Lone Star Governance Progress Tracker 2024-2025

Quarter 4: April-June, 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

Q1 Results- Overall Q1 evaluation results are rolled into the annual results

- Time Use- 31.9%
- 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- 2/5 points
- Progress and Accountability 1- 9/15 points
- Progress and Accountability 2- 4/5 points
- Systems and Processes- 4/15 points

Q2 Results: This self-evaluation was completed in February 2025 for October, November, and December 2024). The board will acknowledge work done on Constraint 3 as the language was refined to provide more clarity.

- 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- 2/5 points
- Progress and Accountability 1- 12/15 points

- o Quarterly Time-Use- 37.24%
- Progress and Accountability 2- 4/5 points
 - The board engaged in an annual board self-evaluation on November 14, 2024
- Systems and Processes- 4/15 points

Quarter 3 Reporting (January - March 2025): Board adopted a revised monitoring calendar

- 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- 12/15 points
 - Quarterly Total Time: 46%
- Progress and Accountability 2- 4/5 points
- Systems and Processes- 1/15 points

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 points
- Progress and Accountability 1- 15/15 points
 - The increased focus on student outcomes was achieved through collaboration with the superintendent, by consistently prioritizing an alignment to student outcome goals and constraints during budget workshops.
 - April 16, 2025:
 - Time focused on student outcome goals: 0%
 - April 23, 2025:
 - Time focused on student outcome goals: 98%
 - May 1, 2025:
 - Time focused on student outcome goals: 100%
 - May 8, 2025:
 - Time focused on student outcome goals: 63%
 - May 22, 2025:
 - Time focused on student outcome goals: 0%
 - June 12, 2025: %
 - Time focused on student outcome goals: 74%
 - Quarterly Total Time: 58%
- Progress and Accountability 2- 4/5 pointsl
- Systems and Processes- 4/15 points

Next Implementation Priorities:

- Staying at "Masters Focus" in Progress and Accountability 1
 - Continue focused conversations around student outcome goals and constraints
 - Engage in effective progress monitoring sessions.
- Move to the "Meets Focus" level in 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:

- October 2025
- Evaluating July- September 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: 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 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 t following are true. | | | |
| □ The board does not have a vision. □ The board does not have goals. □ The board does not consistently distinguish between inputs, outputs, and outcomes. | The board has ✓ adopted a vision statement; ✓ owned the vision development process while working collaboratively with superintendent; ✓ adopted three to fingoals; and ✓ owned the goal development process while working collaboratively with superintendent. | n the ive ess | 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 grantargets. | e of onth | All board members the superintenden agree that the stude outcome goals 1. will challenge the organization; 2. require adult behavior change 3. are influenceab the superintend and 4. are the superintendent's priority for resonallocation. The board relied or root-cause analysis comprehensive students assessment or a similar research based tool to infor the identification aprioritization of all student outcome goals. | t dent e e; le by ent; s first urce n a s, udent , ch-m and | 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 vision and student outcome goals through involvement and communication with students, staff, and community members. | dent dad ship 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

| stauciit 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 t 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 ado GPMs for each stude outcome goal. The superintenden 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 of the | The board has ado no more than three 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. | nt nt that ine /ear; | All board members a the superintendent a that the GPMs: ✓ will challenge the organization; ✓ require adult behachange; ✓ are influenceable the superintenden and ✓ are all predictive of their respective stroutcome goals. | gree avior by at; | All board members at the superintendent at there is broad commownership of the GPI through involvement and communication with students, staff, a community members | gree unity Ms |

^{*}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.



| TEXAS FRAM | IEW | ORK: VISION A | AND | GOALS | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------|---|----------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Vision and Go | 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 focu all prior conditions and following are true. | | |
| The board does not constraints. | have | The board has adopted 1 to 5 superintendent constraints; and owned the constrated development procuping collaboratively with superintendent. | ess | Pach superintenden constraint describes single operational 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 member the superintendent agree that the constraints will challenge the organization to foo on the vision and uphold community values. | l on sis, udent , n-mosf s and it | ☐ The board, in collaboration with superintendent, hadopted one or natheories of action drive overall strate direction. ☐ All board member the superintende agree there is brocommunity owner of the constraint through involvem and communication with students, state community mem | nas nore n to regic rs and nt pad ership s nent ion | |



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 | Masters Focus |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| The board does not meet focus if any of the following are true: | The board is preparing to focus if the following is true. | The board approaches focus if all prior conditions and the following are true. | The board meets focus if all prior conditions and the 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. | ★ The board has adopted no more than three CPMs for each superintendent constraint. ★ All CPMs include: a one- to five-year deadline of a month and year; a baseline of a month and a year; and annual targets. | All board members and the superintendent agree that the superintendent CPMs will challenge the organization to focus on the vision; will challenge the organization to uphold community values; are all predictive of their respective constraint; and are influenceable by the superintendent. | All board members and the superintendent agree there is broad community ownership of the superintendent CPMs through involvement and communication with students, staff, and community members. |

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. | if the following is true | | | | f the | The board masters focus if all prior conditions and the following are true. | | | |
| □ The board does not have student outcome goals, GPMs, superintendent constraints, superintendent CPMs, or annual targets. □ The board does not track its use of time in board authorized public meetings. □ The board does not have a monitoring calendar. | The superintenden owned the monito calendar developm working with the b to adopt a calendar monitors 1. each student outcome goal at least four times year; 2. no more than two student outcome goals per month and a least once per year. The calendar spansilength of the stude outcome goals. The board tracks it time in public meetidentifying each miaccording to the times tracker. | ring nent, oard r that per o e ; at ear. s the ent s tings, inute | 10% or more of the to quarterly minutes in board authorized pure meetings were investing in improving students outcomes according the time use tracker | blic ted to | 25% or more of the to quarterly minutes in board authorized pure meetings were investin improving student outcomes according the time use tracker | ublic sted t to | 50% or more of the t quarterly minutes in board authorized pu meetings were inves in improving student outcomes according the time use tracker | ublic sted t | | |



TEXAS FRAMEWORK: Progress and Accountability

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

| 1 0 | Stadent Jates | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 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. | 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 if all prior conditions and the following are true. | |
| □ Any individual board member does not know if the school system is in low performing status and for how long. □ Any individual board member does not know if any campus is in low performing status and for how long. □ 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. □ The board has not voted to approve a selfevaluation within the past 12 months. | The board has performed a self- evaluation within to previous 12 month using a research aligned instrument performed a superintendent an evaluation no monthan 15 months ag been provided cop of the superintende implementation plan(s), that include campus goals*, to make progress tow the student outcor goals; and not voted to approve the superintendent implementation pla unless required by | ies ent's e | 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 verintendent in on the results and progress toward the student outcome and constraints us information within monitoring report according to the monitoring calence | part ne goals sing | The board received least annually, a resident on the average cost of staff time spent governance using staff use tracker. One quarter ago the board Performed a selevaluation using the LSG Integrity Instrument; and voted to approve quarterly progret tracker. | eport st on the ne f- gy I e the | 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 |

^{*}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 vis | 51011 | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---------------------|
| 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 a following are true. | |
| □ The board has not received a monitoring report. □ There were six or more board authorized public meetings in a month (unless a state of emergency was declared). □ Any meeting of the board lasted longer than eight hours. □ 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. | The board receives and votes to accept monitoring reports to include 1. the student outcome goal and GPM or constraint and CPI being monitored; 2. the current status of the student outcome goal and GPM or constraint and CPI 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 M ous, ne t's | 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 qu | on a and the on enda. lar ified | D Board authorized public meetings in last quarter did not exceed ✓ an average of for meetings per meetings per meeting and ✓ an average of fix other topics per meeting. D The board has 1. reviewed its exist local policies; and 2. only adopted local policies pertaining board work. | ur onth; ree ng; ve sting id | □ Board authorized meetings in the last quarter did not ex ✓. an average of the meetings per meetings per meeting and ✓. an average of the hours per meeting. □ Board members received the final materials to be voon at least seven calendar days before the public meeting. □ No edits to the boaregularly schedule meeting agenda in the three days pricto, or during, the meeting (unless a state of emergence declared). | ted ore ard's ed or |



| QUARTERLY | QUARTERLY PROGRESS TRACKER | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| School Board: | Houston ISD | Date: August 1 | Quarter: 4 | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | | | | |
| Progress and Accountability 1 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 15 | | | | |
| Progress and Accountability 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | | | | |
| Systems and Processes | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 15 | | | | |
| Total | 52 | 55 | 54 | 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 | | | | | | |
| | 58% | | | | | | | | |

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>.













