



Lone Star Governance

Continuous Improvement for Governing Teams

Participant Manual

Participant Name: _____

Workshop Date: _____

Acknowledgements

This work could not have come together without the feedback, corrections, support, and wisdom of many trustees, superintendents, community members and folks from TASA, TASB, TASBO, ESCs, and TEA. Special thanks are due to the following individuals:

Elizabeth Abernethy
 Mario Acosta
 Megan Aghazadian
 Armando Aguirre
 Rick Alvarado*
 Patricia Arvanitis*
 Donna Bahorich
 Nathan Balasubramanian*
 Kara Belew*
 Wayne Blount*
 Von Byer
 Bonny Cain
 Richard Carranza
 Carolyn Castillo
 Deena Cogan
 John Conley*
 Jeff Cottrill**
 Diane Cox
 AJ Crabill*
 Paul Cruz
 Sheron Darragh
 Rick Davis
 Dee Ann Drummond*
 Kathy Duniven
 Laurie Elliott*
 Rich Elsasser

Dori Fenenbock
 Darren Francis
 Diana Freeman
 Viola Garcia
 Tracy Ginsburg
 Leesa Green
 Michael Hinojosa
 Drew Howard*
 Kelly Ingram
 Monica Jaloma**
 Ty Jones
 Ronnie Kincaid
 David Koempel
 Marianne Kondo
 Stephanie Kucera*
 Dale Latham*
 Rick Lambert
 Larry Lee*
 Larry D Lewis*
 Deanna Logan
 Jesse Lopez
 Henryett Lovely
 Danny Lovett
 Delic Loyde*
 Morris Lyon*

Willis Mackey
 Jerry Maze
 Linda McAnelly*
 Diana McBurnett
 Jason McCullough
 Robby McGowen*
 Kristin McGuire
 George McShan
 Marcia McMahan*
 Cathy Mincberg
 Mike Morath
 Gino Morrow
 Alejandro Morua
 Bill Nemir
 Kendall Pace
 Ashley Paz
 Georgina Perez
 Wes Pierce
 Glenn Pittman
 Andres Ramos
 Jacinto Ramos, Jr*
 Alan Richey*
 Lizette Ridgeway
 Vernis Rogers
 Ron Rowell

Rick Salvo
 Rod Schroder
 Penny Schwinn
 Andra Self
 Charlene Simpson*
 Ann Smisko
 Nicole Smith*
 Stephen S. Smith
 Miguel Solis
 Clyde Steelman
 Laura Strube*
 Andy Sustaita
 Byron Terrier
 John Thomas
 David Thompson
 Marvin Thompson
 Norma Torres-Martinez
 Thomas Turner
 Ed Vara*
 Johnny Veselka
 Kelly Waters
 Pam Wells
 Micki Wesley
 Tony Williams*
 Martin Winchester

*Indicates currently certified Lone Star Governance Coach

**Indicates Lone Star Governance Coach Trainer

"A general diffusion of knowledge being essential to the preservation of the liberties and rights of the people . . ."
 —**The Texas Constitution** on the need for an "efficient system of public free schools"

Table of Contents

Legal Notice	4	Time Use Tracker	36
Workshop Details	5	Staff Use Tracker	37
Workshop Intention	6	Sample Board Agenda	38
Lone Star Governance Focus	7	Sample AE (Local)	40
Lone Star Governance Details	8	Sample AE (Exhibit)	44
Workshop Agenda	9	Sample Student Outcome Goals, Constraints, and Progress Measures	47
Day One Notes	10	Sample Monitoring Calendar	49
Day Two Notes	14	Sample Monitoring Report	50
Appendices	18	Sample Superintendent Evaluation	51
Implementation Integrity Instrument	19	Continuous Improvement Timeline	52
Quarterly Progress Tracker	31	Using Normalized Growth to Benchmark Quarterly Targets	53
Sample Goal and Constraints	32	Research and Reference Materials	54
Sample Theory of Action	34	Glossary	57
		Letters of Commitment	61
		Workshop Pre/Post Evaluations	65

Legal Notice

Section 551.001(4)(B) of the Government Code

The Open Meetings Act, excludes from the definition of a meeting, “the attendance by a quorum of a governmental body at a regional, state, or national convention or workshop . . . , if formal action is not taken and any discussion of public business is incidental [to the workshop.]”

The following information is intended as guidance only. Districts and charters are responsible for ensuring that any gathering of a quorum of its board meets the requirements of Texas Government Code, Chapter 551, Open Meetings.



Regional Workshops This section permits members of a governmental body to participate in regional workshops held outside the governmental body's jurisdiction if the members do not take final action or deliberate regarding public business. Therefore, although board members are encouraged to ask questions during this workshop, the questions must be limited to clarification of the content of the workshop, not an attempt to obtain guidance or legal advice regarding circumstances specific to pending or future board matters. Regional workshops may consist of a quorum of only one board.

Further, board members are cautioned not to discuss over meals or on the ride home anything that could be construed as deliberation of a current or future board action item. Attendance at this workshop does not relieve board members of their responsibility to ensure compliance with the Open Meetings Act.



Local Workshops Workshops conducted for a single school board involving a quorum of the members must be posted as a board meeting under the Opens Meeting Act according to Texas Government Code, §551.041, be posted expressly for the delivery of board member continuing education according to 19 Texas Administrative Code §61.1(e), be open to the public according to Texas Government Code, §551.002, and take place within the boundaries of the district according to the Texas Education Code, §26.007.

For additional guidance regarding the Open Meetings Act, please consult the [2020 Open Meetings Handbook](#) published by the Office of the Attorney General and contact your board's legal counsel.

Workshop Details

Lone Star Governance Purpose

The purpose of Lone Star Governance is to provide a continuous-improvement model for governing teams—boards in collaboration with their superintendents—that choose to focus intensively on one primary objective:

Improving Student Outcomes



Lone Star Governance accomplishes this intense focus through tailored coaching aligned to the five pillars of the Texas Framework for School Board Development:




In addition to its singular focus on improving student outcomes, Lone Star Governance provides a systems for governing the secondary, but vital, legal and fiscal responsibilities of the board.

Workshop Intention

The intention of the Lone Star Governance two-day workshop is to create a supportive space in which governing teams can learn about and can prepare for the intense focus on improving student outcomes as described by the Lone Star Governance implementation integrity instrument.

As a result of actively participating in the workshop, trustees and superintendents will possess the following knowledge, skills, and mindset:




Lone Star Governance Focus: Behavior Change

The focus of Lone Star Governance is to align the behavior of trustees individually and boards corporately with proven, research-based behaviors that improve student outcomes.

What Impacts Adult Behavior Change



School Board Behaviors That Improve Student Outcomes



Lone Star Governance Details

Workshop Details

The intention of the Lone Star Governance two-day workshop is to create a supportive space in which governing teams can learn about and can prepare for the commitment to intensely focus on improving student outcomes as described by the Lone Star Governance Integrity Instrument. The workshop is a conversation about researched school board behaviors that improve student outcomes. The workshop draws from the participants' respective experiences and their school's performance. The underlying belief is that leadership matters and that leaders' choices have the power to be transformative in the lives of our students.

Continual Coaching and Support

Lone Star Governance Coaches are committed to provide continual coaching and support to school boards as they work to implement the behaviors that have been shown to increase student outcomes. The ongoing engagement between a school board and coach makes the difference in successful implementation to improve student outcomes.

Training Hours and Certificates

The workshop earns school boards and individual board members continuing education training credit. School boards that attend the LSG Workshop as an entire team with their superintendents will earn a school board Lone Star Governance certificate and may earn credit to satisfy several required training: annual team building, biannual Evaluating and Improving Student Outcomes, and annual additional framework hours. School boards, through continual engagement with an LSG Coach, are supported with all required trainings and the implementation of best practices to improve student outcomes.

Tools and Templates

In order to support school boards, LSG tools and templates, as well as actual examples from various schools across Texas are available by clicking [HERE](#). The templates are downloadable and designed to be customized to meet your local vision and values. Texas state accountability scores for each school system can be viewed at <https://txschools.gov/>.

Leaderboard

The LSG Leaderboard celebrates those that have made the choice to continually improve their behaviors in order to improve student outcomes using the LSG Integrity Instrument to self-evaluate progress. A LSG Coach verified Quarterly Tracker score of 60 or above earns a spot on the LSG Leaderboard that can be viewed [HERE](#).

Workshop Agenda

The workshop is a conversation about governance behaviors that improve student outcomes and it draws from governance-related research as well as promising practices from the participants' respective experiences. The underlying belief is that leadership matters; that leaders' choices have the power to be transformative in the lives of our students. The workshop is about governance behaviors that exemplify this belief.

Day One

9:00 a.m.–6:00 p.m.‡



Vision and Goals



Lunch (on your own)



Vision and Goals (continued)

Day Two

9:00 a.m.–6:00 p.m.‡



Progress and Accountability



Systems and Processes



Lunch (on your own)



Advocacy and Engagement



Synergy and Teamwork

‡ Scheduling a workshop to occur from 9:00–6:00 is an example. Coaches may alter those hours to accommodate trustees and superintendents in attendance. Each day must include eight hours of instructional time.

Day One Notes

Day One Notes Continued

Day Two Notes Continued

A large section of the page is dedicated to a grid of horizontal lines for taking notes. The grid consists of 22 rows and 3 columns of lines, providing ample space for students to write down their notes from the second day of the course.




Day Two Notes Continued

Day Two Notes Continued

Appendices

- **Implementation Integrity Instrument**
- **Quarterly Progress Tracker**
- **Sample Goals and Constraints**
- **Sample Theory of Action**
- **Time Use Tracker**
- **Staff Use Tracker**
- **Sample Board Agenda**
- **Sample AE (local)**
- **Sample AE (exhibit)**
- **Sample Student Outcome Goals, Constraints, and Progress Measures**
- **Sample Monitoring Calendar**
- **Sample Monitoring Report**
- **Sample Superintendent Evaluation**
- **Continuous Improvement Timeline**
- **Research and Reference Materials**
- **Glossary**
- **Letters of Commitment**
- **Workshop Pre/Post Evaluations**





Implementation Integrity Instrument

The intention of Lone Star Governance is to provide a continuous improvement model for governing teams—boards in collaboration with their superintendents—that choose to intensively focus on one primary objective: improving student outcomes. Lone Star Governance accomplishes this intense focus through tailored execution of the five pillars of the Texas Framework for School Board Development, as adopted by the State Board of Education: Vision and Goals, Progress and Accountability, Systems and Processes, Synergy and Teamwork, and Advocacy and Engagement. In addition to its singular focus on improving student outcomes, Lone Star Governance provides a system for governing the secondary, but vital, legal and fiscal responsibilities of the board.

© Copyright 2016–2022 Texas Education Agency (TEA). All Rights Reserved.

Implementation Integrity Instrument Notes

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: VISION AND GOALS

Vision and Goals 1: The board has adopted student outcome goals

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	4	Meets Focus	12	Masters Focus	15
<i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i>		<i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i>		<i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not have a vision. <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not have goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not consistently distinguish between inputs, outputs, and outcomes. 		<p>The board has</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> adopted a vision statement; <input type="checkbox"/> owned the vision development process while working collaboratively with the superintendent; <input type="checkbox"/> adopted three to five goals; and <input type="checkbox"/> owned the goal development process while working collaboratively with the superintendent. 		<p>All goals are specific, quantifiable, student outcome goals that include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> a population; <input type="checkbox"/> a five-year deadline of a month and year; <input type="checkbox"/> a baseline; and <input type="checkbox"/> annual student group targets. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All board members and the superintendent agree that the student outcome goals <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. will challenge the organization; 2. require adult behavior change; 3. are influenceable by the superintendent; and 4. are the superintendents first priority for resource allocation. <input type="checkbox"/> The board relied on a root-cause analysis, comprehensive student needs assessment, or a similar research-based tool to inform the identification and prioritization of all student outcome goals. 		<p>All board members and the superintendent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> have committed the vision and student outcome goals to memory; <input type="checkbox"/> know the current status of each student outcome goal; and <input type="checkbox"/> agree there is broad community ownership of the board's vision and student outcome goals through involvement and communication with students, staff, and community members. 	

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: VISION AND GOALS

Vision and Goals 2: The board has adopted goal progress measures (GPMs) aligned to each student outcome goal

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	4	Meets Focus	12	Masters Focus	15
<i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i>		<i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i>		<i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not have goal progress measures (GPMs). <input type="checkbox"/> The board is treating the annual targets for student outcome goals as if they are GPMs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board has adopted GPMs for each student outcome goal. <input type="checkbox"/> The superintendent owned the GPM development process while working collaboratively with the board. <input type="checkbox"/> The status of each adopted GPM is able to be updated multiple times during each school year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board has adopted no more than three GPMs for each student outcome goal. <input type="checkbox"/> All GPMs are student outputs, not adult inputs or outputs, that include <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a population; 2. a five-year deadline of a month and year; 3. a baseline; and 4. annual student group targets. 	<p>All board members and the superintendent agree that the GPMs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> will challenge the organization; <input type="checkbox"/> require adult behavior change; <input type="checkbox"/> are influenceable by the superintendent; and <input type="checkbox"/> are all predictive of their respective student outcome goals. 	<p>All board members and the superintendent agree there is broad community ownership of the GPMs through involvement and communication with students, staff, and community members.</p>					

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: VISION AND GOALS

Vision and Goals 3: The board has adopted constraints

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	3	Meets Focus	9	Masters Focus	10
<i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i>		<i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i>		<i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>	
The board does not have constraints .		The board has <input type="checkbox"/> adopted 1 to 5 superintendent constraints ; and <input type="checkbox"/> owned the constraint development process while working collaboratively with the superintendent.		Each superintendent constraint describes a single operational action of class of actions the superintendent may not use or allow.		<input type="checkbox"/> The board has adopted one to five board self-constraints. <input type="checkbox"/> The board, where appropriate, relied on a root-cause analysis, comprehensive student needs assessment, or similar research-based tool to inform the identification of and prioritization of superintendent constraints. <input type="checkbox"/> All board members and the superintendent agree that the constraints will challenge the organization to focus on the vision and uphold community values.		<input type="checkbox"/> The board, in collaboration with the superintendent, has adopted one or more theories of action to drive overall strategic direction. <input type="checkbox"/> All board members and the superintendent agree there is broad community ownership of the constraints through involvement and communication with students, staff, and community members.	

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: VISION AND GOALS

Vision and Goals 4: The board has adopted superintendent constraint progress measures (CPMs)

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	2	Meets Focus	4	Masters Focus	5
<i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i>		<i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i>		<i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not have constraint progress measures (CPMs). <input type="checkbox"/> The board is treating the annual targets for constraints as if they are CPMs. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board has adopted CPMs for each superintendent constraint. <input type="checkbox"/> The superintendent owned the CPM development process while working collaboratively with the board. <input type="checkbox"/> The status of each adopted CPM is able to be updated multiple times during each school year. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board has adopted no more than three CPMs for each superintendent constraint. <input type="checkbox"/> All CPMs include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a one- to five-year deadline of a month and year; 2. a baseline; and 3. annual targets. 		<p>All board members and the superintendent agree that the CPMs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> will challenge the organization to focus on the vision; <input type="checkbox"/> will challenge the organization to uphold community values; <input type="checkbox"/> are all predictive of their respective constraint; and <input type="checkbox"/> are influenceable by the superintendent. 		<p>All board members and the superintendent agree there is broad community ownership of the CPMs through involvement and communication with students, staff, and community members.</p>	

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Progress and Accountability

Progress and Accountability 1: The board invests at least half of its time to improving student outcomes

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	4	Meets Focus	12	Masters Focus	15
<i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i>		<i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i>		<i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not have student outcome goals, GPMs, constraints, CPMs, or annual targets. <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not track its use of time in board authorized public meetings. <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not have a monitoring calendar. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The superintendent owned the monitoring calendar development, working with the board to adopt a calendar that monitors <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. each student outcome goal at least four times per year; 2. no more than two student outcome goals per month; 3. each constraint at least once per year. <input type="checkbox"/> The calendar spans the length of the student outcome goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The board tracks its time in public meetings, identifying each minute according to the time use tracker. 		10% or more of the total quarterly minutes in board authorized public meetings were invested in improving student outcomes according to the time use tracker.		25% or more of the total quarterly minutes in board authorized public meetings were invested in improving student outcomes according to the time use tracker.		50% or more of the total quarterly minutes in board authorized public meetings were invested in improving student outcomes according to the time use tracker.	

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Progress and Accountability

Progress and Accountability 2: The board evaluates, but does not interfere with, progress toward improving student outcomes

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	2	Meets Focus	4	Masters Focus	5
<i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i>		<i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i>		<i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Any individual board member does not know if the school system is in low performing status and for how long. <input type="checkbox"/> Any individual board member does not know if any campus is in low performing status and for how long. <input type="checkbox"/> Any individual board member agrees that their first loyalty is owed to staff or vendors, rather than the vision, community values, and improving student outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> The board has not voted to approve a self-evaluation within the past 12 months. 	<p>The board has</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> performed a self-evaluation within the previous 12 months using a research aligned instrument; <input type="checkbox"/> performed a superintendent annual evaluation no more than 15 months ago; <input type="checkbox"/> been provided copies of the superintendent's implementation plan(s) to make progress towards the student outcome goals; and <input type="checkbox"/> not voted to approve the superintendent's implementation plan unless required by law. 		<p>The board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> performs self-evaluations using the LSG Integrity Instrument; <input type="checkbox"/> performed a self-evaluation no more than 45 days prior to the most recent superintendent's evaluation; and <input type="checkbox"/> evaluates the superintendent in part on the results and progress toward the student outcome goals and constraints using information within monitoring reports according to the monitoring calendar. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board receives, at least annually, a report on the average cost of staff time spent on governance using the staff use tracker. <input type="checkbox"/> One quarter ago the board <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performed a self-evaluation using the LSG Integrity Instrument; and 2. voted to approve the quarterly progress tracker. 		<p>The board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> unanimously approved the current quarterly progress tracker; <input type="checkbox"/> has not modified outcome goals, GPMS, constraints, CPMs, or targets during the cycle applicable to the annual superintendent evaluation; and <input type="checkbox"/> considers superintendent performance as indistinguishable from system performance by evaluating the superintendent on only results and progress toward student outcome goals and constraints using information in monitoring reports according to the monitoring calendar. 		

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Systems and Processes

Systems and Processes: The board operates in a way that allows the superintendent to accomplish the vision

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	4	Meets Focus	12	Masters Focus	15
<i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i>		<i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i>		<i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board has not received a monitoring report. <input type="checkbox"/> There were six or more board authorized public meetings in a month (unless a state of emergency was declared). <input type="checkbox"/> Any meeting of the board lasted longer than eight hours. <input type="checkbox"/> Board members did not receive the final version of materials to be voted on at least three calendar days in advance of the board authorized public meeting. 		<p>The board receives and votes on monitoring reports that include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the student outcome goal and GPM or constraint and CPM being monitored; <input type="checkbox"/> the current status of the student outcome goal and GPM or constraint and CPM compared to previous, annual, and deadline targets; <input type="checkbox"/> the superintendent's interpretation of performance; and <input type="checkbox"/> supporting information that describes any needed next steps. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All consent-eligible items were placed on the consent agenda and more than 75% of the items were voted on using a consent agenda. <input type="checkbox"/> The adopted monitoring calendar has not been modified during the past quarter. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Board authorized public meetings in the last quarter did not exceed <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. an average of four meetings per month; 2. an average of three hours per meeting; and 3. an average of five other topics per meeting. <input type="checkbox"/> The board has <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. reviewed its existing local policies; and 2. only adopted local policies pertaining to board work. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Board authorized public meetings in the last quarter did not exceed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. an average of three meetings per month; 2. an average of two hours per meeting; and 3. an average of three other topics per meeting. <input type="checkbox"/> Board members received the final materials to be voted on at least seven calendar days before the public meeting. <input type="checkbox"/> No edits to the board's regularly scheduled meeting agenda in the three days prior to, or during, the meeting (unless a state of emergency was declared). 	

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Advocacy and Engagement

Advocacy and Engagement: The board promotes the vision

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	3	Meets Focus	9	Masters Focus	10		
<p><i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i></p>	<p><i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i></p>	<p><i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i></p>	<p><i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i></p>	<p><i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board has not publicly communicated the board adopted student outcome goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The board has not arranged for any community engagement activities during the previous 12-month period beyond public comments during board authorized public meetings and/or required hearings. 	<p>The board has a two-way communication system in place where the board members at least once per year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> listen for and discuss the vision and values of their students; and <input type="checkbox"/> listen for and discuss the vision and values of their staff and community members. 	<p>The board has</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> provided time during regular scheduled board-authorized public meetings to recognize the accomplishments of its students and staff regarding progress on student outcome goals; and <input type="checkbox"/> hosted a community meeting to discuss progress toward student outcome goals within each feeder pattern with low performing campuses during the previous 12-month period. 	<p>The board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> displays and keeps updated the status and targets of all student outcome goals and GPMs permanently and publicly in the room in which the board most frequently holds regularly scheduled meetings; and <input type="checkbox"/> has led or co-led at least one training on Lone Star Governance for its community during the previous six-month period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Students have been included in at least one Lone Star Governance training or two-way communication meeting in the previous 12-month period. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly selected board members have received an orientation on Lone Star Governance by fellow board members or an LSG Coach prior to being seated. 	

TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Synergy and Teamwork

Synergy and Teamwork: The board works collaboratively and with the superintendent to lead toward the vision.

Does Not Meet Focus	0	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	3	Meets Focus	9	Masters Focus	10
<i>The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:</i>		<i>The board is preparing to focus if the following is true.</i>		<i>The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>		<i>The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The board has not adopted board operating procedures. <input type="checkbox"/> The board does not have a policy that contains a template of ethics and conflicts of interest statement; <input type="checkbox"/> The board has not been able to achieve a quorum in two or more board-authorized public meetings during the previous three months. <input type="checkbox"/> Board members serve on committees formed by the superintendent or staff. <input type="checkbox"/> A board member voted on an item for which they had a conflict of interest, as defined by law, during the previous three months. 		<p>The board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> affirms that at least every two years, it has reviewed all policies governing board operating procedures; <input type="checkbox"/> affirms that all members have signed the ethics and conflict of interest statement in the past 12 months; <input type="checkbox"/> agrees that a committees' role is to advise the board, not to advise the staff; <input type="checkbox"/> agrees that a board officers' role is to advise the board, not to advise the staff; and <input type="checkbox"/> maintained a quorum throughout all regularly scheduled meetings for the past three months. 		<p>The board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> agrees that every member is responsible for the outcomes of all students, not just students in their region of the school system; <input type="checkbox"/> maintained an average attendance of 70% or higher throughout all regularly scheduled board meetings over the previous three months; and <input type="checkbox"/> has set the expectation that information provided to one board member is provided to all board members. 		<p>The board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> maintained an average attendance of 80% or higher throughout all regularly scheduled board meetings over the previous three months; <input type="checkbox"/> agrees that all members have adhered to all policies governing board operating procedures; <input type="checkbox"/> agrees that every member has completed all statutorily required trainings; and <input type="checkbox"/> rather than the superintendent, led the completion of Lone Star Governance tasks. 		<p>All board members and the superintendent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> have completed the Lone Star Governance Workshop; <input type="checkbox"/> agree that all board members have adhered to all adopted board constraints during the previous three months; and <input type="checkbox"/> agree that no board member has given operational advice or instructions to staff members during the previous three months. 	

QUARTERLY PROGRESS TRACKER

School Board:				Date:		Quarter:
Framework	Three Quarters Ago	Two Quarters Ago	One Quarters Ago	Current Quarter	Next Quarter Targets	Total Points Possible
Vision and Goals 1						15
Vision and Goals 2						15
Vision and Goals 3						10
Vision and Goals 4						5
Progress and Accountability 1						15
Progress and Accountability 2						5
Systems and Processes						15
Advocacy and Engagement						10
Synergy and Teamwork						10
Total						100

By signing below, I affirm that the Lone Star Governance Integrity Instrument was completed and is accurate

Board Member Signatures:	% Student Outcome Minutes	Vote Count for	Vote Count Against

EVALUATION NOTES

The standard of evidence for items where board action is required will be the minutes of the meeting during which the board voted to take the described action. Where an opinion of the board is required, a resolution or vote passed by the board will meet the standard of evidence. Any board completing a self-evaluation using the LSG Integrity Instrument that is supported or reviewed by an LSG Coach may submit the review for the LSG Leaderboard. If the board would like their self-evaluation reviewed by an LSG Coach, please email the completed LSG Integrity Instrument to LSG@tea.texas.gov.

GOAL AND CONSTRAINT (EXAMPLES)														
Student Outcome Goal														
Targets	ALL	AA	AI	A	H	PI	TR	W	ED	SE	FSE	EL	CE	NCE
Baseline														
GPM 1.1														
GPM 1.2														
GPM 1.3														

GOAL AND CONSTRAINT (EXAMPLES)

Board Self-Constraint

Superintendent Constraint

CPM 4.1

Baseline					

CPM 4.2

Baseline					

CPM 4.2

Baseline					

Theory of Action (EXAMPLES)	
One Best School System	If the district empowers individual educators to determine instructional materials and methods for their classes; and if the central administration directs all operational and budgetary functions; then teachers will be able to accomplish the board's student outcome goals while central administration ensures that all operations remain within the board's constraints.
Managed Instruction	If the district's central administration directs all instructional materials and methods; and if the central administration ensures that students experience consistency and quality of instructional delivery across all campuses; then the district, through the central administration, will be able to accomplish the board's student outcome goals while operating within the board's constraints.
Earned Autonomy	If the district's central administration directly administers some campuses and grants varying levels of autonomy to other campuses; and if the central administration clearly defines operational thresholds that deserve higher levels of autonomy; and if the central administration clearly defines the specific autonomies earned; and if campuses having earned autonomies agree to operate in pursuit of the board's student outcomes goals while operating within the board's constraints; then the district, directly and through autonomous campuses, will be able to accomplish the board's student outcome goals while operating within the board's constraints.
Performance Management	If the district focuses central administration on the most critical functions of campus accountability and HR support; and if the district provides differentiated paths of continuous improvement for all educators -- whether in administrative roles or classroom roles; and if the differentiated HR system methodically identifies paths for performance improvement, aligns educator incentives with student outcomes, and ensures that educator placement is a function of student needs rather than adult preferences; then the district, through its campuses, will be able to accomplish the board's student outcome goals while operating within the board's other constraints.
System of Great Schools	If the district devolves autonomy from the central administration to campuses; and if the district empowers parents to make choices; and if the district creates performance contracts with campuses; and if the district annually evaluates performance of and demand for high performing campuses; and if the district makes strategic decisions regarding growing access to high performing schools and addressing low performers; then campuses will be able to accomplish the board's student outcome goals while operating within the board's other constraints.

Theory of Action (EXAMPLES)

Number of Total Campuses		Number of Low Performing		Number of Moderately Performing		Number of High Performing	
Possible Theory:	Possible Theory:	Possible Theory:	Possible Theory:				

Possible Theories of Action: What could work for you?

TIME USE TRACKER		Please enter district/charter name here		QTR:	Date:	
Framework Pillars	Student Outcome Minutes	Adult Behavior Minutes	The board tracks its time spent during public authorized meetings			Other Topic Minutes
Vision and Goals	0	0	← Minutes setting student outcome goals			
	0	0	← Minutes setting constraints or theories of action			
Progress and Accountability	0	0	← Minutes receiving, discussing, and voting on Student Outcome Goal Monitoring Reports according to the board adopted Monitoring Calendar			
	0	0	← Minutes receiving, discussing, and voting on Constraint Monitoring Reports according to the board adopted Monitoring Calendar			
	0	0	← Minutes evaluating the superintendent on student outcome goals, GPMS, constraints, and CPMS			
	0	0	← Minutes performing board self-evaluations using the LSG Integrity Instrument			
Systems and Processes	Minutes discussing, debating, and voting on other agenda items (including consent agenda items) →				0	
Advocacy and Engagement	0	0	← Minutes hosting two-way communication meetings on student outcome goals, constraints, theories of action and/or progress toward student outcome goals			
			← Minutes recognizing the accomplishments of students and staff regarding progress on student outcome goals			
Synergy and Teamwork	Minutes fulfilling statutorily required public hearings, forums, and comments Minutes fulfilling statutorily required or Lone Star Governance workshops Minutes in closed session as permitted by law					
Other	Any time spent on an activity that does not meet the conditions listed above →				0	
TOTALS	0	0	0		0	

Use For Student Outcome and Adult Behavior Minutes Percentage Calculation:

Use For Student Outcome Minutes Percentage Calculation:

0	÷	0	× 100 =	0.00%	% Student Outcome and Adult Behavior Minutes
0	÷	0	× 100 =	0.00%	% Student Outcome Minutes

Trustees Present	Trustees Absent	% Attendance	Count of 'Other' Agenda Items	Goals Discussed	Goals on Target	% on Target
		0.00%				0.00%
Consent Items	Consent Items Removed	% Remaining on Consent Agenda		GPMS Discussed	GPMS on Target	% on Target
		0.00%				0.00%

Staff Use Tracker (Examples)						Date:
Staff	Average Monthly Hours Preparing	Average Monthly Hours Attending	Average Monthly Hours Debriefing	Total Average Monthly Hours	Hourly Rate (Compensation / 2080 Hours)	Total Average Monthly Hours × Hourly Rate
Superintendent						
Superintendent	10	6	6	22	72	1650
Senior Staff						
Asst. Superintendent	8	6	6	20	58	1160
CFO	8	6	6	20	55	1100
Other Staff						
Executive Assistant	4	6	6	16	40	640
Principal	3	6	6	15	50	750
Principal	3	6	6	15	50	750
Principal	3	6	6	15	45	675
Total	39	42	42	123	54.67	6725

Board Agenda (Examples)		
Agenda Item	Time Use Tracker	Estimated Time
I. Call to Order	Other	< 1 Minute
II. Pledge	Other	1–3 Minutes
III. Public Comments on Agenda Items	Synergy and Teamwork	<i>Required by Law</i>
IV. Closed Session	Synergy and Teamwork	<i>Not Public</i>
V. Reconvene to Public Session		
A. Actions on Discussions in Closed Session	Systems and Processes	1–5 Minutes
VI. Progress Monitoring Reports		
A. Goal/Constraint Report	Vision and Goals: Student Outcomes	45–60 Minutes
B. Goal Progress Recognitions	Advocacy and Engagement: Student Outcome Recognition	
C. Board Self-Evaluation	Progress and Accountability: Using LSG Integrity Instrument	
VII. Consent Agenda	Systems and Processes	< 1 Minute
VIII. Discussion and Action Items	Systems and Processes	20–30 Minutes
IX. Other Business		
A. Required Hearing	Synergy and Teamwork	<i>Required by Law</i>
B. Financial Reports	Vision and Goals: Other Outcomes	15–20 Minutes
C. Committee Reports	Vision and Goals: Other Outcomes	
D. Public Recognition	Advocacy and Engagement: Other Recognition	
X. Adjourn	Other	< 1 Minute
Notes		
The ideal board agenda should strive to invest 50% of the board’s time during meetings on student outcomes, keep the length of meetings to an average of two hours, and limit the average number of topics discussed per meeting to three.		

Board Agenda—Your Ideal Agenda

Agenda Item	Time Use Tracker	Estimated Time
Notes		

SAMPLE AE (Local)

This is not intended to be copy/pasted or adopted as written. This is only intended as one example of what a sample AE (local) could look like. For shorthand below, X represents baselines, Y represents targets, and Z represents deadlines.

Vision	Every child, prepared for success in college, a career or the military
Mission	Improving outcomes for all students by providing leadership, guidance, and support to schools
Board's Role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure creation of a shared vision that promotes improved student outcomes. The board shall accomplish this by incorporating the community's vision and goals into student outcome goals, superintendent constraints, and board constraints. • Measure and communicate how well the vision is being accomplished. The board shall accomplish this by collectively ensuring progress and accountability through monthly monitoring of district performance to ensure progress toward the vision and values and regular communications to the community. • Provide guidance and direction for accomplishing the vision. The board shall accomplish this by creating systems and processes for the district through distinct board and superintendent roles and responsibilities, which includes selecting the superintendent, delegating to the superintendent the authority and responsibility to implement the board's goals within law and the superintendent constraints, and considering and voting on the superintendent's recommendations. • Works with the superintendent to lead the district toward the vision. The board shall accomplish this by behaving in a manner that demonstrates the synergy and teamwork of the board and the district. • Promote the vision. The board shall accomplish this by providing advocacy and engagement for students, families, staff, and stakeholders. <p>In carrying out the above activities, the board shall at all times comply with the Texas Education Code and other law, as applicable.</p>

SAMPLE AE (Local)

<p>Superintendent's Role</p>	<p>The superintendent, as the board's delegate for managing district operations, shall be responsible for accomplishing the board's student outcome goals within the boundaries provided by the board and superintendent constraints and state and federal law.</p> <p>State and federal law require board adoption of policies on a variety of topics. The board's adopted policies in the district's local policy manual constitute compliance with these legal requirements. In accordance with state law, the superintendent shall be responsible for preparing recommendations for policies to be adopted by the board, overseeing implementation of adopted policies, and developing appropriate administrative regulations. In recommending policy for board adoption, the superintendent shall identify when the board is required to adopt policy or has statutory decision-making authority that cannot be delegated to the superintendent. Required board policy addressing administrative issues shall be handled by consent agenda, with the superintendent informing the board of substantive changes. Any operational issues not required to be board adopted shall be addressed in administrative regulations and the board shall take necessary steps to remove such issues from all policies in the C–G Local Policy series.</p>
<p>Board's Student Outcome Goals for the Superintendent</p>	<p>The board's student outcome goals, as aligned with the district vision, are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of students persisting in their second year post-secondary will increase from X% to Y% by Z • Y% of entering kindergarten students will be school-ready on a multidimensional assessment by Z—up from X% • The percentage of students at low performing (D or F rated) campuses who meet or exceed standard will increase from X% to Y% by Z <p>The superintendent shall interpret and implement the board's student outcome goals and, in consultation with the board, select goal progress measures (GPMs) for each student outcome goal [see AE (exhibit)]. For any school year during which the board's student outcome goals are not met, the superintendent shall make reasonable progress toward meeting the student outcome goals.</p>

SAMPLE AE (Local)

<p>Board's Constraints for the Superintendent</p>	<p>In achieving the board's student outcome goals, the superintendent shall not</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow the district to undermine the authority and autonomy of individual schools to implement changes designed to improve student outcomes • Allow low performing (D or F rated) campuses to have inequitable access to experienced and effective staff • Allow the number of students in low performing (D or F rated) campuses to increase or remain the same <p>The district will pursue a System of Great Schools theory of action where central administration devolves autonomy to schools, empowers parents to make choices, creates performance contracts with campuses, annually evaluates performance of and demand for schools, and makes strategic decisions regarding growing access to high performing schools and addressing low performers. Campus performance contracts will require the campus to accomplish the board's student outcome goals while operating within the board's other constraints.</p> <p>The superintendent shall interpret the superintendent constraints and, in consultation with the board, select constraint progress measures (CPMs) for each constraint [see AE (EXHIBIT)].</p>
<p>Board's Constraints for the Board</p>	<p>The board shall operate within the its role, as defined above, and the its operating procedures. The board, either collectively or through the actions of individual trustees, shall not</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify this policy, AE (local), more than once per year • Perform or appear to perform any of the responsibilities delegated to the superintendent • Violate this or any other board-adopted policy or board operating procedures

SAMPLE AE (Local)

<p>Board Self Evaluation</p>	<p>The board shall conduct formative self-evaluations at least quarterly and, within 45 days prior to conducting the annual superintendent evaluation, an annual summative evaluation. The board shall self-evaluate using the TEA Implementation Integrity Instrument.</p>
<p>Superintendent Evaluation</p>	<p>The board shall annually evaluate the superintendent based on the district's achievement of the board's student outcome goals and compliance with the superintendent constraints. Accomplishment of at least 80 percent of the adopted progress measures' (GPMs and CPMs) annual targets shall be an automatic indicator of success; below that threshold, the board's judgment shall be the indicator of success.</p>

SAMPLE AE (Exhibit)

This is not intended to be copied and pasted. This is only intended as one example of what a revised AE (exhibit) could look like. For shorthand below, X represents baselines, Y represents targets, and Z represents deadlines.

Sample Student Outcome Goals and Goal Progress Measures

G1. Percentage of students persisting in their second year post-secondary will increase from X% to Y% by Z

- Goal 1 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- GPM 1.1: Percentage of students who demonstrate above grade level proficiency on STAAR-aligned district literacy and numeracy benchmarks will increase from X% to Y% by Z
- GPM 1.1 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- GPM 1.2: Percentage of students who demonstrate above grade level proficiency on STAAR-aligned district numeracy benchmarks will increase from X% to Y% by Z
- GPM 1.2 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- GPM 1.3: Percentage of students who exceed the STAAR Progress Measure on STAAR-aligned district formative assessments will increase from X% to Y% by Z
- GPM 1.3 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%

SAMPLE AE (Exhibit)

Sample Student Outcome Goals and Goal Progress Measures

G2. Y% of entering kindergarten students will be school-ready on a multidimensional assessment by Z—up from X%

- Goal 2 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- GPM 2.1: Percentage of kindergarten students who attended PreK classrooms who meet the “school ready” standard will increase from X% to Y% by Z
- GPM 2.1 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- GPM 2.2: Percentage of PreK students making growth/progress on the district’s assessment will increase from X% to Y% by Z
- GPM 2.2 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%

G3. The percentage of students at low performing campuses who meet or exceed standard will increase from X% to Y% by Z

- Goal 3 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- GPM 3.1: Percentage of students at low performing campuses growing at least 1.5 grade levels per year will increase from X% to Y% by Z
- GPM 3.1 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- GPM 3.2: Percentage of the total student population at low performing HS campuses who scored a 3 or better on an AP course will increase from X% to Y% by Z
- GPM 3.2 Annual Targets: SSY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%

SAMPLE AE (Exhibit)

Sample Constraints and Constraint Progress Measures

C1. Do not allow the district to undermine the authority and autonomy of individual schools to implement changes designed to improve student outcomes

- CPM 1.1: Percentage of principal survey responses indicating they were able to select every member of their staff will increase from X% to Y% by Z
- CPM 1.1 Annual Targets: SSY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%

C2. Do not allow low performing campuses to have inequitable access to experienced and effective staff

- CPM 2.1: Percentage of principals at under performing schools whose performance evaluations place them in the bottom half of all principals in the district will decrease from X% to Y% by Z
- CPM 2.1 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- CPM 2.2: Percentage of teachers at under performing schools whose performance evaluations place them in the bottom half of all teachers in the district will decrease from X% to Y% by Z
- CPM 2.2 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- CPM 2.3: Percentage of 1st year principals or 1st year teachers at under performing campuses will decrease from X% to Y% by Z
- CPM 2.3 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%

C3. Do not allow the number of students at low performing campuses to increase or remain the same

- CPM 3.1: Number of campus restarts will increase from X to Y by Z
- CPM 3.1 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%
- CPM 3.2: Number of students in low performing campuses will decline from X to Y by Z
- CPM 3.2 Annual Targets: SY20/21=A%, SY21/22=B%, SY22/23=C%, SY23/24=D%, SY24/25=E%

Sample Student Outcome Goals, Constraints, and Progress Measures

These are not intended to be copied and pasted. They are only intended as examples of what goals, constraints, and/or their progress measures could look like. The items below are modified from actual districts in Texas. For shorthand below, X represents baselines, Y represents targets, and Z represents deadlines.

Student Outcome Goals and Goal Progress Measures

- The percentage of students in grades K–2 who are reading on or above grade level on multiple measures will increase from X% to Y% by the end of school year Z.
- Percentage of students persisting in their second year post-secondary will increase from X% to Y% by Z.
- Y% of entering kindergarten students will be school-ready on a multidimensional assessment by Z -- up from X%.
- The percentage of students at low performing (D or F rated) campuses who meet or exceed standard will increase from X% to Y% by Z.
- The percentage of students in grades 3–8 who meet standard on both reading and math STAAR will increase from X% to Y% by the end of school year Z.
- The four-year graduation rate will increase from X% for the graduation class of Z to Y% for the graduating class of ZZ.
- Y% of students will exhibit Satisfactory or above performance on state assessments, and students below Satisfactory performance will demonstrate more than one year of academic growth, up from X%, by Z.
- The achievement gap by race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status will decline from X and be no greater than Y percentage points on all academic measures by Z.
- Y% of students will graduate with qualifying scores for community college, college, military or industry certification by Z, up from X%.
- All entering kindergarten students will be school-ready on a multidimensional assessment by Z; X is the current percentage.
- Y% of students, instead of the current X%, will participate in at least one extracurricular or co-curricular activity each year by Z.
- Percentage of students who meet final level two on state exams will increase from X% to Y% by Z.
- Percentage of students who meet the STAAR Progress Measure on the state exams will increase from X% to Y% by Z.

Sample Constraints and Constraint Progress Measures

- The superintendent shall not allow the number of students in low performing (D or F rated) campuses to increase or remain the same.
- The superintendent will not allow teacher attendance at under performing campuses to drop below 95%.
- The superintendent shall not allow the district to undermine the authority and autonomy of individual schools to implement changes designed to improve student outcomes.
- The superintendent shall not allow low performing (D or F rated) campuses to have inequitable access to experienced and effective staff.
- The superintendent shall not allow any campuses to not fully implement and maintain Professional Learning Communities.
- The superintendent shall not allow adult convenience or preference to take priority over the academic progress of students.
- The superintendent shall not allow Improvement Required or Formerly Improvement Required campuses to have a principal with fewer than two years in-role experience.
- Number of campus restarts will increase from X to Y by Z.
- Number of students in low performing campuses will decline from X to Y by Z.
- Difference between the percent of all students in AP courses and the percent of African-American students in AP courses will decrease from X% to Y% by Z.
- Difference between the percent of all ISD students in AP courses and the percent of Hispanic students in AP courses will decrease from X% to Y% by Z.
- The number of TEA or district program review exceptions will decrease from X% to Y% by Z
- The number of TEA or district audit exceptions will decrease from X% to Y% by Z
- The number of major state and local test security violations will decrease from X% to Y% by Z
- The number of student privacy violations will decrease from X% to Y% by Z
- The fund-balance ratio (% of overall budget represented by the fund balance) will decrease/increase from X% to Y% by Z.
- The unrestricted fund balance ratio will decrease/increase from X% to Y% by Z.

Monitoring Calendar (Example)

School Board: Lone Star ISD

Years: 19/20–23/24

Month	Student Outcome Goals GPMs	Constraints CPMs	Leadership Evaluations	Trainings	Other
August	G5: GPM 5.1		Board Self-Evaluation	Team Building	Budget Hearing
September	Goals : Yearly Target Report	Constraint: Yearly Target Report	Superintendent Annual Evaluation	TASB Conference	TAPR Hearing
October	G1: GPM 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 G2: GPM 2.1, 2.2, 2.3				FIRST Hearing
November	G4: 4.3		Board Self-Evaluation		
December	G5: GPM 5.1				
January	G3: GPM 3.1, 3.2 G4: GPM 4.1, 4.2	C1: CPM 1.1, 1.2			
February	G1: GPM 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 G2: GPM 2.1, 2.2, 2.3		Board Self-Evaluation		
March	G3: GPM 3.3	C2: CPM 2.1			
April	G4: GPM 4.1, 4.2			Local Orientation	
May	G5: GPM 5.1		Board Self-Evaluation	Into/Update to the code	
June	G1: GPM 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 G2: GPM 2.1, 2.2, 2.3	C1: CPM 1.1, 1.2		EISO Training	
July	G3: GPM 3.1, 3.2			Cyber Security Human Trafficking	Budget Workshop

Monitoring Report (Example)

Date:

Goal 1: The percentage of 3rd grade students whose score meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 45% to 64% by June 2024. (Current 2019: 45% | 2020: 48% | 2021: 52% | 2022: 56% | 2023: 60% | 2024: 64%)

Overall Progress

Goal Progress Measure 1.2: The percent of Kindergarten students that are reading on grade level will increase from 60% to 73% by June 2024.


(2019: 60% 2020: 62% 2021: 64% 2022: 67% 2023: 70% 2024: 73%)



Student Group Targets		
	Current	Target
African American	xx%	xx%
American Indian	xx%	xx%
Asian	xx%	xx%
Dyslexia	xx%	xx%
Economic Disadv.	xx%	xx%
EL	xx%	xx%
Hispanic	xx%	xx%
Special Ed	xx%	xx%
White	xx%	xx%


Evidence and Future Plans

Campus 1: 38% Economically Disadvantaged Students



The plan moving forward is . . .

Campus 2: 74% Economically Disadvantaged Students



Superintendent Evaluation (Example)

Student Outcome Goal and GPMs	Target	Actual	Met or 2/3 Met	Constraint and CPMs	Target	Actual	Met or 2/3 Met
Student Outcome Goal 1	65%	68%	Y	Constraint 1	< 742	748	Y
GPM 1.1	70%	71%		CPM 1.1	< 5	4	
GPM 1.2	67%	68%					
GPM 1.3	65%	63%					
Student Outcome Goal 2	70%	68%	Y	Constraint 2	4%	5%	N
GPM 2.1	70%	71%		CPM 2.1	5%	6%	
GPM 2.2	74%	72%		CPM 2.2	3%	6%	
GPM 2.3	70%	71%		CPM 2.3	3%	5%	
Student Outcome Goal 3	65%	67%	Y	Constraint 3	2	2	Y
GPM 3.1	68%	70%		CPM 3.1	2	3	
GPM 3.2	70%	71%		CPM 3.2	2	1	
GPM 3.3	68%	70%					
Student Outcome Goal 4	65%	62%	N	N/A			-
GPM 4.1	67%	66%					
GPM 4.2	65%	68%					
GPM 4.3	70%	68%					
Student Outcome Goal 5	65%	68%	Y	N/A			-
GPM 5.1	21	23					
GPM 5.2	41%	53%					
GPM 5.3	3.0	3.2					

By signing below, I affirm that the information evaluated is complete and accurate.

	<i>Board President</i>	Targets Met	6
	<i>Board Secretary</i>	Targets Not Met	2
	<i>Superintendent</i>	% Targets Met	75

EVALUATION NOTES
 Superintendent summative evaluation targets are considered met if either the Student Outcome Goal or Constraint is met or 2/3 of the respective GPMs or CPMs are met.
 Performance is considered met if 75% of summative targets are met.
 If 75% of the evaluation targets are not met, the board should use its own judgement based on the Monitoring Reports received and voted on according to the Monitoring Calendar.

Continuous Improvement Timeline (Exemplar Sample)

Quarter 0			
Period Three months prior to completing the Lone Star Governance Workshop	Self-Evaluate By Within 60 days of completing the Lone Star Governance Workshop	Goal Set baseline (<i>this example uses 44</i>) and set growth expectations (<i>this example uses 20%</i>)	
Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Period 1st, 2nd, and 3rd month after completing the LSG Workshop	Period 4th, 5th, and 6th month after completing the LSG Workshop	Period 7th, 8th, and 9th month after completing the LSG Workshop	Period 10th, 11th, and 12th month after completing the LSG Workshop
Self-Evaluate By End of 4th month after LSG	Self-Evaluate By End of 7th month after LSG	Self-Evaluate By End of 10th month after LSG	Self-Evaluate By End of 13th month after LSG
Goal +11.2 points over baseline or 20%	Goal +9.0 points increase or 20%	Goal +7.2 points increase or 20%	Goal +5.7 points increase or 20%
Quarter 5	Quarter 6	Quarter 7	Quarter 8
Period 13th, 14th, and 15th month after completing the LSG Workshop	Period 16th, 17th, and 18th month after completing the LSG Workshop	Period 19th, 20th, and 21st month after completing the LSG Workshop	Period 22nd, 23rd, and 24th month after completing the LSG Workshop
Self-Evaluate By End of 16th month after LSG	Self-Evaluate By End of 19th month after LSG	Self-Evaluate By End of 22nd month after LSG	Self-Evaluate By End of 25th month after LSG
Goal +4.6 points increase or 20%	Goal +3.7 points increase or 20%	Goal +2.9 points increase or 20%	Goal +2.3 points increase or 20%

Evaluation Notes

The standard of evidence for items where board action is required will be the minutes of the meeting during which the board voted to take the described action. Where an opinion of the board is required, a resolution adopted by a majority of the board will meet the standard of evidence. Any board wanting an independent evaluation of its quarterly progress tracker may request a review from TEA staff. When available, recordings of board meetings may be used in the independent evaluation process. For decision-making purposes, TEA will rely on both the self-evaluation and TEA staff-led independent evaluation.

Using Normalized Growth to Benchmark Quarterly Targets

Normalized growth indexes the amount of growth (in percentage points) to the total amount of growth possible (again in percentage points). Put another way, normalized growth is the amount of growth achieved divided by the amount that could be achieved. Mathematically, it is determined using this formula (where g stands for normalized growth, expressed as a percentage):

$$g = \frac{(\text{current score}) - (\text{prior score})}{100 - (\text{prior score})}$$

The following demonstrates calculating quarterly targets using normalized growth, with 44 as the baseline score and 20% as the target growth.

Baseline	Score	44.0
	Room for Growth	56.0
Quarter 1	Score	56.2
	Room for Growth	44.8
Quarter 2	Score	64.2
	Room for Growth	35.8
Quarter 3	Score	71.3
	Room for Growth	28.7
Quarter 4	Score	77.1
	Room for Growth	22.9



Madsen, Adrian; McKagan, Sam; and Sayre, Eleanor. 2016. "Normalized gain: What is it and when and how should I use it?" Last modified April 20, 2017. <https://www.physport.org/recommendations/Entry.cfm?ID=93334>.

Research and Reference Materials

Lone Star Governance Materials

[LSG Participant Manual](#)

[LSG Templates](#)

Research Studies and Articles

[The Relationship Between School Board Governance Behaviors and Student Achievement](#), Ivan J. Lorentzen

[School District Leadership That Works](#), J. Timothy Waters and Robert J. Marzano

[The Impact of School Board Governance on Academic Achievement in Diverse States](#), Michael Ford

[The Role of School Boards in Improving Student Achievement](#), Washington State School Directors' Association

[Eight Characteristics of Effective School Boards](#), Center for Public Education

[Does School Board Leadership Matter?](#), Arnold F. Shober and Michael T. Hartney

[The Governance Factor: A Predictive Study of School Board Influence on Student Achievement in Texas Public Schools](#), Marc Puig

[The Lighthouse Inquiry: School Board/Superintendent Team Behaviors in School Districts with Extreme Differences in Student Achievement](#), The Iowa Association of School Boards

[School Board Governance and Student Achievement: School Board Members' Perceptions of Their Behaviors and Beliefs](#), Bobbie Plough

[School Boards and Student Achievement: The Relationship between Previously Identified School Board Characteristics and Improved Student Learning](#), Jonathon Holmen

[Roles and Responsibilities of Local School Board Members in Relation to Student Achievement](#), Mary Delagardelle

Research and Reference Materials

Recommended Books

Improving School Board Effectiveness: A Balanced Governance Approach, Thomas L. Alsbury and Phil Gore

What School Boards Can Do: Reform Governance for Urban Schools, Donald R. McAdams

The 4 Disciplines of Execution: Achieving Your Wildly Important Goals, Chris McChesney, Sean Covey, and Jim Huling

The Future of School Board Governance: Relevancy and Revelation, Thomas L. Alsbury

Boards That Make A Difference, John Carver

Good To Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap and Others Don't, Jim Collins

Great by Choice: uncertainly, Chaos, and Luck—Why Some Thrive Despite Them All, Jim Collins and Morten T. Hansen

Start with Why: How Great Leaders Inspire Everyone to Take Action, Simon Sinek

The Infinite Game, Simon Sinek

The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Proactive of the Learning Organizations, Peter M. Senge

Influencer: The New Science of Leading Change, Joseph Grenny, Kerry Patterson, David Maxfield, Ron McMillan, and Al Switzler

The Power of Habit: Why We Do What We Do in Life and Business, Charles Duhigg

Smarter, Better, Faster: The Transformative Power of Real Productivity, Charles Duhigg

Switch: How to Change Things When Change is Hard, Dan and Chip Heath

Research and Reference Materials

School Board Training

[Framework for School Board Development](#)

[State Board of Education Administrative Rules](#)

[HB 3 Board-Adopted Plans and Goals](#)

[Board Training Requirements and Training Providers](#)

Curriculum Standards, Assessment and Accountability: TEKS, STAAR[®], and A-F

[Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills \(TEKS\)](#)

[TEKS Resource System](#)

[Student Assessment Overview](#)

[STAAR Report Card Overview](#)

[STAAR Technical Report](#)

[STAAR Vertical Scale Technical Report](#)

[STAAR Performance Standards](#)

[Texas Assessment Student Portal](#)

[A-F Overview, Information, and Resources](#)

Glossary

Annual Targets: A measure of yearly outcomes. The aggregate of all student groups identified by the population. These are never Goal Progress Measures.

Annual Student Group Targets: A measure of yearly outcomes for each applicable student group identified by the closing the gaps domain with 25 or more students.

Baseline: The measure's agreed starting point, current state. Used for comparing and monitoring growth.

Board Authorized Public Meetings: Any non-closed meeting authorized by the board or board president including, but not limited to, board workshops, board hearings, and board committees.

Board Self-Constraints: Specific operational actions or class of actions the board places on itself and/or members that support behaviors that keep the boards' focus on board work, align with the vision, and grounded in community values.

Board Self-Evaluation: Boards use the LSG Integrity Instrument to self-evaluate quarterly as a means of monitoring whether or not their adult behaviors are increasingly focused on improving student outcomes.

Board Work: Operations designated by state or federal law/rule or items designated by the board's adopted student outcome goals, constraints, vision, and/or values. Items that are not legally required and that the board has not designated as board work are, by default, superintendent work.

Consent-eligible Items: All items for board consideration that may be placed by default on the board's consent agenda. Examples: personnel actions, contract renewals, previous meeting minutes, policy updates, construction amendments, non-monitoring administrative reports, committee reports, enrollment updates, regular financial reports where financial activities remained within budgetary parameters, and any other item up for board consideration.

Constraint: Specific operational actions or class of actions that are not used or allowed and are aligned with the vision and grounded in community values.

Constraint Progress Measures (CPMs): Specific graph-plottable indicators used to determine if the superintendent constraint is likely to be honored or not. CPMs include a baseline, target, population, and deadline, are predictive of the constraint, and influenceable by the superintendent.

Deadline: Month and year by when the measure's current state will equal the future state by reaching the target.

Goals: Specific, measurable, attainable, results-based, and timebound statements that describe a desired state.

Goal Progress Measures (GPMs): Specific graph-plottable indicators used to determine if the goal is likely to be met or not. GPMs include a baseline, target, population, and deadline, are predictive of the goal, and influenceable by the superintendent. It is recommended that the superintendent select one to three GPMs per Student Outcome Goal.

Inputs: Resources and activities invested in a particular program, process, or strategy; usually knowable at the beginning of a cycle; a measure of effort applied. In school systems, operational and instructional inputs are selected by the superintendent.

Influenceable: The superintendent has authority over roughly 80% of whatever the progress measure is measuring.

Leadership Evaluations: Routine monitoring of board and superintendent performance conducted by the board. superintendent evaluation is indistinguishable from district evaluation. As such, the superintendent's evaluation is based only on accomplishment of the student outcome goals, avoidance of the constraints, and progress as determined by their respective progress measures.

Lone Star Governance (LSG): Texas' continuous improvement framework for governing teams—boards and their superintendents -- that choose to be intensely focused on improving student outcomes. Governing teams that implement the LSG framework with integrity understand that student outcomes do not change until adult behaviors change—starting with me.

LSG Integrity Instrument: A continuous improvement framework, used for quarterly self-evaluations on researched based behaviors, for school governance teams that commit to focus on improving student outcomes.

Monitoring Calendar: A board-adopted, multi-year schedule that describes the months during which student outcome goals, constraints, and progress measures are reported to the board and when leadership evaluations are conducted.

Monitoring Report: A report that provides evidence of progress to the board regarding their adopted Student Outcomes Goals, Goal Progress Measures, Constraints, and Constraint Progress Measures according to the Monitoring Calendar. A monitoring report must contain: the student outcome goal and GPM or constraint and CPM being monitored; the current status of the student outcome goal and GPM or constraint and CPM compared to previous, annual, and deadline targets; the superintendent's interpretation of performance; and supporting information that describes any needed next steps.

Other Outcomes: A measure of school system results that are not student results; outcomes that are not student outcomes. Examples: parent engagement, financial performance, staff retention.

Other Topics: Items that require board debate, discussion, and/or discernment during a board authorized public meeting that are categorized as Other Topic Minutes according to the Time Use Tracker.

Outcomes: The impact of the program or strategy; usually knowable at the end of a cycle; a measure of the effect on the intended beneficiary.

Outputs: The result of a particular set of inputs; usually knowable in the midst of a cycle; a measure of the implementation of the program, process, or strategy. In school systems, operational and instructional outputs are selected by the superintendent. Example: interim assessment.

Population: The group of students who will be impacted, evaluated, and/or who are being measured.

Predictive: There is some evidence of a correlation between the progress measure and the student outcome goal or constraint.

Quarterly Progress Tracker: A tool used to monitor the progress of board self-evaluation scores using the LSG Integrity Instrument.

Staff Use Tracker: A tool used to report the average cost of staff time spent on governance.

Standard of Evidence: Physical evidence that can be provided to support the score in the LSG Integrity Instrument. Items where board action is required will be the minutes of the meeting during which the board voted to take the described action. Where an opinion of the board is required, a resolution or vote passed by the board will meet the standard of evidence.

Standard of Integrity: Doing what I have allowed people to expect of me—to the degree I have allowed them to expect it—by when I have allowed them to expect it.

State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR): A criterion-referenced group of TEKS-based, standardized summative assessments that measure the extent to which Texas students have learned and are able to apply the knowledge and skills defined in the TEKS. Every STAAR question is directly aligned to the TEKS for the grade/subject or course being assessed.

Student Outcomes: A measure of school system results that are student results rather than adult results; outcomes that are a measure of what students know or are able to do. Example: summative assessment.

Student Outcome Goals: Student outcomes that describe what students know or be able to do -- as distinct from adult inputs, adult outputs, student inputs, and student outputs. Student Outcome Goals include a baseline, target, population, and deadline. They challenge the organization and require adult behavior change. A board's student outcome goals are the superintendent's first priority for resource allocation.

Superintendent Evaluation: A tool used to report performance towards achieving student outcome goals and constraints. As superintendent performance is indistinguishable from school performance, evaluation targets are considered met if the annual targets of the student outcome goals or Constraints are met OR 2/3 of the respective GPMs or CPMs are met. Superintendent performance is considered met if 75% or more evaluation targets are met. If 75% or more of the evaluation targets are not met, the board will use their own judgement for performance based upon the Monitoring Reports received and voted upon according to the Monitoring Calendar.

Superintendent Constraints: Specific operational actions or class of actions the superintendent may not use or allow that are aligned with the vision and grounded in community values.

Superintendent Work: The operational inputs and outputs of the school system, except the operations legally required by state or federal law/rule or items directly pertaining to the board's adopted student outcome goals, constraints, progress measures, or theories of action.

Target: The measure's desired future state.

Texas Essential Knowledge & Skills (TEKS): Specific knowledge or skills that every child, K-12, in Texas is expected to know and be able to do.

Theories of Action: A research-based high-level strategic constraint with which inputs and outputs must be aligned and which drives overall strategic direction. Unlike other constraints, the theory of action does not have CPMs.

Time Use Tracker: A tool used to track the board's use of time during board authorized public meetings.

Two-way Communication: Communication that is intentional, meaningful, and purposeful that allows for input from stakeholders and responses from board members and administrative staff. Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, students, parents, residents, staff members, and business owners.

Letters of Commitment

This is a commitment to constantly be willing to change our own behavior for the benefit of our students. To show this commitment, you are invited to write three letters that reflect on this commitment.

You are invited to self-address an envelope. In 30 days, your letters will be mailed to remind you of the commitment you have made to change your adult behaviors to improve student outcomes.



Dear Colleague—

A behavior of mine that may have made it harder for the board to be focused on student outcomes was . . .

The benefit to me was . . .

The cost to you and/or to students was . . .

In that moment, I was pretending that . . .

This page as been left blank intentionally.

Dear Students—

As an education leader, my behavior lacked integrity when . . .

The benefit to me was . . .

The cost to you was . . .

What you can expect from me going forward is . . .

Dear Self—

I'm giving up . . .

When I behaved that way, the benefit to me was . . .

But the cost was . . .

Because of my commitment to improving student outcomes, I'm giving it up . . .

This page as been left blank intentionally.

Workshop Pre-Evaluation

1) How proficient are you at distinguishing between educational inputs, outputs, and outcomes?				
1 Not at all proficient	2 Somewhat proficient	3	4 Proficient	5 Very Proficient

2) How often do you want your board to review and discuss the measurable progress toward the board's student outcome goals?				
1 Not At All Often (once per year)	2 Somewhat Often (twice per year)	3 (quarterly)	4 Often (every other month)	5 Very Often (monthly)

3) How useful do you expect this workshop to be?				
1 Not At All Useful	2 Somewhat Useful	3	4 Useful	5 Very Useful

4) How proficient are you with setting goal progress measure targets for student outcome goals?				
1 Not at all proficient	2 Somewhat proficient	3	4 Proficient	5 Very Proficient

5) How likely are you to recommend this workshop to other trustees and superintendents?				
1 Not At All likely	2 Somewhat Likely	3	4 Likely	5 Very Likely

6) Comments				

Workshop Post-Evaluation

1) How proficient are you at distinguishing between inputs, outputs, and outcomes?				
1 Not at all proficient	2 Somewhat proficient	3	4 Proficient	5 Very Proficient

2) How often do you want your board to review and discuss the measurable results of the board's annual student performance goals?				
1 Not At All Often (once per year)	2 Somewhat Often (twice per year)	3 (quarterly)	4 Often (every other month)	5 Very Often (monthly)

3) How useful was this workshop to you?				
1 Not At All Useful	2 Somewhat Useful	3	4 Useful	5 Very Useful

4) How proficient are you with setting key performance indicator targets for student outcome goals?				
1 Not at all proficient	2 Somewhat proficient	3	4 Proficient	5 Very Proficient

5) How likely are you to recommend this workshop to other trustees and superintendents?				
1 Not At All likely	2 Somewhat Likely	3	4 Likely	5 Very Likely

6) Comments				

A large, faint, circular seal with a serrated edge. The seal contains a five-pointed star in the center, surrounded by the words "LONE STAR" at the top and "GOVERNANCE" at the bottom. The seal is rendered in a light gray color.

**Student outcomes do not change
until adult behaviors change.**



Continuous Improvement for Governing Teams