and Justice	0	95	95	100			
Houston Academy for International Studies	0	5	5	100			
Lamar High School	0	7	7	100			
North Houston Early College HS	0	33	33	100			
Northside High School	0	17	17	100			
Pershing Middle School	0	30	30	100			
Sharpstown High School	0	10	10	100			
Worthing High School	0	38	38	100			
Sterling High School	5	769	774	99.4			
Sam Houston CMST	8	1,044	1,052	99.2			
Michael E. DeBakey HS for Health Profess.	7	642	649	98.9			
Waltrip High School	4	214	218	98.2			
Westbury High School	18	581	599	97.0			
Heights High School	6	121	127	95.3			
Chavez High School	3	48	51	94.1			
East Early College High School	9	136	145	93.8			
Margaret Long Wisdom High School	31	375	406	92.4			
Milby High School	43	253	296	85.5			
Stephen F. Austin High School	64	172	236	72.9			
Barbara Jordan High School for Careers	14	32	46	69.6			
Scarborough High School	79	165	244	67.6			
Madison High School	113	223	336	66.4			
Westside High School	28	47	75	62.7			
Challenge Early College High School	38	53	91	58.2			
South Early College HS	5	6	11	54.5			
Wheatley High School	46	42	88	47.7			
Beechnut Academy	*	*	1	*			
Bellaire High School	*	*	1	*			
Billy R Reagan K-8 Educational Center	*	*	1	*			
Furr High School	*	*	1	*			
Harris County JJAEP	*	*	1	*			
Young Women's College Prep Academy	*	*	1	*			
Secondary DAEP	*	*	2	*			
Overall	522	5,648	6,170	91.5			

Source: HISD Chancery Ad hoc Data Warehouse, downloaded using IBM Cognos on 5/28/2018 Note: * Denotes less than five students

4

CTE Code	Type of Diploma	PEIMS Code	20	16	20	17
2		_	Ν	%	N	%
	Completion of individualized Education Plan ¹	04, 05, 06, 07	80	.02	71	1.1
	Regular/Minimum ¹	18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 27, 30	281	8.5	541	8.2
	Recommended	22, 25, 28, 31	2,504	76.1	5,021	76.4
	Distinguished Achievement	23, 26, 29, 32,	247	7.5	451	6.9
	Foundation High School Program	34, 35, 54, 55, 56, 57	180	5.5	488	7.4
HISD	Completion of individualized Education Plan	04, 05, 06, 07	322	3.1	210	2.0
	Regular/Minimum	18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 27, 30	1,272	10.5	1,169	11.0
	Recommended	22, 25, 28, 31	7,310	71.5	7,497	70.6
	Distinguished Achievement	23, 26, 29, 32,	809	7.9	758	7.1
	Foundation High School Program	34, 35, 54, 55, 56, 57	512	5.0	979	9.2

Appendix E: Graduation Diplomas

Source: District and School Profiles, 2015–2016 and 2016–2017; HISD 2016–2017 Graduate File (Access); PEIMS 2015–2016 and 2016–20167(Access).

Note: ¹Applies only to students receiving special education services. These students graduated in a minimum high school program under TAC Chapter 74 with curriculum content modifications through the student's individualized education program (IEP).

No statutory exclusions for state accountability were applied.



Appendix F: Multiple Regression

Subject Predictors Constantialized biological control of the second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second se	Subject	Dradiatora		Standardized	05.0%	onfidor
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Subject	Predictors		Coefficients	95.0% Co Interva	onfiden al for R
Algebra I Bound Bo Signal Bo Signal Bound Bo Signal			B	Beta	Lower	aaU
Algebra I Constant 3958.8** 3928.8 3928.5 English language Learner 31.8 .001 -818.1 88 Economically Disadvantaged -71.9** .054 4103.5 -44 At-Risk 180.7** .158 -207.9 -15 Special Education -300.8** .183 -339.6 -26 Gifted and Talented 513.5** .279 469.9 55 R ² .17 - - 74 49.9 55 R ² .001 -678.0 60					Bound	Bou
English language Learner 31.8 0.01 -818.1 88 Economically Disadvantaged -71.9** 054 -103.5 -44 Ar-Risk -180.7** 156 -207.9 -15 Special Education -300.8** 1183 -339.6 -26 Gifted and Talented 513.5** .279 469.9 55 R ² .17 - - - - F 6,331; Approached Grade Level = 3550-3951; Meets = 4000-4267; Masters = 4333-6123 - 617 Biology I Constant 4156.9** 4129.6 418 English language Learner -38.1 -001 -678.0 60 Economically Disadvantaged -231.8** -146 -335.6 -27 Gifted and Talented 673.5** 429 643.1 70 R ² .006 -028.8 400.0.6** 398.8 400 English language Learner 280.0 -600.28 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4** -,127	Algebra I	Constant	3958.8**		3928.8	3988
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		English language Learner	31.8	.001	-818.1	881
At-Risk -180.7** 158 -207.9 -15 Special Education 300.8** 183 -339.6 -26 Gifted and Talented 513.5** .279 469.9 55 R^2 .17 - - 79 469.9 55 R^2 .17 - - 241.1** - 70 85 - 70 75 6 120 41.8 - 0.01 678.0 60 80 60 60 60 80 60 60 80 60 60 80 60 60		Economically Disadvantaged	-71.9**	054	-103.5	-40
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		At-Risk	-180.7**	158	-207.9	-153
Gifted and Talented 513.5^{**} 279 469.9 55 R^2 .17 .17 F 241.1^{**} $n = 5,831; Approached Grade Level = 3550-3951; Meets = 4000-4267; Masters = 4333-6123 Biology I Constant 4156.9^{**} 4129.6 4156.9^{**} English language Learner -338.1 -0.001 -678.0 60 Economically Disadvantaged -231.8^{**} -156 -260.1 -20 ArRisk -205.0^{**} -141 -232.9 -17 Special Education -314.8^{**} -146 -355.6 -27 Gifted and Talented 673.5^{**} 429 643.1 70 R^2 -33 T T T T Iconstant 4010.6^{**} 3983.8 400 English I Constant 4010.6^{**} -173 277.2 222 Special Education -388.9^{**} -182 -429.1 -34 English II Constant $		Special Education	-300.8**	183	-339.6	-262
R^2		Gifted and Talented	513.5**	.279	469.9	557
F 241.1** $n = 5,831; Approached Grade Level = 3550-3951; Meets = 4000-4267; Masters = 4333-6123 Biology I Constant 4156.9** 4129.6 412 English language Learner -38.1 001 -678.0 60 Economically Disadvantaged -231.8** 156 -260.1 -20 Ar-Risk 205.0** 141 -232.9 -17 Special Education -314.8** 146 -355.6 -27 Gifted and Talented 673.5** .429 643.1 70 R* -33 - - 71.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 73.3 - 7 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** - 721.0** 721.0** 721.0** $		R^2		.17		
n = 5,831; Approached Grade Level = 3550-3951; Meets = 4000-4267; Masters = 4333-6123 Biology I Constant 4156.9** 4129.6 412 English language Learner -33.1 001 678.0 600 Economically Disadvantaged -231.8** 156 -260.1 -220 At-Risk -205.0** 141 -232.9 -17 Special Education -314.8** 146 -355.6 -27 Gifted and Talented 673.5** .429 643.1 70 R ² .33 F 721.0** 721.0** 721.0** n = 7,459; Approached Grade Level = 3500–3958; Meets = 4000–4495; Masters = 4576–6201 200.6 802.8 400 English I Constant 4010.6** 3983.8 400 English Ianguage Learner 286.3 .0006 -602.8 111 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4** -,127 -212.1 -15 At-Risk -249.6** -,173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9** -,182 -429.1		F		241.1**		
Biology I Constant 4156.9** 4129.6 418 English language Learner -38.1 001 -678.0 60 Economically Disadvantaged -231.8** 156 -260.1 -22 At-Risk -205.0** 141 -232.9 -17 Special Education -314.8** 146 -355.6 -27 Gifted and Talented 673.5** .429 643.1 70 R ² .33 - - 721.0** - n = 7,459; Approached Grade Level = 3500-3958; Meets = 4000-4495; Masters = 4576-6201 - 983.8 400 English I Constant 4010.6** .9983.8 400 English language Learner 286.3 .006 -602.8 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4** -,127 -212.1 -15 At-Risk -249.6** -,173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9** -,182 -429.1 -34 F 7 759.9*8 -		n = 5,831; Approached Grade Level =	3550-3951; Meets = 4000-	-4267; Masters =	4333-612	3
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Biology I	Constant	4156.9**		4129.6	4184
Economically Disadvantaged -231.8** 156 -260.1 -20 At-Risk -205.0** 141 -232.9 -17 Special Education -314.8** 146 -355.6 -27 Gifted and Talented 673.5** .429 643.1 70 R^2 .33 F 721.0** 71 n = 7,459; Approached Grade Level = 3500-3958; Meets = 4000-4495; Masters = 4576-6201 100 660.8 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4** 127 -212.1 -15 At-Risk -249.6** 173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9** 182 -429.1 -34 Gifted and Talented 627.9** .419 598.8 65 R^2 .34 F 759.9*8 759.9*8 759.9*8 n = 7,378; Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 136 -26 English II Constant 4024.7** 399.9.2 400 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1**		English language Learner	-38.1	001	-678.0	601
At-Risk -205.0^{**} 141 -232.9 -17 Special Education -314.8^{**} 146 -355.6 -27 Gifted and Talented 673.5^{**} $.429$ 643.1 70 R^2 -33 F 721.0^{**} F $r = 7,459;$ Approached Grade Level = 3500–3958; Meets = $4000-4495;$ Masters = $4576-6201$ 3983.8 403 English Ianguage Learner 286.3 0.006 602.8 111 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4^{**} 127 -212.1 -155 At-Risk -249.6^{**} 173 -277.2 -222 Special Education -388.9^{**} 182 -429.1 -34 Gifted and Talented 627.9^{**} $A14$ 598.8 65 R^2 -34 R^2 $.34$ F 759.9^{*8} $n = 7,378;$ Approached Grade Level = $3750-3976;$ Meets = $4000-4644;$ Masters = $4691-6357$ 65 R^2 $.34$ F 9399.2 400 413 595.6 65 R^2 $.34$ F $8691-6357$		Economically Disadvantaged	-231.8**	156	-260.1	-203
Special Education -314.8^{**} -146 -355.6 -27 Gifted and Talented 673.5^{**} $.429$ 643.1 70 R^2 $.33$ 70 R^2 $.33$ F 721.0^{**} $n = 7,459; Approached Grade Level = 3500-3958; Meets = 4000-4495; Masters = 4576-6201 English I Constant 4010.6^{**} 3983.8 402 English language Learner 286.3 .006 -602.8 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4^{**} -127 -212.1 -157 At-Risk -249.6^{**} 173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9^{**} 182 429.1 -34 F 759.9^{*8} n = 7,378; Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 400-4454; Masters = 4691-6357 English II Constant 4024.7^{**} 3999.2 402 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1^{**} 113 -183.5 -133 F 7378; Approached Grade Level = 3775-3946; Meets = 4000-4698; Masters = 7831-6382 -3$		At-Risk	-205.0**	141	-232.9	-177
Gifted and Talented 673.5^{**} $A29$ 643.1 70 R^2 .33 F 721.0^{**} 721.0^{**} $n = 7,459;$ Approached Grade Level = 3500-3958; Meets = 4000-4495; Masters = 4576-6201 721.0^{**} 721.0^{**} English I Constant 4010.6^{**} 3983.8 403 English language Learner 286.3 .006 -602.8 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4^{**} -127 -212.1 -15 At-Risk -249.6^{**} 173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9^{**} 182 -429.1 -34 F 759.9*8 $n = 7,378;$ Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 English II Constant 4024.7^{**} $.113$ -183.5 -13 $A + F$ 759.9*8 $n = 7,378;$ Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 English II Constant 4024.7^{**} $.113$ -183.5 -13 $A + F$ $7378;$ Approached Grade Level = 3775-3946; Meets = 4000-4698; Masters = 7831-6382 136 136 <		Special Education	-314.8**	146	-355.6	-274
R^2 .33 F 721.0** $n = 7,459; Approached Grade Level = 3500-3958; Meets = 4000-4495; Masters = 4576-6201 English I Constant 4010.6** 3983.8 403 English Ianguage Learner 286.3 .006 -602.8 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4** 127 -212.1 -15 At-Risk -249.6** 173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9** 182 -429.1 -34 R^2 .34 F 759.9*8 R^2 R^2 .34 F 759.9*8 R R = 7,378; Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 English II Constant 4024.7** 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1** .113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3** .168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0** .191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9** .133 59$		Gifted and Talented	673.5**	.429	643.1	703
F 721.0** n = 7,459; Approached Grade Level = 3500-3958; Meets = 4000-4495; Masters = 4576-6201 English I Constant 4000.6** 3983.8 403 English language Learner 286.3 .006 -602.8 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4** 127 -212.1 -15 At-Risk -249.6** 173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9** 182 -429.1 -34 Gifted and Talented 627.9** .419 598.8 65 R^2 .34 - - 759.9*8 - - 759.9*8 n = 7,378; Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 - - 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3** 1168 -236.9 -16 Special Education -407.0** 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9** .413 595.6 65 R^2 .34 - - - </td <td></td> <td>R^2</td> <td></td> <td>.33</td> <td></td> <td></td>		R^2		.33		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		F		721.0**		
English I Constant 4010.6** 3983.8 403 English language Learner 286.3 .006 -602.8 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4** 127 -212.1 -15 At-Risk -249.6** 173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9** 182 -429.1 -34 Gifted and Talented 627.9** .419 598.8 65 R^2 .34 - - - - - - English II Constant 4024.7** 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1** 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3** 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0** 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9** .413 595.6 65 R^2 .34 - - 939.1** - n = 7,439; Approached Grade Level = 3775–3946; Meets = 4000–4698; Masters = 7831–6382 - - 26 U.S. History Constant		n = 7,459; Approached Grade Level =	3500-3958; Meets = 4000-	-4495; Masters =	= 4576–620 ⁻	1
English language Learner 286.3 .006 -602.8 117 Economically Disadvantaged -184.4** 127 -212.1 -15 At-Risk -249.6** 173 -277.2 -22 Special Education -388.9** 182 -429.1 -34 Gifted and Talented 627.9** .419 598.8 65 R^2 .34 - - 759.9*8 - $n = 7,378; Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 - - - English II Constant 4024.7** 3999.2 400 -$	English I	Constant	4010.6**		3983.8	403
Economically Disadvantaged -184.4^{**} 127 -212.1 -155 At-Risk -249.6^{**} 173 -277.2 -222 Special Education -388.9^{**} 182 -429.1 -34 Gifted and Talented 627.9^{**} $.419$ 598.8 655 R^2 $.34$ F 759.9^{*8} 759.9^{*8} $n = 7,378; Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 Constant 4024.7^{**} 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1^{**} 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3^{**} 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0^{**} -191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} .413 595.6 65 R^2 .34 F 939.1^{**} n = 7,439; Approached Grade Level = 3775-3946; Meets = 4000-4698; Masters = 7831-6382 U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 029 -1589.7 $	-	English language Learner	286.3	.006	-602.8	117
At-Risk -249.6^{**} 173 -277.2 -222 Special Education -388.9^{**} 182 -429.1 -34 Gifted and Talented 627.9^{**} $.419$ 598.8 65 R^2 .34 F 759.9^{*8} 759.9^{*8} Image: constant 6024.7^{**} 3999.2 402 Constant 4024.7^{**} 3999.2 402 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1^{**} 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3^{**} 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0^{**} 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} $.413$ 595.6 65 R^2 .34 F 939.1^{**} $n = 7,439;$ Approached Grade Level = $3775-3946;$ Meets = $4000-4698;$ Masters = $7831-6382$ U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 F 039.4^{**} 029 -158.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 106 -163.3 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>-184.4**</td><td>127</td><td>-212.1</td><td>-156</td></t<>		Economically Disadvantaged	-184.4**	127	-212.1	-156
Special Education -388.9^{**} 182 -429.1 -34 Gifted and Talented 627.9^{**} $.419$ 598.8 65 R^2 $.34$ F 759.9^{*8} 759.9^{*8} $n = 7,378;$ Approached Grade Level = $3750-3976;$ Meets = $4000-4644;$ Masters = $4691-6357$ $Constant$ 4024.7^{**} 3999.2 405 English II Constant 4024.7^{**} 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1^{**} 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3^{**} 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0^{**} $.191$ -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} $.413$ 595.6 65 R^2 $.34$ F 939.1^{**} $n = 7,439;$ Approached Grade Level = $3775-3946;$ Meets = $4000-4698;$ Masters = $7831-6382$ U.S. History $Constant$ 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 029 -1589.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 106 -163.3 <		At-Risk	-249.6**	173	-277.2	-222
Gifted and Talented 627.9^{**} $.419$ 598.8 65 R^2 .34 F 759.9^{*8} $n = 7,378$; Approached Grade Level = $3750-3976$; Meets = $4000-4644$; Masters = $4691-6357$ English II Constant 4024.7^{**} 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1^{**} 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3^{**} 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0^{**} 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} $.413$ 595.6 65 R^2 .34 F 939.1^{**} $n = 7,439$; Approached Grade Level = $3775-3946$; Meets = $4000-4698$; Masters = $7831-6382$ U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 Loss History Constant 4301.7^{**} 029 -1589.7 -286 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 029 -1589.7 -286 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 220 -286.1 -233 Special Education -327.3^{**} 139		Special Education	-388.9**	182	-429.1	-348
R^2 .34 F 759.9*8 $n = 7,378; Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 English II Constant 4024.7** 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1** 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3** 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0** 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9** .413 595.6 65 R^2 .34 F 939.1** n = 7,439; Approached Grade Level = 3775-3946; Meets = 4000-4698; Masters = 7831-6382 U.S. History Constant 4301.7** 4276.1 432 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -11 At-Risk -220 -286.1 -23 -23 -23 -23 -23 -23 -23 U.S. History Constant 4301.7** 4276.1 432 -220 -286.1 -23 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -11 At-Risk -220 $		Gifted and Talented	627.9**	419	598.8	656
F T59.9*8 $n = 7,378; Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 English II Constant 4024.7^{**} 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1^{**} 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3^{**} 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0^{**} 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} .413 595.6 65 R^2 .34 F 939.1^{**} n = 7,439; Approached Grade Level = 3775-3946; Meets = 4000-4698; Masters = 7831-6382 U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 029 -1589.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 106 -163.3 -111 At-Risk -260.9^{**} 220 -286.1 -233 Gifted and Talented 466.9^{**} .323 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26 .26 .26 <$		B^2		.34		
$n = 7,378;$ Approached Grade Level = 3750-3976; Meets = 4000-4644; Masters = 4691-6357 English II Constant 4024.7** 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1** 113 -183.5 -13 At-Risk -212.3** 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0** 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9** .413 595.6 65 R^2 .34 - - - 939.1** $n = 7,439;$ Approached Grade Level = 3775-3946; Meets = 4000-4698; Masters = 7831-6382 - - - U.S. History Constant 4301.7** 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4** 029 -1589.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -11 At-Risk -260.9** 220 -286.1 -23 Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26		F		759.9*8		
English II Constant 4024.7** 3999.2 405 Economically Disadvantaged -157.1^{**} 113 -183.5 -133 At-Risk -212.3^{**} 168 -236.9 -188 Special Education -407.0^{**} 191 -447.7 -366 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} $.413$ 595.6 65 R^2 $.34$ F 939.1^{**} $n = 7,439;$ Approached Grade Level = $3775-3946;$ Meets = $4000-4698;$ Masters = $7831-6382$ U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4^{**} 029 -1589.7 -286 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 106 -163.3 -111 At-Risk -260.9^{**} 220 -286.1 -233 Special Education -327.3^{**} 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9^{**} $.323$ 436.6 49 R^2 $.26$ $.26$ $.26$ $.26$		n = 7.378: Approached Grade Level =	3750-3976: Meets = 4000-	-4644: Masters =	4691-635	7
Economically Disadvantaged -157.1^{**} 113 -183.5 -133 At-Risk -212.3^{**} 168 -236.9 -188 Special Education -407.0^{**} 191 -447.7 -366 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} $.413$ 595.6 655 R^2 .34 F 939.1^{**} $n = 7,439;$ Approached Grade Level = $3775-3946;$ Meets = $4000-4698;$ Masters = $7831-6382$ U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4^{**} 029 -1589.7 -286 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 106 -163.3 -111 At-Risk -260.9^{**} 220 -286.1 -223 Special Education -327.3^{**} 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9^{**} $.323$ 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26 .26 .26	English II	Constant	4024.7**	,	3999.2	405
At-Risk -212.3^{**} 168 -236.9 -18 Special Education -407.0^{**} 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} $.413$ 595.6 65 R^2 .34 F 939.1^{**} $n = 7,439;$ Approached Grade Level = $3775-3946;$ Meets = $4000-4698;$ Masters = $7831-6382$ U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4^{**} -029 -1589.7 -286 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 106 -163.3 -111 At-Risk -260.9^{**} 220 -286.1 -233 Special Education -327.3^{**} 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9^{**} $.323$ 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26 .26 .26	-	Economically Disadvantaged	-157.1**	113	-183.5	-130
Special Education -407.0^{**} 191 -447.7 -36 Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} $.413$ 595.6 65 R^2 .34 F 939.1^{**} $n = 7,439;$ Approached Grade Level = $3775-3946;$ Meets = $4000-4698;$ Masters = $7831-6382$ U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4^{**} 029 -1589.7 -286 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 106 -163.3 -111 At-Risk -260.9^{**} 220 -286.1 -233 Special Education -327.3^{**} 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9^{**} $.323$ 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26 .26 .26		At-Risk	-212.3**	168	-236.9	-187
Gifted and Talented 624.9^{**} $.413$ 595.6 65 R^2 $.34$ F 93.1^{**} $n = 7,439;$ Approached Grade Level = $3775-3946;$ Meets = $4000-4698;$ Masters = $7831-6382$ U.S. History Constant 4301.7^{**} 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4^{**} 029 -1589.7 -286 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9^{**} 106 -163.3 -111 At-Risk -260.9^{**} 220 -286.1 -233 Special Education -327.3^{**} 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9^{**} $.323$ 436.6 49 R^2 $.26$ $.26$ $.26$ $.26$		Special Education	-407.0**	191	-447.7	-366
R^2 .34 F 939.1** n = 7,439; Approached Grade Level = 3775–3946; Meets = 4000–4698; Masters = 7831–6382 U.S. History Constant 4301.7** 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4** 029 -1589.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -11 At-Risk -260.9** 220 -286.1 -233 Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26		Gifted and Talented	624.9**	413	595.6	654
F 939.1** $n = 7,439; Approached Grade Level = 3775-3946; Meets = 4000-4698; Masters = 7831-6382 U.S. History Constant 4301.7** 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4** 029 -1589.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -111 At-Risk -260.9** 220 -286.1 -233 Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26 $		B^2				
n = 7,439; Approached Grade Level = 3775–3946; Meets = 4000–4698; Masters = 7831–6382 U.S. History Constant 4301.7** 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4** 029 -1589.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -111 At-Risk -260.9** 220 -286.1 -237 Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26		F		939.1**		
U.S. History Constant 4301.7** 4276.1 432 English language Learner -939.4** 029 -1589.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -11 At-Risk -260.9** 220 -286.1 -23 Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R^2 .26 .26 .26 .26		n = 7,439; Approached Grade Level =	3775–3946; Meets = 4000-	-4698; Masters =	- 7831–6382	2
English language Learner -939.4** 029 -1589.7 -28 Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -11 At-Risk -260.9** 220 -286.1 -23 Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R ² .26 .26 .26 .26	U.S. History	Constant	4301.7**	,	4276.1	432
Economically Disadvantaged -136.9** 106 -163.3 -11 At-Risk -260.9** 220 -286.1 -23 Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R ² .26 .26 .26 F 939.1 .26 .26		English language Learner	-939.4**	029	-1589.7	-289
At-Risk -260.9** 220 -286.1 -23 Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R ² .26 .26		Economically Disadvantaged	-136.9**	106	-163.3	-11(
Special Education -327.3** 139 -376.0 -27 Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R ² .26 .26 .26 .26		At-Risk	-260.9**	220	-286.1	-235
Gifted and Talented 466.9** .323 436.6 49 R ² .26 F 930.1		Special Education	-327.3**	- 139	-376.0	-278
$\frac{R^2}{F}$ 030.1		Gifted and Talented	466 9**	303	436.6	497
		B ²		.523	-00.0	-57
		F		030 1		

HISD Research and Accountability

ارات