# Lone Star Governance Progress Tracker 2025-2026

Quarter 1: July-September, 2025

## Why Board Self-Evaluation Matters

The Board exists to represent the community's vision and values in its promise to improve student outcomes—the sole reason for a school system's existence. Lone Star Governance is a framework designed to drive the board's ability to function most effectively and deliver on its promise to improve student outcomes.

Self-evaluation is the process of calibration and recalibration that allows the board to align and realign its behaviors with those most effective in creating the context for improving student outcomes. These behaviors are often not intuitive; therefore, it can be easy for board members to fall back to the behaviors that are more intuitive, which, more often than not, are more appropriate in the realm of project management and work that belongs to the Superintendent. The Board assessing itself with the LSG instrument in a consistent fashion (quarterly) assists the board in shifting and maintaining its focus on governance vs. management.

## **Aligning Saying with Doing**

In collaboration with a Lone Star Governance Coach, the board has adopted an implementation timeline to identify the scope and sequence that will be deployed as its members implement the LSG framework. This is what the board says they intend to do. Along the process of implementing the framework, it should be expected that conditions may change, and the work plan must be adapted to align with reality. The quarterly progress tracker is a tool for the board to assess how well its intention of becoming most effective is aligned with the reality of how it is actually governing.

Self-evaluation is a continuous improvement exercise and is not about laying blame and pointing fingers. It serves as a reminder for the board to match its doings with its sayings. A board that says it wants to be student outcomes-focused will need to employ behaviors that create the conditions for systemwide focus on improving student outcomes. As the board continues to improve, the board's growth and accomplishments are cause for celebration. In the times when the board's intentions become misaligned with its reality, it is proper to identify this fact and adapt the plan as necessary.

#### **Previous Results**

#### Quarter 4 Reporting (April - June 2025)

- Vision and Goals 1- 12/15 points
- Vision and Goals 2- 12/15 points
- Vision and Goals 3- 9/10 points
- Vision and Goals 4- 4/5 point

- Progress and Accountability 1- 15/15 points
  - Quarterly Total Time: 58%
- Progress and Accountability 2- 4/5 points
- Systems and Processes- 4/15 point

#### **Current Quarter**

#### **Quarter 1 Reporting (July - September 2025)**

- Vision and Goals 1- 12/15 points
- Vision and Goals 2- 12/15 points
- Vision and Goals 3- 9/10 points
- Vision and Goals 4- 4/5 points
- Progress and Accountability 1- 15/15 points
  - The board has done a great job focusing its conversations around student outcomes.
    - July: Board meetings did not take place during this month.
    - August 14, 2025
      - Time focused on student outcome goals: 78%
    - September 11, 2025:
      - Time focused on student outcome goals: 82%

- September 27, 2025:
  - Time focused on student outcome goals: 98%
- Quarterly Total Time: 87%
- Progress and Accountability 2- 4/5 points
- Systems and Processes- 4/15 points

#### **Next Implementation Priorities:**

- Staying at "Masters Focus" in Progress and Accountability 1
  - o Continue focused conversations around student outcome goals and constraints
  - Engage in effective progress monitoring sessions.
- Move to the "Meets Focus" level in the Systems and Processes category.
  - Conduct a review of the board's existing local policies and adopt only those policies that directly pertain to board governance and responsibilities.

### **Next Quarterly Self-Evaluation:**

- January 2026
- Evaluating October December 2025





## **Houston ISD Board of Managers** 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.

The Houston ISD Board of Managers Implementation Integrity Instrument is based on the Lone Star Governance Instrument. It has been adapted to meet the exit criteria agreed upon with the Texas Education Agency. This instrument is designed to support the Board of Managers in their governance responsibilities

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



TEXAS FRAMEW	TEXAS FRAMEWORK: VISION AND GOALS										
Vision and Goals 1	Vision and Goals 1: The board has adopted student outcome goals										
Does Not Meet Focus	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	4	Meets Focus	12	Masters Focus	15			
The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:	The board is preparing to f if the following is true.	focus	The board approaches for if all prior conditions and following are true.		The board meets focus if all prior conditions and to following are true.		The board masters focus all prior conditions and a following are true.				
<ul> <li>□ The board does not have a vision.</li> <li>□ The board does not have goals.</li> <li>□ The board does not consistently distinguish between inputs, outputs, and outcomes.</li> </ul>	The board has  ✓ adopted a vision statement;  ✓ owned the vision development proces while working collaboratively with superintendent;  ✓ adopted three to five goals; and  ✓ owned the goal development proces while working collaboratively with superintendent.	the e	All goals are specific, quantifiable, student outcome goals that include  a population; a five-year deadlin a month and year; a baseline of a month and a year; annual targets; and annual student grangets.	e of onth	All board members the superintendent agree that the stude outcome goals  1. will challenge the organization;  2. require adult behavior change  3. are influenceable the superintendent and  4. are the superintendent's priority for resonallocation.  The board relied or root-cause analysis comprehensive studed assessment, or a similar research based tool to inform the identification a prioritization of all student outcome goals.	t dent e e; le by ent; s first urce n a s, udent ch- m	All board members at the superintendent  ✓ have committed the vision and student outcome goals to memory;  □ know the current status of each student outcome goal; and agree there is broad community owner of the board's visic and student outcome goals through involvement and communication wis students, staff, and community members.	dent d ad aship on ome			



## **TEXAS FRAMEWORK: VISION AND GOALS**

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

student outcome g								
Does Not Meet Focus	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	4	Meets Focus	12	Masters Focus	15
The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:	The board is preparing to if the following is true.	focus	The board approaches for if all prior conditions and following are true.		The board meets focus if all prior conditions and a following are true.		The board masters focus all prior conditions and t following are true.	
□ The board does not have goal progress measures (GPMs). □ The board is treating the annual targets for student outcome goals as if they are GPMs.	The board has adop GPMs for each stude outcome goal.  The superintendent owned the GPM development proces while working collaboratively with board.  The status of each adopted GPM is ab to be updated mult times during each school year.	tess the	The board has ado no more than thre GPMs for each stude outcome goal.*  All GPMs are stude outputs, not adult inputs or outputs, include  1. a population; 2. a five-year deadl of a month and ye 4. annual targets; 5. annual student group targets.	ent nt that ine /ear;	All board members at the superintendent at that the GPMs:  will challenge the organization;  require adult behachange;  are influenceable the superintender and  are all predictive of their respective stroutcome goals.	avior by at;	All board members a the superintendent a there is broad comm ownership of the GPI through involvement and communication with students, staff, a community members	gree unity <b>Ms</b>

<sup>\*</sup>Framework flexibility was provided for this indicator in collaboration with Houston ISD to ensure alignment with the district's focus on student outcomes, as determined by the Texas Education Agency.



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	
The board does not mee if any of the following ar		The board is preparing to if the following is true.	o focus	The board approaches for if all prior conditions and following are true.		The board meets focus if all prior conditions and t following are true.		The board masters focus all prior conditions and a following are true.		
The board does not he constraints.	nave	The board has  ✓ adopted 1 to 5  superintendent constraints; and  ✓ owned the constrated development procupille working collaboratively with superintendent.	ess	Pach superintenden constraint describes single operational act or class of actions the superintendent may use or allow.	a tion e	The board has add one to five board sconstraints.  The board, where appropriate, relied a root-cause analy comprehensive stuneeds assessment or similar research based tool to infor the identification of superintendent constraints.  All board members the superintendent agree that the constraints will challenge the organization to foo on the vision and uphold community values.	i on sis, udent , i-m of t	☐ The board, in collaboration with superintendent, he adopted one or metheories of action drive overall strate direction. ☐ All board member the superintender agree there is broacommunity owner of the constraints through involvement and communication with students, staff community members.	as ore to egic s and at ad eship ent on eff, and	



## **TEXAS FRAMEWORK: VISION AND GOALS**

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

Does Not Meet Focus	Preparing To Focus	Approaches Focus	2	Meets Focus	4	Masters Focus	5
The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:	The board is preparing to focular if the following is true.	us The board approaches for if all prior conditions and following are true.		The board meets focus if all prior conditions and t following are true.		The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true.	
☐ The board does not have superintendent constraint progress measures (CPMs).	The board has adopted CPMs for each superintendent constraint.  The superintendent owned the CPM development process while working collaboratively with the board.  The status of each adopted CPM is able to be updated multiple times during each school year.	2. a baseline of a month and a yea	e <b>nt</b> ar onth	All board members at the superintendent at that the superintender CPMs  will challenge the organization to for on the vision; will challenge the organization to up community values are all predictive of their respective constraint; and are influenceable the superintendent	gree ent cus hold ;	All board members a the superintendent agree there is broad community ownershifthe superintendent Communication with students, staff, a community members	ip of CPMs

# **TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Progress and Accountability**

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

Student outcomes								
Does Not Meet Focus	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	4	Meets Focus	12	Masters Focus	15
The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:	The board is preparing to if the following is true.	focus	The board approaches for if all prior conditions and following are true.		The board meets focus if all prior conditions and to following are true.		The board masters focus all prior conditions and t following are true.	
<ul> <li>□ The board does not have student outcome goals, GPMs, superintendent constraints, superintendent CPMs, or annual targets.</li> <li>□ The board does not track its use of time in board authorized public meetings.</li> <li>□ The board does not have a monitoring calendar.</li> </ul>	The superintenden owned the monito calendar developm working with the b to adopt a calenda monitors  1. each student outcome goal at least four times year;  2. no more than two student outcome goals per month  3. each constraint least once per year;  The calendar spans length of the stude outcome goals.  The board tracks it time in public meeidentifying each miaccording to the til use tracker.	ring nent, oard r that per o e ; at ear. s the ent s	10% or more of the to quarterly minutes in board authorized pu meetings were inves in improving student outcomes according the time use tracker	<b>blic</b> ted to	25% or more of the to quarterly minutes in board authorized pureetings were investin improving student outcomes according the time use tracker	i <b>blic</b> ted : to	depth of the total quarterly minutes in board authorized pure meetings were investing in improving student outcomes according the time use tracker	iblic ted to



## **TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Progress and Accountability**

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

toward improving								
Does Not Meet Focus	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	2	Meets Focus	4	Masters Focus	5
The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:	The board is preparing to if the following is true.	o focus	The board approaches for if all prior conditions and following are true.		The board meets focus if all prior conditions and following are true.		The board masters focus all prior conditions and t following are true.	
<ul> <li>□ Any individual board member does not know if the school system is in low performing status and for how long.</li> <li>□ Any individual board member does not know if any campus is in low performing status and for how long.</li> <li>□ 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.</li> <li>□ The board has not voted to approve a selfevaluation within the past 12 months.</li> </ul>	The board has  performed a self- evaluation within previous 12 month using a research aligned instrument  performed a superintendent ar evaluation no more than 15 months age  been provided coppof the superintend implementation plan(s), that include campus goals*, to make progress tow the student outco goals; and  not voted to approach the superintenden implementation plunless required by	ns t; nnual re go; oies ent's e vards me	The board  performs self- evaluations using the LSG Integrity Instrument;  performed a self- evaluation no more than 45 days prior to the most recent superintendent's evaluation; and  evaluates the superintendent in on the results and progress toward th student outcome and constraints us information within monitoring report according to the monitoring calence	part ne <b>goals</b> sing	The board receive least annually, a re on the average corof staff time spent governance using staff use tracker.  One quarter ago to board  Performed a selevaluation using the LSG Integrit Instrument; and voted to approve quarterly programmer.	eport st on the ne f-	The board  ✓ unanimously appr the current quarte progress tracker;  ✓ has not modified outcome goals, Gr constraints, CPMs or targets during t cycle applicable to annual superinter evaluation; and  □ considers super- intendent perform as indistinguishabl from system per- formance by evalu the superintenden on only results and progress toward student outcome goals and constra using information monitoring report according to the monitoring calend	PMs, s, the the ndent nance le le le lints in ts

<sup>\*</sup>Campus goals should be aligned to the district's early childhood literacy and mathematics proficiency goals and CCMR goals required by H.B. 3 (86th Texas Legislature)

# **TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Systems and Processes**

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

accomplish the vi	31011							
Does Not Meet Focus	Preparing To Focus	1	Approaches Focus	4	Meets Focus	12	Masters Focus	15
The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true:	The board is preparing to if the following is true.	focus	The board approaches for if all prior conditions and following are true.		The board meets focus in all prior conditions and following are true.		The board masters focus all prior conditions and t following are true.	
<ul> <li>□ The board has not received a monitoring report.</li> <li>□ There were six or more board authorized public meetings in a month (unless a state of emergency was declared).</li> <li>□ Any meeting of the board lasted longer than eight hours.</li> <li>□ 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.</li> </ul>	The board receives and votes to accept monitoring reports the include  1. the student outcome goal and GPM or constraint and CPM being monitored;  2. the current status of the student outcome goal and GPM or constraint and CPM compared to previous annual, and deadling targets;  3. the superintendent interpretation of performance; and  4. supporting information that describes any needed next steps.	me  M  of me  ous, ne	All consent-eligible items were placed the consent agend more than 75% of items were voted ousing a consent agend monitoring calend has not been mod during the past questions.	on a and the on enda. dar ified	□ Board authorized public meetings in last quarter did not exceed  √. an average of formeetings per meetings per meetings per meeting. □ The board has 1. reviewed its exist local policies; ar 2. only adopted local policies pertainition board work.	n the oft onth; aree ng; ve	Board authorized meetings in the last quarter did not ex  I. an average of the meetings per meetings per meeting.  I. an average of two hours per meeting.  I. an average of the other topics per meeting.  I. Board members received the final materials to be voto on at least seven calendar days before the public meeting.  I. No edits to the boar regularly schedule meeting agenda in the three days pricto, or during, the meeting (unless a state of emergency declared).	ted  ted  ted  pre  ard's  d



QUARTERLY	PROGRESS	TRACKER				
School Board:	Houston ISD	Date: October	Quarter: 1			
Framework	Three Quarters Ago	Two Quarters Ago	One Quarter Ago	Current Quarter	Next Quarter Targets	Total Points Possible
Vision and Goals 1	12	12	12	12	12	15
Vision and Goals 2	12	12	12	12	12	15
Vision and Goals 3	9	9	9	9	9	10
Vision and Goals 4	2	4	4	4	4	5
Progress and Accountability 1	12	12	15	15	15	15
Progress and Accountability 2	4	4	4	4	4	5
Systems and Processes	4	1	4	4	4	15
Total	55	54	60	60	60	80

The Lone Star Governance Instrument has been revised to align with the requirements outlined in the exit criteria agreement between the Houston Independent School District (HISD) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA).

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					
	87%							

#### **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 <u>LSG@tea.texas.gov</u>.







