



Accountability Monitoring System
Focused Data Analysis (FDA) for
Campuses Rated AU

Campus Name: Chico High School

Campus Number: 249904001

LEA Name: Chico ISD

Accountability Year: 1st Year AU

SECTION I: State Assessment Performance
(Required for AU campuses with unacceptable performance in any subject area)

1. Using the **selection criteria chart** identify students with low performance in the AU subject area(s) and list them on the SLR Student Demographics worksheet.
2. To identify students with low performance in subject areas not tested the previous year (depending upon grade level - writing, science, or social studies), evaluate historical testing data, including state and district assessments, and by using common factors such as limited English proficiency (LEP) status, disciplinary placements, failing grades, students who were placed in their grade level (which include students at the Student Success Initiative (SSI) grade levels), or other at-risk indicators. Those students determined to be at-risk of failing state assessments should be added to the SLR.

SECTION II: CAUSAL FACTORS FOR LOW PERFORMANCE

Feeder Pattern & Campus Based Analysis
(Required for AU campuses with unacceptable performance in any subject area)

1. Feeder System Analysis: Using three years of historical data from the feeder schools, analyze by accountability subgroups, special program participation or other commonalities to determine significant factors that impact student performance. Consider state assessment, attendance, and discipline trends. Evaluate SSI Committee decisions, campus to campus transition plans, Response to Intervention (RtI), etc. For elementary schools, perform the same type of analysis for each grade level.

Identified Issues and Findings

Three years of historical data from the student populations of All Students, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged were analyzed for this study, In 2009 eighth grade All Students subgroup scored 85% in math but scores in 2010 for this same group of students decreased 22% points to 63%; in 2011 they gained 2% points to score 65%.

In 2009, eighth grade Hispanic Students subgroup scored 86% in math but scores in 2010 for this same group of students decreased 32% points to 54%; in 2011 they gained 8% points to score 62%. A similar trend was followed for White Students transitioning from 8th to 9th grade with a decline in mastery in math of 17% points. Economically disadvantaged students transitioning into high school experienced a decline of 31% points in math.

Ninth grade Hispanics and economically disadvantaged students mastered only 2 to 4 out of 10 objectives in math. In 2009 Hispanic students met standard in math. In 2011, 20% of the Hispanic subgroup met standard at the 9th grade level in math. In reading, social studies and writing, students maintained or increased their mastery from previous years. Science did experience a decrease with all subgroups dropping from 2009-2011.

A transition plan for students entering high school from the junior high has not been in place.



Accountability Monitoring System
Focused Data Analysis (FDA) for
Campuses Rated AU

Campus Name: Chico High School

Campus Number: 249904001

LEA Name: Chico ISD

Accountability Year: 1st Year AU

2. Attendance: Analyze the attendance for students listed on the SLR Student Demographics worksheet and identify possible causal factors for low performance and/or failure to complete or graduate with the cohort group. Evaluate the effectiveness of the campus attendance system including the timeliness of administrative responses to unexcused absences, tardiness to class, the "recovery/re-teach" practices for students who are absent, and current practices to improve student attendance such as parent support/conferences, counseling, disciplinary and/or legal consequences. Evaluate systems and procedures in place to comply with TEC §25.092, Minimum Attendance for Class Credit as it relates to mastery of the TEKS (not applicable to charter schools).

Identified Issues and Findings

The attendance percentage for the high school in the 2008-2009 school year was 95.2%, and it dropped to 95.07% in the 2009-2010 school year. But the attendance rose in the 2010-2011 school year to 95.62%.

A review of the attendance data for the target population (Hispanic-Math) revealed the following: of the 14 Hispanics not passing math TAKS in high school, only 1 student exceeded the 10% attendance rule with 19 or more absences. Of the 46 students being monitored on the SLR, 12 students had 10 or more absences. Of the students being monitored on the SLR, 12 were removed for disciplinary reasons with in the school year to serve DAEP or ISS.

3. Discipline: (ISS, DAEP, OSS, JIAEP, and Expulsion): Analyze disciplinary removals for students listed on the SLR Student Demographics worksheet to identify possible causal factors for low performance and/or failure to complete or graduate with the cohort group. Evaluate the administration's effectiveness in the implementation of the Student Code of Conduct and the discipline management plan, including the equity and appropriateness of disciplinary removals. Evaluate the rigor/relevance of the instructional delivery in alternative settings in relation to the regular program. Evaluate the effectiveness of the transition plan from a disciplinary removal setting to the regular classroom, as well as the procedures to "accelerate" student learning if essential knowledge and skills were not mastered.

Identified Issues and Findings

Of the 46 students being monitored for TAKS math, 34 were not assigned to disciplinary placements; either ISS or DAEP in 2010-2011. Twelve of the 46 students being monitored were removed for disciplinary reasons. Twelve students will be monitored for behavior and a Behavior Intervention Plan may need to be put in place for the 12 students if not on file.

Local Board policies for assignment to DAEP will be examined to see if amendments need to be made. Implementing steps on offenses not legally binding will be a consideration.

4. Student Data: Disaggregate and analyze data by accountability subgroups, special program participation, or other commonalities. Determine if student classroom grades align with 1) local benchmark assessment results, 2) local curriculum-based assessment (CBA) results, and 3) previous state assessment results. Determine if local assessments used to track student progress are aligned with TEKS objectives and are written at STAAR rigor. Determine if decisions regarding student interventions are based on local assessment results.

Identified Issues and Findings

Math 6 weeks grades and final grades did not correlate with TAKS results for eight of the 14 Hispanics who failed the TAKS. There were inconsistencies in benchmark testing. Therefore there is insufficient data available. Benchmarks will be implemented for the 2011-2012 school year. Testing will be conducted twice this year, once in November and then again in February. Teachers will conduct their own content based assessments at the end of each six weeks beginning the 2nd Six Weeks on TEKS student expectations (SEs)



Accountability Monitoring System
Focused Data Analysis (FDA) for
Campuses Rated AU

Campus Name: Chico High School

Campus Number: 249904001

LEA Name: Chico ISD

Accountability Year: 1st Year AU

To be assessed on TAKS and STAAR. Textbooks have been the main resource for teaching the curriculum during the past few years. Previous state assessment results show low scores in math, and though teachers did try to track progress, the rigor of the curriculum was not appropriate to meet state testing standards. With the implementation of C-Scope the rigor and complexity of instruction should improve.

5. Curriculum: Analyze the curriculum for each area of low performance. Determine if the curriculum is based on TEKS objectives and provides sufficient rigor. Evaluate the vertical and horizontal alignment of local curriculum with TEKS. Evaluate the implementation of the curriculum. Conduct item analysis for assessment objectives/ Student Expectations (SE) to determine strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. Consider the effectiveness and pacing of the district's scope and sequence. Evaluate the alignment of local assessments to state assessments.

Identified Issues and Findings

For the 2010-2011 school year, the textbook has been the main resource for teaching the curriculum; therefore instruction did not meet the rigor and complexity needed for students to be successful on state testing. For the 2011-2012 school year, the scope and sequence of C-Scope is being implemented at the secondary campus. The rigor of C-Scope exemplar lessons is considered to be high and well in line with that of the TAKS and new STAAR. The scope and sequence is aligned both vertically and horizontally and addresses the TEKS at each grade level. Locally developed common assessments were used in the 2010-2011 school year, but were not implemented with consistency.

The percent met standard from 2010 to 2011 decreased in the 9th grade from 54% to 20% hispanic passing. In 10th grade there was an increase from 60% to 62% for the hispanic population. Factors that may have influenced test results to show decrease in the 9th grade may include the lack of a viable curriculum. The increase of 10th grade scores may result from having the same teacher for 2 years.

Student performance on the objectives appeared to follow a pattern; the mastery percentages were not the same for the separate student populations, but what was low for one group was low for others, what was high for one group was high for others. This leads one to the conclusion that the effectiveness of the lesson/curriculum was deficient; therefore, teachers will use data to target specific lessons for improvement and implement change in the curriculum to target low SEs.

6. Instructional Program: Analyze the instructional program for each area of low performance. Use the item analysis developed in #5 to determine strengths and weaknesses of the instructional program. Determine if the curriculum is implemented consistently district wide. Evaluate the effectiveness of instructional delivery in the area(s) of low performance, including the lesson cycle, learning styles and/or brain compatibility strategies, formative assessment and questioning, and individualized instructional methodologies, sheltered instruction, etc. Evaluate the effectiveness of the academic interventions and teacher support strategies. Evaluate the availability, utilization, and effectiveness of instructional materials and resources.

Evaluate the effectiveness of special services and programs available to provide timely interventions to students from prior cohorts. Determine if all requirements of TEC §28.0211 (Accelerated Instruction), TEC §28.0212 (Personal Graduation Plan- PGP; optional for charters) and TEC §28.0213 (Intensive Program of Instruction) have been met. Review campus procedures for identifying targeted students.

Identified Issues and Findings

The Instructional program has shown many weaknesses over the past 3 years in math. C-Scope curriculum along with other supplemental materials was not fully implemented in the past, but will begin to be implemented into instruction and lesson plans for the 2011-2012 school year. Professional development to address instructional delivery and engagement has not been included for all teachers on the campus during the past 3 years. Based upon a study of the records as well as classroom observations, professional



**Accountability Monitoring System
Focused Data Analysis (FDA) for
Campuses Rated AU**

Campus Name: Campus Number:

LEA Name: Accountability Year:

development needs include rigorous questioning, cooperative learning, strategies, the lesson cycle as well as C-Scope, STAAR, and SIOP. Interventions in the past has consisted of tutorials if students chose to attend. PGP's will be updated this fall.

SECTION III: COMPLETION/DROPOUT RATE
(Required for campuses with low completion and/or dropout rate)

1. Identify the students that did not complete or graduate with their cohort groups for 2009, 2010, and 2011. Evaluate the quality of leaver data and student tracking systems. Determine the characteristics of students impacting the completion and/or dropout rates for these years. Identify factors and trends which impacted the completion and/or dropout rate (i.e. demographics, attendance, discipline, academic performance data, state assessment exemptions, etc.). By subpopulations, identify the special programs in which students in the targeted group participated (i.e., PEP, homeless, BE/ESL, CTE, special education, migrant, etc.), and determine reasons for not graduating. Analyze the data of the feeder campuses and identify trends/issues that impact completion rates. Identify students who were placed in their grade level which includes those at SSL grade levels. Note: Findings from this probe should also be addressed in the feeder schools' campus improvement plans and the district improvement plan.

Identified Issues and Findings

2. Evaluate the effectiveness of special services and programs available to assist students from prior cohorts with timely interventions. Determine if all requirements of TEC §28.0211 (Accelerated Instruction), TEC §28.0212 (Personal Graduation Plan-PGP; optional for charters), and TEC §28.0213 (Intensive Program of Instruction) have been met. Review campus procedures for identifying targeted students. Analyze the effectiveness of support services and drop out recovery programs available. Review campus procedures for accurately documenting and reporting student leavers.

Identified Issues and Findings

3. Apply the characteristics identified in #1 and the findings in #2 above to the current student cohorts to identify the target group. Enter the names on the SLR (Student Demographics worksheet) and complete the demographic information for each student. Analyze the process used to monitor student progress prior to failure and before students have dropped out of school.

Identified Issues and Findings