International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, Volume 5, Issue 6, June-2014
ISSN 2229-5518

.How some factors affects State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) percentage at level III Advanced of high school in Bexar County?

By:

Aml Zahid

Bachelor's in Business Administration-Marketing

King Abdulaziz University

2005

Exit Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Public Administration

The University of Texas at San Antonio

College of Public Policy

Department of Public Administration

April 2014

Table of Contents

Introduction:

The State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) is the new program of student academic testing. These tests were implemented in the 2011-2012 school year, in order to determine the performance standards in a more rigorous manner than previous testing approaches. The continual standardized testing format is to ensure that students are obtaining the necessary basic knowledge to perform better academically, which will help ensure that students obtain a basic level of performance that prepares the student for adulthood and further education. The STAAR program was implemented from grades 3 through to 12. In order to prevent confusion for Grades 11 and 12 working under the previous system, the implementation will not be in done fully for these grade levels until the 2014-2015 school year (i.e. Grades 10 to 12 of the previous system will not be moved to STAAR, in order to ensure that current high school students are not negatively affected). This is important to this study because the aim of testing the effectiveness of STAAR testing will require that the students that are participating in this study can only be from Grades 3 to 11 of the current academic year. Thus, the results may indicate Grades 9-12 but not all schools districts have tested all three grades due to the adverse effect there may be to attainment levels as a new testing regime.

There have been some important changes under STAAR that ought to be considered, in comparison to the previous programs. The most important is that STAAR introduces the first timed tests, unless there is a prescribed medical condition (STAAR, n.d.). This impact ought to be considered when examining the student performance because this new application may have an enhanced effect on those students who have not been accustomed to time limits. Thus, the current eleventh grade students have only

had timed tests for the last two years, while grade 3 through 5 under the STAAR have only now had the experience of timed testing.

Older student will be more vested in the testing process because their future careers will be influenced by academic testing (i.e. it is a significant determinant to entering college) (Best et al, 2011). This suggests that academic testing ought to be truly reflective of the student's academic capability. Thus, the representative samples to determine achievement will be narrowed down based on age because academic readiness is purported to be associated with university readiness (Kallison & Stader, 2012). The rationale for this is that the study is interested in the factors that affect the student achieving Level III: Advanced Academic Performance.

Purpose of Study:

There are three performance categories in STAAR that test the academic capabilities of children, which are: Level III: Advanced Academic Performance; Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance; and Level I: Unsatisfactory Academic Performance. These are thought to measure the effectiveness of schools. The research will recommend the level of readiness for students based on their performances (Kallison & Stader, 2012). The research suggests that there are many factors that affect the student's performance such as race, special education, economics disadvantage, bilingual/ESL education, parental educational background and parental career and technical education (Thomas & Stockton, 2003). These factors will be obtained from the students that are studied, in order to determine if there are trends in the factors that affect student performance.

How some factors affect State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) percentage at level III Advanced of high school in Bexar County?

Literature Review

The continual standardized testing format helps ensure that students are obtaining the necessary preparation for college or life in a working environment. Academic Readiness tests are used internationally to test students' capabilities, which help determine the effectiveness of the school's teaching and whether the individual can go further in education (Zwick, 2012). There are problems with such tests because they do not necessarily identify the different types of skills and interests that the student has because they too culturally biased (Perone, 1991). The primary issue is whether standardized testing is culturally disadvantaging because different attitudes to testing and 'academic success' can result in marginalization of certain groups within the education system (Perone, 1991). In a sense, academic testing can be designed on a very narrow cultural basis of understanding, which suggests that the scores will not reflect the real capabilities of the student due to the biased context that the testing model is based upon (Kagitcibasi & Berry, 1989).

For example, parental intervention plays an important role in academic readiness (Eamon, 2005). The role of parental intervention requires understanding of the educational model, which if developed in a narrow cultural context will put cultural minorities at a disadvantage (Eamon, 2005; Stewart, 2013; Brooks-Gunn and Markman, 2005). Academic readiness through standardized testing may be fundamentally flawed, unless it can adapt to cultural differences. However, this is unlikely because it will create too much complexity and so-called inefficiencies in the academic testing.

In other words, the purpose of such testing is used for benchmarking, which is setting standard for furture students, as well as determining future academic capability as

opposed to an individual basis that will allow for cultural idiosyncrasies to be identified (Perone, 1991). Individual testing is not based on a one-size-fits-all test, rather, it involves examining the capability of the student through personal interviews, psychological testing, and personal engagement with the specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Culture is another important factor, which relates to the social background of the child (such as racial characteristics, place of upbringing, parents parental background and socioeconomic background). A fundamental problem that arises with the one-on-one model is that it is not culturally plausible in that academic testing requires cultural sensitivity to prevent marginalization. Socioeconomic factors ought to be factored into developing fair and effective tests.

Academic Readiness & Socioeconomic Factors:

Academic success is not only based on student capability and dedication. Rather, there are a number of external factors that can have a direct impact on the academic readiness of students, which include wealth, parental work, educational background, and geographic location. These are the factors that this study is interested in examining because, if academic readiness tests are to be fair and accountable, strategies to counter these external factors are necessary (National Center of Fair and Open Testing, 2007). One of the most important factors to consider is poverty because it has a number of different impacts, which include limited nutrition, early work requirements and unfavorable social conditions that impede on academic readiness (De Witt, 2011). Research suggests that poverty has a significant role on the academic readiness of students in that impoverished children tend to perform inadequately (Skiba et al, 2005).

Special Needs Education and the Gifted:

Skiba et al (2005) explore the number of certain socioeconomic groups in special needs education, which can be translated into the need for additional help to make the student academically ready. Skiba et al identify that:

> Among the predominant explanations offered for the existence of disproportionate ethnic representation in special education is the influence of poverty or socioeconomic disadvantage on the academic readiness of minority students (p. 131).

The implication of this explanation is that there must be special measures in place to help ensure that there are additional structures present to counter the harms caused by poverty. The poverty link, as a factor that affects student readiness, derives from the fact that a disproportionate number of minorities are impoverished (Skiba et al, 2005). This may indicate that certain racial groups are less interested in education and academic readiness, however, this is a fundamentally flawed argument because the association to poverty is actually more closely associated with racial minority status than poor performance and academic readiness (Skiba et al, 2005).

Research also indicates that the gifted generally come from more affluent sectors of society (Skiba et al, 2005), which suggests that there is an association between socioeconomic advantage/disadvantage and whether a child requires special education or has had the educational advantage to be gifted (Skiba et al, 2005). This raises questions on whether testing is biased to the affluent and whether scoring above average does not really relate to economic ability.

Race, Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Educational Attainment:

A more accurate explanation is that there is an effect of poverty on these races in respect to the resources that the educational facilities hold (i.e. the gifted will be more prevalent in affluent areas because they have better resources). For example, racial

groups that are traditionally marginalized live in locations where there are less equipped educational facilities (Roderick et al, 2009). Consequently, socioeconomic pressures have an impact on the academic attainment these individuals, which it may be incorrect to link academic attainment to race; rather it is marginalization within the social and educational structures. Socioeconomic factors include lesser expected attainment because poverty will result in children attending less equipped schools. Additionally, there are the realities of poverty, which include the need to work or care for siblings whilst parents work long hours, peer pressure to join gangs and/or engage in sexual activities (Kim et al, 2013). These factors require a school-wide program to engage in attainment, however, this does not mean that all groups that come from impoverished areas will give rise to a poor parental attitude to attainment (Kim et al, 2013). In fact, it can result in a higher order drive for attainment.

A particular explanation for the lower educational attainment in low socioeconomic status students is that the economic viability of entering the higher education system is poor access. As Roderick et al (2009) identifies:

> Exit examinations could be useful as a measure of college readiness, but only if evidence shows that students who pass these examinations have access to or do well in college, or both. So far, research on high school exit examinations has largely focused on whether they influence graduation and labor market outcomes, with findings generally indicating that adding the hurdle of passing an exit examination is linked with greater high school dropout rates (p. 194).

This suggests that the education system has been develop to perpetuate the interests of the elite and shut out the impoverished from joining part of the elite (Aiyer et al, 2013).

Parental Attitudes and At Risk Category:

The implications of these differential factors are important to understand why there may be poor attainment in certain socioeconomic group. Potential future opportunities for employment and higher education have a direct effect on how the parents view the potential for further education, which can be perpetuated in the attitudes of children (i.e. work readiness is more important to academic readiness because access to higher education may be fundamentally limited) (Reardon, 2011).

The attitudes of parents towards education can be very important in the success of children because lack of education or focus on basic needs may result in children in low socioeconomic areas being deemed at risk (Reardon, 2011). At risk children refer to individuals who may not have their social, economic, educational or emotional needs met. This can require intervention to help families focus on these aspects. In other words, parents in low socioeconomic conditions tend to have under-performing kids, perhaps because such children are not having their basic needs properly met.

Davis-Kean (2005) identifies there are a number of strategies to develop a framework that is more appropriate to engage change attitudes in impoverished households to attainment. However, Roderick et al (2009) is correct to identify that there has to be sufficient provision for these children to enter higher education. Thus, parent perception may play a role in poor attainment, which can be countered through intervention strategies (Davis-Kean, 2005). An interesting factor that is highlighted in the study by Sirin (2005) is that socioeconomic status is a more prevalent factor in affecting attainment than that of minorities. The rationale of marginalization can play an important role in explaining why some groups have lesser attainment than others, which is linked to the findings surrounding geographic location (Sirin, 2005).

English Language Learners and Educational Attainment:

Language ability and race are integrally interconnected because individuals that come from migrant families that generally come from impoverished countries will move to the USA without English language skills (Gonzalez et al, 2005; Kim et al, 2012; Hill et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013). This suggests that the child not only has to come to terms with a new educational model but also a new language. It is perceived that this will have a direct effect on their attainment at school, however, this does depend upon family attitudes of integrating and learning a new language (Gonzalez et al, 2005).

The total immersion of a child in a new language can result in quick adaptation, as long as the school applies an inclusive approach with specialized aid for these children (Hill et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013). A problem that arises is that the children with the greatest obstacles to learning and adapting to the language/educational change, due to socioeconomic disadvantage and lack of at home English language engagement, will generally live in areas of social disadvantage where schools may not have the necessary resources to allow for quick English language adaptation (Gonzalez et al, 2005). Nonetheless, there are certain cultures that are more prone to support English language engagement in the home and through the educational framework, which suggests that socioeconomic disadvantage will have a limited effect (Kim et al, 2012). Therefore, the fact that a child does not speak English as their first language and come from a background of socioeconomic disadvantage does not mean that they will fail to have a high educational attainment level.

Socioeconomic Disadvantage, Race, At Risk and Academic Readiness:

Racial disparity and economic achievement is much wider than simply the application of a race association. The access to education, availability of higher education ,and the ingrained marginalization require an enhanced understanding of all the different factors that may affect student attainment (Hill et al, 2013). These different factors and the interaction with the nature and quality of education have a direct impact on student attainment, which includes the access to resources (Goree, 2013). Resource availability in the home and in the education system has a direct effect on student readiness (Duncan & Magnuson, 2005). Thus, it is necessary not only to explore the overt factors on attainment, but also the underlying influences that result in the disparity must be explored and applied such as the marginalization and disillusionment of parents (Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005).

A Note on the Content of STAAR in Comparison to the National SAT:

To equate STAAR to other academic readiness tests, it is important to identify the content of these tests. The End of Course (EOC) assessments will be administered for students entering grade 9 and beyond and impact the final score (i.e. 15%). The EOC assessments include: English (English I, English II, English III); Mathematics (Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II); Science (Biology, Chemistry, Physics); and Humanities (World Geography, World History, and U.S. History) (STAAR, n.d.). This is a comprehensive testing model because it identifies a set of courses that are important to ensure that there is a more comprehensive understanding of academic readiness than the national Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT).

The SAT has traditionally been questioned because it only deals with three areas, which are math, reading comprehension and writing (Fleming, 2002; National Center of

Fair and Open Testing, 2007). There has been expansion to humanities, languages and sciences; however, these are still sweeping generalities that may not indicate the specific skills of the student. The form of testing in SAT is overly generalized and may be suited for the individual who can pass test, as opposed to measuring academic success. This makes the EOC framework a more effective approach to standardized testing because there is targeted testing based upon curriculum (Gonzalez et al, 2005). The SAT application is identified as more successful when used in conjunction with high school grades (i.e. the EOC testing) (Sackett et al, 2012).

Sackett et al's (2012) study identifies that the predictive value of SATs plus high school grades is important because it illustrates that the STAAR's EOC approach mixes the framework and may be more successful in academic readiness prediction. Sackett et al (2012) also recognizes the success of SAT's predictive nature when linked to socioeconomic status. It is assumed that STAAR will have the same (if more effective) impact because it is linked directly to what the student is being taught in the school, as opposed to a general selection of questions based on the numerous approaches that are used across the states of the USA. The one concerning factor in Sackett et al's study (2012) is that SAT scores provide some validity for predicting freshman grades, even when socioeconomic factors are considered. This suggests that the SAT scoring only has a limited impact while academic readiness is only effective for the freshman year of college, which could be translated to a single year's predicativeness.

STAAR – The Testing Factory Model in Texas:

Academic readiness test may only have a slight impact on examining the predicative nature of STAAR, which question this framework for long term use (Sackett

et al, 2012). A year's intervention can change the student's academic readiness, especially if targeting students who exhibit socioeconomic factors that indicate a high risk for lower academic readiness (Duncan et al, 2006). If such intervention can improve academic readiness questions the use of such factory style tests because it they are biased to economic disadvantage then there is perpetuation of oppression within the education system, as opposed to developing strategies for achievement (Finn et al, 2014). Thus, the links between socioeconomic status and STAAR results have to be carefully considered, in order to determine the effectiveness of these tests in predicating academic readiness fairly. In addition, there ought to be careful consideration for factors that impact academic readiness negatively can be countered through effective intervention strategies.

The final aspect to be highlighted is that the testing model may be exacerbating these disparities because it is based on the norm, which suggests that marginalization is not properly examined in student attainment (Harden et al, 2013). Language factors in a standardized testing system can mean further marginalization for individuals where English is their second language, which is especially highlight in Texas within the Hispanic community (Ruecker, 2013). Specialized consideration of the standardized factory is a direct factor in marginalization and poor student attainment (Stokes, 2013)

Research Question, Aim and Variables:

The overall aim of this study is to identify the key factors that affect the student's achievement (i.e. what are the external factors that can impact the student's performance). This aim leads to the research question that will be examined, which is:

How some factors affect State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) percentage at level III Advanced of high school in Bexar County?

The identification of these factors are necessary to define the problems and find solutions to increase the number of students' performance (level one) to success with an advance (level three) academic performance (Aberger et al, 2010). Thus, the variables of the study will be:

Dependent Variable: Average (STAAR) percentage at level III Advanced per campus to determine if different socioeconomic factors affect performance differently.

Independent Variables: The number of economically disadvantaged students per campus (economically disadvantaged); special education, ESL Education (English language learners), gifted and at risk. The percentage of Hispanic students.

The hypothesis of the study is:

H: Higher Average Percentages of STAAR will be obtained for the above variables where all of the independent variables will have an adverse effect on Level III STAAR Attainment, except for gifted students who will have a positive relationship.

Hypothesis

The literature review has explored the different factors that need to be considered to ensure that all students have the same opportunity access to academic readiness to support the general hypothesis, in order to develop the sub-hypotheses which will apply a deductive approach to the statistical analysis where the following sub-hypothesis will be tested. These are:

(i) Economically disadvantaged students are less likely to perform better than students who have no economic disadvantages..

(ii) Students who are not at risk are more likely to perform better than students who are at risk.

(iii) Hispanic students' performance is lower on STAAR compared to students in the majority.

(iv) Gifted students are most likely to perform better than students who are not gifted.

(iv) Special education students are less likely to perform better than students who have no special needs.

(v) English language learners are less likely to perform better than students who are not English language learners. These assumptions are based upon beliefs that race, economic status, English as a second language and special educational needs can have a negative effect on educational attainment. The initial literature review has illustrated where these assumptions have derived from. Thus, after the deductive analysis then the literature will be reconsidered and considered within the context of the statistical analysis, in order to determine the validity of the results and to make a number of recommendations on how to develop a fairer educational testing system (in necessary) within Texas

Methodology:

Approach & Justification:

The nature and the scope of the literature on academic readiness indicate that it is a complex topic. Thus, it is necessary for me to synthesize the data, in order to understand how

socioeconomic factors of individual students affect them and how this correlated to Level III attainment.

Research Design:

SPSS will be used to examine the results that have been recorded 2012-2013 Texas Academic Reports. A selection of schools have been chosen where Level III results at High Schools have been collated, indicating a number of socioeconomic factors that those who have achieved this level of attainment have gained.

It is not sufficient to just undertake a descriptive statistical of these factors, identify trends and issues that are present and then analyze the results. The nature of the SPSS analysis will include descriptive statistics that will provide the distributional variables that are at play. After the descriptive analysis, the methodological framework will then engage with multivariate analysis through identifying the correlation between the different variables to determine the validity of the null hypothesis. The correlative analysis will allow me to ascertain the main factors that are at play, in order to ascertain which factors are the most prevalent in linking educational attainment with the dependent socioeconomic factors.

School Selection:

The selection criteria in this research have centered upon all the schools that are located in Bexar County Area where Level III test results have been published and were made accessible (regardless of their overall categorization). It was important only to use schools where all of the dependent variables have been answered, in order to analyze a complete set of statistical analysis. Due to the scope of this research, all the 45 public high schools in the ten independent school districts that are located in Bexar County that provide all of the dependent variable information on Level III Star attainment have been selected. The use of this form of analysis

will be used on both the existing studies (such as parental involvement by race) on educational attainment, and how this links to the descriptive and correlative statistical analysis of the data from Level III STAAR attainment scores in a cross section of schools in the state of Texas. This (dependent variables) shows the percentage score for the STAAR at level III composite, calculated as follows: total composite score for all students who took the STAAR divided by Number of students who took the STAAR. (Glossary.Texas Education Agency)

Description / Measurements: Table2: Description / Measurements / Univariate

The first independent variable is economically disadvantaged students, is measured by the percentage of economically disadvantaged students is calculated as the sum of the students coded as eligible for free or reduced-price lunch or eligible for other public assistance, divided by the total number of students: number of students coded as eligible for free or reduced-price lunch or other public assistance divided by total number of students. (Glossary.Texas Education Agency)

The second independent variable is special education students, is measured by the percentage of special education students per campus. This refers to the population served by programs for students with disabilities. Assessment and other decisions for students in special education programs are made by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee. The ARD committee is made up of the parent(s) or guardian, teacher, administrator, and other concerned parties (Glossary.Texas Education Agency).

The third independent variable is Hispanic, is measured by the percentage of Hispanic students per campus. Students and staff are reported as African American, Hispanic, White, American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races. In the Profile section, both counts and percentages of the total number of students and staff in each of these categories are shown (Glossary.Texas Education Agency).

The fourth independent variable is students at risk, is measured by the percentage of students at risk per campus. According to the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), there are certain risk factors that play into a student dropping out of school. These risk factors can be caused by the student, or happen beyond the student's control. It can come from a level of academic achievement, such as grades, a lack of advancement, personal issues such as pregnancy or already being a parent, living conditions such as homelessness, psychological issues and criminal issues (Glossary.Texas Education Agency). While a student may not necessarily drop out of school due to any of these risk factors, having them does increase the possibility that it will happen. Having a supportive environment in school that can provide a safe and nurturing place for students to learn is important. Students who have their physical and mental well-being needs met have an increased ability to learn, which can lead to greater success in life. (Glossary.Texas Education Agency)

The fifth independent variable is English language learners, is measured by the percentage of students at risk per campus. Student of limited English proficiency" suggests a student whose primary language is other than English and whose English language skills are such that the student has difficulty performing ordinary classwork in English.). (Glossary.Texas Education Agency)

The last independent variable "Gifted Students" is measured by the percentage of gifted students per campus. Gifted and talented students" suggests a child or youth who performs at or shows the potential for performing at a remarkably high level of accomplishment when compared to others of the same age, experience, or environment and who:

(1) Exhibits high performance capability in an intellectual, creative, or artistic area;

(2) Possesses an unusual capacity for leadership; or

(3) Excels in a specific academic field. (Glossary.Texas Education Agency)

Anaylsis / Findings:

Table 3: Correlational Analysis of the Varibles:

Correlations

		AllSubjects	Economically Disadvantaged	Hispanic	SpecialEducation	AtRisk	ELL	Gifted
AllSubjects	Pearson Correlation	1	-.907**	-.761**	-.732**	-.913**	-.613**	.347*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.019
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
EconomicallyDisadvantaged	Pearson Correlation	-.907**	1	.894**	.766**	.931**	.745**	-.152
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.319
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Hispanic	Pearson Correlation	-.761**	.894**	1	.499**	.775**	.651**	.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.829
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
SpecialEducation	Pearson Correlation	-.732**	.766**	.499**	1	.837**	.650**	-.243
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.108
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
AtRisk	Pearson Correlation	-.913**	.931**	.775**	.837**	1	.732**	-.230
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.128
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
ELL	Pearson Correlation	-.613**	.745**	.651**	.650**	.732**	1	-.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.600
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Gifted	Pearson Correlation	.347*	-.152	.033	-.243	-.230	-.080	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.319	.829	.108	.128	.600	
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The table above shows the strong positive correlations among the independents variables.

To illustrate, the independent variable economically disadvantage students has a correlation to Hispanic with a value of 0.849. Secondly, the independent variable economically disadvantage students has a correlation to special education with a value of 0.766. Thirdly, the independent variable economically disadvantage students has a correlation to at risk with a value of 0.931. Finally, the independent variable economically disadvantage students has a correlation to ELL with a value of 0.745 and a significance of 0.000. The independent variable Hispanic has a correlation to at risk with a value of 0.755 and a significance of 0.000. The independent

variable special education has a correlation to at risk with a value of 0.837 and to ELL with 0.650 and a significance of 0.000. Finally, the independent variable at risk has a correlation to at ELL with a value of 0.732 and a significance of 0.000.

The null hypothesis tested for the correlation is: There is no correlation among the independent variables. However, the alternate hypotheses are: There are correlation among them since the Pearson correlations of each variable is between 0 and 1; moreover, the Sig of each variable is less than the both levels .01 and .05. As a result, we reject the null hypotheses and accept the alternate hypotheses

Table 4: Bivariate and Multivariate regression on the dependent variable:

Independent Variable	Bivariate	Bivariate	Bivariate	Bivariate	Bivariate	Bivariate	Multivariate
Economically Disadvantaged	-0.187*** 0.013						-0.140** 0.049
Hispanic		-0.173*** 0.023					0.020 0.036
Special Education			-1.382*** 0.196				0.242 0.220
Gifted & Talented Education				0.538* 0,221			0.251** 0.088
At Risk					-0.319*** 0.022		-.0.186** 0.058
English Language Learners (ELL)						-0.872*** 0.171	-0.219 0.111
Constant	18,913	19,956	23,075	3,589	24,190	12,663	18,177
N	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
Adjusted R2	0.818	0.569	0.525	0.100	0.829	0.362	0.89
*P<.05;**P<.01;***P<.001							

In the links between the independent variables there is a pretty sound relationship for being at risk and economically disadvantage Adjusted R2 value (i.e. 82.9 and 81.8 respectively). Then there is a moderate link to being Hispanic Adjusted R2 value 56.9 and needing special education Adjusted R2 value52.2. There is a weak relationship between English as language

learners Adjusted R2 value 36.2 and a very weak relationship, in respect to being gifted Adjusted R2 value10. Thus, the main category where there is a strong relationship is being at risk and being economically disadvantaged.

The multivariate analysis show that with all the independent variables included, the model only accounted for Adjusted R2= 89% of the variation in the dependent variable. Also, none of the variables has a Beta that is statistically greater than zero.

Model 1: Bivariate of Economically Disadvantaged: (Appendixes)

The model 1 displays that percentage of economically disadvantaged students per Level III performance per campus is R2 = 81% of the variation in the percentage of STAAR Level III. The co-efficient in the bivariate regression is also statistically significant because t-= 23.164 and sig = 0.000 and (Beta >0). There is a negative effect between attainment at STAAR Level III and economic disadvantage.

Table 5: To clarify, this negative relationship, schools with high percentage of economically disadvantaged students have low STAAR Level III. For example, school number 27 John F Kennedy H S has 97.3% of economically disadvantaged students with only 2% of STAAR Level III. Contrarily, school number 12 Reagan H S has 10% of economically disadvantaged students and very high percentage of STAAR Level III with 25%. This demonstrates that, when the percentage of economically disadvantaged students decreases, the percentage of STAAR Level III score dramatically increases.

Model 2: Bivariate of Hispanic: (Appendixes)

The model 2 displays that percentage of Hispanic students per Level III performance per campus is R2 = 56% of the variation in the percentage of STAAR Level III. The co-efficient in

the bivariate regression is also statistically significant because t-= 7.683 and sig = 0.000 and (Beta >0). There is a negative effect between attainment at STAAR Level III and Hispanic.

Table 5: To clarify, this negative relationship, schools with high percentage of Hispanic disadvantaged students have low STAAR Level III. For example, school number 45 Lanier H S has 97.7% of Hispanic with only 2% of STAAR Level III. Contrarily, school number 37 Randolph H S has 16.3% of Hispanic and percentage of STAAR Level III with 14%. This demonstrates that, when the percentage of Hispanic students decreases, the percentage of STAAR Level III score dramatically increases.

Model 3: Bivariate of Gifted: (Appendixes)

The model 3 displays that percentage of gifted students per Level III. The model summary displays that percentage of Gifted students per Level III performance per campus is R2= 10% of the variation in the percentage of STAAR Level III. The co-efficient in the bivariate regression is also statistically significant because t-= 2.429 and sig = 0.019 and (Beta >0). There is a positive effect between attainment at STAAR Level III and the person being gifted, although it is weak.

Table 5: To clarify, this positive relationship, schools with high percentage of gifted students have high STAAR Level III. For example, school number 1 Alamo H S has 21.2 % of Gifted with only 19% of STAAR Level III. Contrarily, school number 10 Madison H S has 4.5 % of Gifted and the percentage of STAAR Level III with 9%. This demonstrates that, when the percentage of gifted students increases, the percentage of STAAR Level III score dramatically increases.

Model 4: Bivariate of Special Education: (Appendixes)

The model 4 displays that percentage of Special Education per Level III The model summary displays that percentage of Special Education per Level III performance per campus is R2= 52% of the variation in the percentage of STAAR Level III. The co-efficient in the bivariate regression is also statistically significant because t-= 7.043 and sig = 0.000 and (Beta >0). There is a negative effect between attainment at STAAR Level III and being a person that needs special education, although it is only moderately strong.

Table 5: To clarify, this negative relationship, schools with high percentage of special education students have low percentage STAAR Level III. For example, school number 1 Alamo H S has 21.2 % of Gifted with only 19% of STAAR Level III. Contrarily, school number 10 Madison H S has 4.5 % of Gifted and the percentage of STAAR Level III with 9%. This demonstrates that, when the percentage of gifted students increases, the percentage of STAAR Level III score dramatically increases.

Model 5: Bivariate of At Risk: (Appendixes)

The model 5 displays that percentage of At Risk per Level III The model summary displays that percentage of At Risk per Level III performance per campus is R2= 82% of the variation in the percentage of STAAR Level III. The co-efficient in the bivariate regression is also statistically significant because t-= 14.644 and sig = 0.000 and (Beta >0). There is a negative effect between attainment at STAAR Level III and being at risk, which is the strongest of the links.

Table 5: To clarify, this negative relationship, schools with high percentage of at risk have low percentage STAAR Level III. For example, school number 45 Linear H S has 78 % of at risk with only 2% of STAAR Level III. Contrarily, school number 3 Samuel V H S has 18.4

% of at risk and the percentage of STAAR Level III with 18%. This demonstrates that, when the percentage of at risk students increases, the percentage of STAAR Level III score dramatically decreases.

Model 6: Bivariate of English Language Learners: (Appendixes)

The model 6 displays that percentage of ELL per Level III. The model summary displays that percentage of ELL per Level III performance per campus is R2= 36% of the variation in the percentage of STAAR Level III. The co-efficient in the bivariate regression is also statistically significant because t-= 5.093 and sig = 0.000 and (Beta >0). There is a negative effect between attainment at STAAR Level III and being ELL, which is the strongest of the links. The indication is that there is a negative effect between attainments at STAAR Level III and being an English language learner, which indicates a moderate negative link.

Table 5: To clarify, this negative relationship, schools with high percentage of ELL have low percentage STAAR Level III. For example, school number 45 Linear H S has 15.9 % of ELL with only 2% of STAAR Level III. Contrarily, school number 37 Randolph H S has 0 % of ELL and the percentage of STAAR Level III with 14%. This demonstrates that, when the percentage of ELL students increases, the percentage of STAAR Level III score dramatically decreases.

Model 7: Multivariate of all Independent Variables: (Appendixes)

There is a strong link between attainment in level three and the accumulation of all of the independent variables, which is 95% when adjusted it is still 89%. However, the actual significance is identified as at risk and Gifted with (t- 4.595 / 3.152), which is interesting because it supports the anomaly of the high multivariate effect of STAAR assessment. That means the variable used explain more of the variance in the dependent variable. These results indicate that

the primary link is between at risk, and Gifted. Nevertheless, the percentage of Gifted is the greatest positive effect on STAAR per campus and At-Risk had the greatest negative effect on STAAR per campus.

Conclusion / STAAR Policy Implications:

The hypothesis that were set were statistically all identified to be true. However, the statistics highlight that there are a number of considerations that have to be considered in the links between them. Thus, each of the hypotheses will be considered in turn:

(i) Those who are at risk will have a negative effect to Level III status.

The at risk category has the strongest adverse link with Level III Attainment, which indicates that there are a number of factors at play to determine who needs special attention to counter this adverse link. The links between Hispanic and economically disadvantage prove this application, which is also seen in the link between these groups and special educational needs. These groups are a subset of at risk, which highlights further exploration into the interaction with the different subsets that make up at risk individuals and then create a targeted program to counter the adverse effect on Level III STAAR attainment. Therefore, there is a multivariable cause of poor Level III STAAR attainment that need to be explored in further depth to make an effective policy to counter the adverse risk factors.

(ii) Hispanics at will have a negative effect to Level III status;

It was shown that there is a negative correlation between being Hispanic and achieving Level III STAAR, which the results provided that there was a moderate link. The inference was that there

was a moderate correlation on this factor whilst the null hypothesis was rejected. The fact that there is a moderate link comes from the effect between the independent variables showing that there is a high number of Hispanics at risk and being economically disadvantaged. The indication is that these two groups may be a better place for policy targeting and not the Hispanic population. This moderate significance was supported by the Multivariate Analysis and the negative (adverse) effect was identified in the bivariate analysis. Thus, the statistics illustrate that there is an adverse link between being Hispanic and attainment at Level III STAAR.

It is important not to misplace this link on a race characteristics basis, expect that there is a high number of socially disadvantaged Hispanics. This suggests that where there is a high level of this group there will be a greatly impoverished area, which suggests targeting this issue is necessary to level the playing field for the Hispanic population of Texas.

(iii) English as Language Learners will have a negative effect to Level III status.

It was shown that there is a weak negative correlation between English as language learners and achieving Level III STAAR. This weak effect was identified throughout the different levels of analysis, which highlights that learning English another language does not mean that there will be a necessarily negative affect on STAAR achievement. The Multivariate Analysis showed that this was the strongest link, although the no significance. The inference is that this will be an anomaly or it may be that further testing is required. Nonetheless, the bivariate analysis reconfirmed that there was an adverse link, albeit it is only moderate between Level III STAAR attainment and English Language Learning.

The moderate link does make sense because English is the testing language, which suggests that there needs to be measures in place to ensure that students are helps with their English transition.

The fact that there is a moderate link indicates that there are steps being taken to provide this help, nevertheless, the link requires that more should be done.

(iv) Gifted individuals will have a positive effect to Level III status; and

It was assumed that the gifted will have a strong effect because these individuals have been separated because of their academic ability. However, the results showed that there was a very weak positive link between the two, which calls into question the viability of the gifted program. Further investigation into the weak correlation has to be made, in order to determine if there should be such a separation, whether the determination mechanism on gifted is correct and/or if the teaching program is sufficient. Nonetheless, the results do highlight a systemic problem with the gifted program.

(v) Those with special educational needs will have a negative effect to Level III status.

There was a moderate adverse link between those with special educational needs and Level III attainment status. This is interesting because such a group one would assume would have a strong negative link; however, this was not the case. Although a stronger link than that of the gifted application, there is still not the expected outcome. The inference of these results should be examined, in order to ascertain whether the assumptions made about persons with such needs are correct. It may be that the testing criteria are wrong or it may be that the teaching practices for these persons are effective. If it is the latter then it is clearly the case that more can be done because policy wants to achieve the weakest link possible.

Recommendation

State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) aims at introducing a new program of testing students academically. This approach introduces the timing aspect in testing

and is aimed at ensuring that students have obtained the necessary basic knowledge before advancing to higher levels. This approach comes with a list of policy changes that are bound to impact differently to different social and economic groups. Such groups include the economically disadvantaged, students at risk, and those with special needs. This paper explores the ways that the government and Texas specialists can help such groups improve in academic performance. The policy acknowledges that the economically disadvantaged since access to education, especially higher education, is limited. Therefore, achieving Level III STAAR status is nearly impossible. To uplift the academic performance of Hispanic students, there should be special consideration on providing further resources made. Such interventions will reduce the number of economically challenged students. The Hispanic population and those economically challenged constitute a big chunk of those at risk. To mitigate this problem a targeted program that seeks to counter the adverse consequence on achievement of Level III should be created. On the students with special needs, reducing the percentage of students with special needs ensures that they can comfortably learn along with fellow students. Besides, the teaching methods for such groups need to be revised and improved accordingly. Finally, the percentage of English language learners directly affects the academic performance. With the STAAR approach being based on English as the language of examination/ testing, there is utmost need to ensure that students are served with the appropriate translation services. The lack of this adversely affects the academic performance of the affected students.

Appendixes

Table 1: Summary of Literature Review by Variables:

Dependent Variable:	***Summary of Literature:***	***Key References***
Average (STTAR) percentage at level III Advanced per campus:	Academic achievement is affected by a number of different socioeconomic variables that link to poverty, race, geographic location, parental educational achievement, employment background and achievement.	Brooks-Gun & Markman, 2005; Gonzalez et al, 2005; Kim et al, 2012; Hill et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013; Duncan & Magnusson, 2005; Sirin, 2005; Davis-Kean, 2005; Reardon, 2011; Sackett et al, 2012; Thomas & Stockton, 2003
	Structural factors include, limited resources for high poverty areas, limited access to higher education and entrenched marginalization in the standardized testing system	Roderick et al, 2009; Finn et al, 2009; Aiyer et al, 2013; Stokes, 2013; Harden et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013; Goree, 2013
Independent Variables:	*Summary Variables*	*Key References*
	Socio-Economic Factors:	
The number of economically disadvantaged students per campus (low-income):	This can have a direct impact on attitudes of parents and students because access to good education, especially higher education is limited.	Brooks-Gun & Markman, 2005; Roderick et al, 2009; Aiyer et al, 2013; Hill et al, 2013; Harden et al, 2013; Duncan & Magnusson, 2005; Sirin, 2005; Davis-Kean, 2005; Reardon, 2011; Sackett et al, 2012; Thomas & Stockton, 2003

The number of students of each race per campus (White, Hispanic, Black and Other):	The number of these groups on campus can have a direct impact on attainment, which includes language barriers pulling average marks down. Another factor that has to be considered is how access to higher education and attitudes can have a direct impact on academic readiness.	Roderick et al, 2009; Gonzalez et al, 2005; Kim et al, 2012; Hill et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013; Sackett et al, 2012; Thomas & Stockton, 2003
Family Educational & Employment Background (High School, Grade…, College, University, Technical, Professional):	The educational and employment background can have a direct impact on the perceptions of parents. However, there is a diversity of perceptions within these groups, which can be linked to ethnicity (i.e. some groups seem to have a cultural drive to attainment whilst others are disillusioned due to marginalization).	Brooks-Gun & Markman, 2005; Gonzalez et al, 2005; Kim et al, 2012; Hill et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013; Duncan & Magnusson, 2005; Davis-Kean, 2005; Reardon, 2011; Sackett et al, 2012; Thomas & Stockton, 2003

Special Needs:

Special Educational Needs (Medical/Psychological):	Special educational needs are related to poverty because there may be an increased health issue. This is especially the case when there is marginalization because there is a systemic belief that access to higher education is not possible (and may be true due to structural barriers).	Brooks-Gun & Markman, 2005; Skiba et al, 2009; Finn et al, 2014; Harden et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013; Duncan & Magnusson, 2005
Language (English as a Second Language (ESL)):	This is of particular concern, especially with standardized teaching and tests because the translation aspect is not properly examined.	Gonzalez et al, 2005; Kim et al, 2012; Hill et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013

Structural Factors:

Standardized testing:	Standardized testing creates a factory based model that further marginalized the marginalized. In addition, it may have a weak predictive factor.	Rueker Brooks-Gun & Markman, 2005; Finn et al, 2014; Aiyer et al, 2013; Stokes, 2013; Ruecker, 2013; Goree, 2013; Sackett et al, 2012
Teaching standards (i.e. children per class room, course provision):	The size of classes and access to resources can have a direct impact on the attainment of schools (i.e. a small under-resourced rural school and under-resourced urban school may have different results due to teaching and class size standards)	Roderick et al, 2009; Aiyer et al, 2013; Stokes, 2013; Harden et al, 2013; Ruecker, 2013; Goree, 2013; Sackett et al, 2012; Thomas & Stockton, 2003

Table 2: Measurements / Univariate

Variable Name	Description / Measurements	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
(STAAR) percentage at level III Advanced (ALL SUJECT)	This shows the percentage score for the STAAR at level III composite, calculated as follows: total composite score for all students who took the STAAR divided by Number of students who took the STAAR. (Glossary.Texas Education Agency) Measurement / The percentage of STAAR at level III per campus.	8.689	8.000	5.8730	2.0	25
Economically Disadvantaged Students	The percent of economically disadvantaged students is calculated as the sum of the students coded as eligible for free or reduced-price lunch or eligible for other public assistance, divided by the total number of students: number of students coded as eligible for free or reduced-price lunch or other public assistance divided by total number of students. (Glossary.Texas Education Agency) Measurement / The percentage of economically disadvantaged studentsat per campus.	54.711	57.900	28.4922	5.2	97.3
Special education	This refers to the population served by programs for students with disabilities. Assessment and other decisions for students in special education programs are made by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee. The ARD committee is made up of the parent(s) or guardian, teacher, administrator, and other concerned parties. Measurement: The percentage of special education students per campus	10.409	10.300	3.1099	5.2	20.6
Hispanic	Students and staff are reported as African American, Hispanic, White, American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races. In the *Profile* section, both counts and percentages of the total number of students and staff in each of these categories are shown.(Glossary.Texas Education Agency) Measurement / The percentage of Hispanic studentsat per campus.	64.962	64.800	25.7563	16.3	98.4
At Risk	The number students at risk per campus. According to the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), there are certain risk factors that play into a student dropping out of school. These risk factors can be caused by the student, or happen beyond the student's control. It can come from a level of academic	48.604	50.000	16.8070	18.4	78.0

	achievement, such as grades, a lack of advancement, personal issues such as pregnancy or already being a parent, living conditions such as homelessness, psychological issues and criminal issues. While a student may not necessarily drop out of school due to any of these risk factors, having them does increase the possibility that it will happen. Having a supportive environment in school that can provide a safe and nurturing place for students to learn is important. Students who have their physical and mental well-being needs met have an increased ability to learn, which can lead to greater success in life. (Glossary.Texas Education Agency) Measurement / The percentage of studentsats at risk per campus.					
ELL	Student of limited English proficiency" suggests a student whose primary language is other than English and whose English language skills are such that the student has difficulty performing ordinary classwork in English.). (Glossary.Texas Education Agency) Measurement / The percentage of English language kearners per campus.	4.560	3.100	4.1334	.0	18.8
Gifted	gifted and talented students" suggests a child or youth who performs at or shows the potential for performing at a remarkably high level of accomplishment when compared to others of the same age, experience, or environment and who: (1) exhibits high performance capability in an intellectual, creative, or artistic area; (2) possesses an unusual capacity for leadership; or (3) excels in a specific academic field. (Glossary.Texas Education Agency) Measurement / The percentage gifted students per campus.	9.482	8.900	3.7928	4.5	21.2

Table 3: Correlational Analysis of the Varibles:

Correlations

		AllSubjects	Economically Disadvantaged	Hispanic	SpecialEducation	AtRisk	ELL	Gifted
AllSubjects	Pearson Correlation	1	-.907**	-.761**	-.732**	-.913**	-.613**	.347*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.019
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
EconomicallyDisadvantaged	Pearson Correlation	-.907**	1	.894**	.766**	.931**	.745**	-.152
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.319
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Hispanic	Pearson Correlation	-.761**	.894**	1	.499**	.775**	.651**	.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.829
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
SpecialEducation	Pearson Correlation	-.732**	.766**	.499**	1	.837**	.650**	-.243
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.108
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
AtRisk	Pearson Correlation	-.913**	.931**	.775**	.837**	1	.732**	-.230
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.128
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
ELL	Pearson Correlation	-.613**	.745**	.651**	.650**	.732**	1	-.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.600
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Gifted	Pearson Correlation	.347*	-.152	.033	-.243	-.230	-.080	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.319	.829	.108	.128	.600	
	N	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4: Bivariate and Multivariate regression on the dependent variable:

Independent Variable	Bivariate	Bivariate	Bivariate	Bivariate	Bivariate	Bivariate	Multivariate
Economically Disadvantaged	-0.187*** 0.013						-0.140** 0.049
Hispanic		-0.173*** 0.023					0.020 0.036
Special Education			-1.382*** 0.196				0.242 0.220
Gifted & Talented Education				0.538* 0,221			0.251** 0.088
At Risk					-0.319*** 0.022		-.0.186** 0.058
English Language Learners (ELL)						-0.872*** 0.171	-0.219 0.111
Constant	18,913	19,956	23,075	3,589	24,190	12,663	18,177
N	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
Adjusted R2	0.818	0.569	0.525	0.100	0.829	0.362	0.89
*P<.05;**P<.01;***P<.001							

Table 5: Variables Statistics for Bexar County ISD:

#	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	All Subjects	EcoDis	At Risk	ELL	Hispanic	Gifted	Special Education
1	ALAMO HEIGHTS	ALAMO HEIGHTS HS	19	16.4	25.8	1.4	37.5	21.2	6
2	BOERNE	BOERNE H S	14	22.2	26.8	1.2	27.6	4.8	7.3
3	BOERNE	SAMUEL V CHAMPIO HS	18	9.8	18.4	0.5	24.4	5.6	5.6
4	COMAL	CANYON HS	10	32.2	37.3	3.1	42.2	11.3	8.2
5	COMAL	SMITHSON VALLEY H S	17	11.9	22.4	0.6	30.6	15.3	6.7
6	COMAL	CANYON LAKE H S	12	37.9	37.7	0.9	19.8	10	14
7	NORTH EAST	CHURCHILL H S	13	29.6	34.1	1.9	48.5	8.2	8.6
8	NORTH EAST	LEE HS	9	66.1	52.5	6.9	80.8	17.2	9.5
9	NORTH EAST	MACARTHUR H S	10	40.5	40.6	2.9	52.9	5.9	10.3
10	NORTH EAST	MADISON H S	9	43	46.3	1	53.9	4.5	9
11	NORTH EAST	JOHNSON H S	21	13.5	22.6	1.5	39.8	8.9	5.7
12	NORTH EAST	REAGAN H S	25	10	22.6	1.9	38.6	10.1	5.5
13	NORTH EAST	ROOSEVELT H S	8	65.2	57.7	4.5	59.5	5.4	12.8
14	NORTHSIDE	HOLMES H S	5	73.9	56.2	4.1	82.5	9.1	12.1
15	NORTHSIDE	JAY H S	8	70	54.7	2.8	82.6	17	11.5
16	NORTHSIDE	MARSHALL H S	10	49.1	47.3	4.1	65.7	10.7	11.5
17	NORTHSIDE	BRANDEIS H S	15	26.3	36.8	3.5	55.2	13.6	8.2
18	NORTHSIDE	CLARK H S	16	35	35.9	2.9	52.5	14.5	10.3
19	NORTHSIDE	O'CONNOR H S	14	27.7	36	2.5	53.9	14.2	8.7
20	NORTHSIDE	STEVENS H S	5	62	58	2.2	76.5	7.9	12.1
21	NORTHSIDE	TAFT H S	12	45.1	41.3	1.9	66.3	15.7	9.3
22	NORTHSIDE	WARREN H S	9	47.8	45.9	1.6	72.8	11.8	9.9
23	JUDSON	JUDSON H S	6	49.8	54.8	4.1	46.7	7.5	11.8
24	JUDSON	KAREN WAGNER H S	3	65.1	74.1	6.3	48.7	6.3	11.8
25	SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY	BYRON P STEELE II HS	11	15.1	35.6	0.5	32.8	5	8.7
26	SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY	SAMUEL CLEMENS H S	12	24.2	38.7	1.5	36.5	6.6	8.2
27	EDGEWOOD	JOHN F KENNEDY HSW	2	97.3	69.6	3.7	98.4	9.7	12.2
28	EDGEWOOD	MEMORIAL H S	2	88.4	76.3	8.1	98.1	9.3	13.6
29	MEDINA VALLEY	MEDINA VALLEY H S	10	44.8	32.1	1.6	51.3	7	9.7
30	SOUTH SAN ANTONIO	SOUTH SAN ANTONIO HS	3	80	57.6	5	96.8	6.4	9.7
31	HARLANDALE	HARLANDALE HS	4	85	60.9	7.4	97.9	9.1	10.4
32	HARLANDALE	MCCOLLUM H S	3	79	58.3	2.7	95.3	7.9	11.3
33	EAST CENTRAL	EAST CENTRAL HS	6	57.9	50	1.5	64.8	7.3	8.4

34	SOUTHWEST	SOUTHWEST HS	4	78.5	51.6	3.8	90.3	6.7	10.3
35	SOUTHSIDE	SOUTHSIDE HS	3	72.5	55.6	6.2	88.8	9.1	10.9
36	SOMERSET	SOMERSET HS	2	73.6	59.6	5.1	84.2	6.3	9.3
37	RANDOLPH FIELD ISD	RANDOLPH H S	14	5.2	19.1	0	16.3	8.6	5.2
38	SAN ANTONIO ISD	BRACKENRIDGE H S	4	87.7	63.8	10	93.9	11.3	12
39	SAN ANTONIO ISD	BURBANK H S	4	87.4	67.2	10	98	10.8	12.1
40	SAN ANTONIO ISD	EDISON H S	3	87.9	66.9	18.8	95.1	9.1	12.2
41	SAN ANTONIO ISD	FOX TECHNICAL H S	7	87.4	48.2	9.5	94.8	12.8	10.1
42	SAN ANTONIO ISD	HIGHLANDS H S	2	85.9	71.8	7.4	88.1	8	16
43	SAN ANTONIO ISD	HOUSTON H S	2	92.1	76.9	10.8	49.3	5	20.6
44	SAN ANTONIO ISD	JEFFERSON H S	3	86.6	63.6	11.4	95.4	7.6	13.3
45	SAN ANTONIO ISD	LANIER H S	2	95.4	78	15.9	97.7	6.4	17.8

References

Aberger, S., Brown, B., Mantil, A., & Perkins, A. (2009, November 20). *Closing the student achievement gap: The overlooked strategy of socioeconomic integration*. Retrieved from http://a100educationalpolicy.pbworks.com/f/Closing+the+Achievement+Gap+-+Socioeconomic+Integration.pdf

Aiyer, JK Adas, MO & Lapps, S (2013) "Urban Education Reform- Case Study: North Forest Independent School District," *ECI Interdisciplinary Journal for Legal and Social Policy*: Vol.3, Iss 1 Retrieved http://ecipublications.org/ijlsp/vol3/iss1/4

Best, JR, Miller, PH and Naglieri, JA (2011) Relations between executive function and academic achievement from ages 5 to 17 in a large, national representative sample. *Learning and Individual Differences* Vol 21, pp. 327

Brooks-Gunn, J & Markman, LB (2005) The Contribution of Parenting to Ethnic and Racial Gaps in School Readiness *The Future of Children* Vol 15, pp. 139

Davis-Kean, PE (2005) The Influence of Parent Education and Family Income on Child Achievement: The Indirect Role of Parental Expectations and the Home Environment. *Journal of Family Psychology* Vol 19, pp. 294

DeWitt, P. (2011, November 30). Finding common ground [Special section]. *Education Week*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/finding_common_ground/2011/11/poverty_matters.html?qs=socioeconomic

Duncan, GJ & Magnusson, KA (2005) Can Family Socioeconomic Resources Account for Racial and Ethnic Test Score Gaps? *The Future of Children* Vol. 15, pp. 35

Duncan, GJ, Dowsett, CJ, Claessens, A et al (2006, November 14) School Readiness and Later Achievement. Retrieved from http://eprints.ioe.ac.uk/5971/1/Duckworth2007SchoolReadiness1428.pdf?origin=publicationDetail

Eamon, MK (2005). "Social-Demographic, School, Neighborhood and Parenting Influences on the Academic Achievement of Latino Young Adolescents" *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* Vol 35, pp. 163

Finn, AS, Kraft, MA, West, MR et al (2014). Cognitive Skills, Student Achievement Tests and Schools. *Psychological Science* Published online January 16, 2014 DOI: 10.1177/0956797613516008

"Glossary." Texas Education Agency -. N.p., n.d. Web. 09 Apr. 2014.

Gonzalez, H, Cavazos, S, De La Garza, E et al (2005). An Analysis of Extant Data that Addresses Sociological, Curricular, Instructional and Academic Issues that Affect Hispanic Students' College Readiness in South Texas. *Journal of Border Education Research* Vol 4, pp. 6

Goree, TL (2013, August) Exploring Principals' Perceptions of Characteristics, Practices and Programs that Influence College Readiness for Low Socioeconomic Students in Smaller Texas High Schools: A Delphi Study *PhD University of Texas at Arlington*. Retrieved:

http://dspace.uta.edu/bitstream/handle/10106/23942/Goree_uta_2502D_12301.pdf?sequence=1

Harden, KP, Trucker-Drob, EM & Tackett, JL (2013). The Texas Twin Project. *Twin Res Hum Genet* Vol 16, pp. 385

Hill, K, Moser, D, Shannon, RS & St. Louis, T (2013, May) Narrowing the Racial Achievement Gap: Policy Success at the State Level *Robert M La Follette School of Public Affairs Workshop in Public Affairs, Domestic Concentration Public Affairs 869*

Kagitcibasi, B & Berry, JW (1989) "Cross Cultural Psychology: Current Research and Trends" *Annual Review of Psychology* Vol 40, pp. 493

Kallison, JM & Stader, DL (2012) Effectiveness of Summer Bridge Programs in Enhancing College Readiness. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* Vol 36, pp. 340

Kim, Y, Sherraden, M & Clancy, M (2012) Parental Educational Expectations by Race/Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status. *Economics of Education Review* vol 33, pp. 82

National Center for Fair and Open Testing (2007) *2006 college bound seniors average SAT scores* retrieved www.fairtest.org

Perrone, V (1991) "On standardized testing" *Childhood Education* Vol 67, pp. 131

"Glossary." Texas Education Agency

Rambo, JR (2004). *Predicting Student Performance on the Texas of Academic Skills Exit Level Exam: Predictor Modeling through Logistic Regression* PHD University of North Texas. Retrieved: http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc4577/m2/1/high_res_d/dissertation.pdf

Reardon, SF (2011) *The Widening Academic Achievement Gap Between the Rich and the Poor: New Evidence and Possible Explanations* July 2011 paper. Retrieved from: http://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/reardon%20whither%20opportunity%20-%20chapter%205.pdf

Roderick, M, Nagaoka, J & Coca, V (2009) College Readiness For All: The Challenge for Urban Schools. *The Future of Children* Vol 19, pp. 185

Ruecker, T (2013) High-Stakes Testing and Latina/o Students: Creating a Hierarchy of College Readiness. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* Vol 12, pp. 303

Sackett, PR, Kuncel, NR, Beatty, AS et al (2012) The Role of Socioeconomic Status in SAT-Grade Relationships in College Admissions Decisions. *Psychological Science* Vol 23, pp. 1000

Skiba, RJ, Poloni-Staudinger, L, Simmons, AB, Feggins-Aziz, R & Chung, CG (2005) Unproven Links: Can Poverty Explain Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education? *The Journal of Special Education* Vol 39, pp. 130

Stewart,W (2013). Is Pisa fundamentally flawed? *TES Connect* July 26, 2013. Retrieved: http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6344672

Stokes, KL (2013) The Impact of the Factory Model Of Education in Central Texas *PhD Thesis Baylor University.* Retrieved: https://beardocs.baylor.edu:8443/xmlui/bitstream/handle/2104/8878/Kelsey_Stokes_honorsthesis.pdf?sequence=1

Texas Education Agency – Glossary (2011-12). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=3439

Texas Education Agency (n.d.) State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness: A Parent's Guide to the Student Testing Program. Retrieved: http://www.aisd.net/aisd/Portals/123/STAAR/staar-general_brochure.pdf

Thomas, J & Stockton, C (2003) "Socioeconomic Status, Race, Gender & Retention: Impact on Student Achievement" Retrieved from: http://www.usca.edu/essays/vol72003/stockton.pdf

Zwick, R (2012) "The Role of Admissions Test Scores, Socioeconomic Status and High School Grades in Predicting College Achievement" *Pensamiento Educativo. Revista de Investigación Educacional Latinoamericana* Vol 49, pp. 23