

# State Accountability Update

TAAE Conference February 3-4, 2011

Presented by Nancy Rinehart, TEA Performance Reporting Division

## Accountability Resources

- ESC Accountability Staff
- Division of Performance Reporting  
Phone: (512) 463-9704  
Email: [performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us)
- AEA <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/aea>
- Accountability <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/>
- Accountability Resources <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/resources/index.html>
- AYP <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp>
- U.S. Department of Education information [www.ed.gov/nclb/](http://www.ed.gov/nclb/)

## TEASE

TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability Website access forms are available at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/webappaccess/AppRef.htm>

## 2011 State Accountability Procedures and Indicators

<b>Jan - Feb</b>	Accountability System Development – 2010 Review / 2011 Development
<b>March 3-4</b>	Educator Focus Group meeting
<b>March 21-25</b>	Educator Focus Group Report posted on web for public comment
<b>Late March</b>	Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee meeting
<b>Early April</b>	Public comments due to TEA
<b>Mid/Late April</b>	Final decisions for 2011 announced by Commissioner
<b>Late May</b>	<i>2011 Accountability Manual</i> posted online
<b>July 29</b>	2011 State Accountability ratings release

## Standard Accountability Procedures

TAKS Indicator	2010	2011
<i>Exemplary</i>	≥ 90%	≥ 90%
<i>Recognized</i>	≥ <b>80%</b>	≥ 80%
<i>Academically Acceptable</i> – Reading/ELA	≥ 70%	≥ 70%
Writing, Social Studies	≥ 70%	≥ 70%
Mathematics	≥ <b>60%</b>	≥ <b>65%</b>
Science	≥ <b>55%</b>	≥ <b>60%</b>
<b>Completion Rate I Indicator</b>		
<i>Exemplary</i>	≥ 95.0	≥ 95.0%
<i>Recognized</i>	≥ 85.0%	≥ 85.0%
<i>Academically Acceptable</i>	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%
<b>Grades 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate Indicator (all ratings)</b>	≥ <b>1.8%</b>	≥ <b>1.6%</b>
<b>Underreported Students (district only)</b>	150 and ≥ <b>4.0%</b>	150 and ≥ <b>3.0%</b>

Numbers in bold indicate a change from the prior year.

Assessment Results (Standard and AEA)	2010	2011
<b>TAKS (Accommodated)</b> - All Subjects and Grades, combined w/ TAKS	Use	Use
<b>TAKS-Modified</b> - All Subjects and Grades, combined w/ TAKS	Report	<b>Use</b>
<b>TAKS-Alternate</b> - All Subjects and Grades, combined w/ TAKS	Report	<b>Use</b>
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Progress</b> - All Students only	Report	<b>Use</b>

### Use of Texas Projection Measure (TPM) in 2011

As stated in the July 8, 2010 letter from the commissioner to district superintendents, proposals to be considered regarding the use of TPM in 2011 state accountability include:

- Suspension of the use of TPM for accountability ratings.
- Continued use of TPM in state accountability, but only for districts that elect to use it.
- Modifications to the TPM calculation and/or its use to include additional safeguards such as:
  - applying performance floors,
  - counting each student who fails but is projected to pass as a fraction of a passer,
  - prohibiting TPM to be used for the same measure in a subsequent year,
  - limiting the number of measures for which TPM can be used in a given year, and
  - limiting which rating categories can use TPM.

### Commended Performance Requirements – New for 2011

- *Exemplary*: 25% commended on reading/ELA and mathematics
- *Recognized*: 15% commended on reading/ELA and mathematics
- *Student Groups*: All Students (regardless of size)  
Economically Disadvantaged (if minimum size is met)
- *Required Improvement (RI) and Exceptions*: Cannot be used with Commended Performance to attain a higher rating.
- *TPM*: 2011 advisory committees will discuss use of TPM for Commended Performance.

### ELL Progress Indicator – New for 2011 (Standard and AEA)

- 2011 Preview of ELL Progress indicator shown on 2008-09 and 2009-10 AEIS reports.
- Campus column correlates to 'All Students' data to be evaluated if minimum size criteria are met (30 students).
- ELL Progress indicator information can be found in Appendix H of the 2009-10 AEIS Glossary and the ELL FAQ available online at the Resource link on the Performance Reporting website. <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/resources/index.html>

### Standard Procedures for 2011

- Standard is 60%.
- Evaluated only for *Exemplary* and *Recognized* ratings.
- Only All Students are evaluated if meets minimum size of 30 students.
- RI and the Exceptions Provision are scheduled to be applied.

### AEA Procedures for 2011

- Standard is 55%.
- RI is calculated.
- Only All Students are evaluated if meets minimum size of 30 students.
- The ELL Progress indicator cannot be the sole reason for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating.

## AEA Procedures

### At-Risk Registration Criterion

- Each registered AEC must have at least 75% at-risk student enrollment verified through 2010-11 PEIMS fall enrollment data in order to be evaluated under 2011 AEA procedures and receive an AEA rating on July 29, 2011. Two safeguards have been incorporated for AECs that are below the at-risk requirement.
  - *Prior-Year PEIMS At-Risk Data Safeguard:* If a registered AEC does not meet the at-risk criterion in 2011, then it remains under AEA if the AEC had at least 75% at-risk enrollment in 2010.
  - *New Campus Safeguard:* If a new campus is registered for evaluation under AEA procedures, then the AEC is not required to meet the at-risk criterion in its first year of operation. This safeguard provides an accommodation for new campuses with no prior-year data.
- In April, letters will be mailed to the registered AECs that do not meet the 2011 at-risk registration criterion informing them that AEA registration has been rescinded, and the AEC will be evaluated under 2011 standard accountability procedures.
- The Final 2011 Registered AEC list will be posted on the AEA website in May 2011. This list will contain the AECs that will receive a 2011 AEA rating.
- A list of the charter operators that will be rated under 2011 AEA procedures will also be posted on the AEA website in May 2011.

TAKS Progress Indicator	2010	2011
<b>AEA: AA Standard</b>	50%	55%
<b>Definition</b>	TAKS + TPM (grades 3-10) + TGI (grade 11) + Exit-Level Retests	
<b>Use of TAKS (Accommodated) Results</b>	All subjects and grades	
<b>Use of TAKS–Modified Results</b>	None	All subjects and grades
<b>Use of TAKS–Alternate Results</b>	None	All subjects and grades
<b>Student Groups</b>	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged	
<b>Use of District At-Risk TAKS Data</b>	If the AEC does not meet the TAKS Progress standard based on results for fewer than 10 TAKS tests, or if there are no TAKS results for the AEC, then the AEC is evaluated on the district performance of at-risk students. This feature is applied only to AECs.	
<b>Required Improvement</b>	Applied with recalculated prior year results.	

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7–12) Indicator	2009 from 2007-08	2010 from 2008-09	2011 from 2009-10
<b>AEA: AA Standard</b>	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	NCES definition		
<b>Student Groups</b>	All Students only		
<b>Use of District At-Risk Dropout Rate Data</b>	AECs that do not meet the accountability standard or demonstrate RI are evaluated on Annual Dropout Rate of at-risk students in the district. This feature is applied only to AECs.		
<b>Required Improvement</b>	Applied		

<b>Completion Rate II (Grades 9–12) Indicator</b>	<b>2009</b> Class of 2008	<b>2010</b> Class of 2009	<b>2011</b> Class of 2010
<b>AEA: AA Standard</b>	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
<b>Completion Rate II Definition</b>	Graduates + GED Recipients + Continuing Students		
<b>Dropout Definition</b>	Phase-in NCES definition	NCES definition	
<b>Student Groups</b>	All Students only		
<b>Use of District At-Risk Completion Rate II Data</b>	If the AEC of Choice does not meet the accountability standard or has students in any of grades 9-12 but does not have a Completion Rate II, then the AEC of Choice is evaluated on Completion Rate II of at-risk students in the district. If at-risk students in the district do not meet minimum size requirements for All Students, then the AEC of Choice is not evaluated on Completion Rate II. This feature is applied only to AECs of Choice.		
<b>Required Improvement</b>	Applied		

### **House Bill (HB) 3 Exclusions to the Dropout and Completion Rates (Standard and AEA)**

HB 3 defined certain exclusions that TEA must make when evaluating dropout and completion rates for state accreditation and performance ratings. HB 3 explicitly requires use of the current National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition until 2011-12 which TEA interprets to mean 2010-11 dropouts collected in the 2011-12 school year. Therefore, 2008-09 dropouts collected in 2009-10 (2010 ratings) and 2009-10 dropouts collected in 2010-11 (2011 ratings) will be processed using current definitions with no HB 3 exclusions applied.

### **HB 3 Implementation**

- December 1, 2010** **HB 3 Transition Plan** is posted online and submitted to the governor, lieutenant governor, other key legislative members and staff, and the Legislative Budget Board (LBB)  
<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/hb3plan/>
- July 29, 2011** 2011 ratings are the last ratings issued under the current accountability system
- 2011-2012** Assignment of performance ratings are suspended for this school year.  
 New academic accountability system is developed with input from advisory groups on the timelines specified in the transition plan.
- August 8, 2013** District and campus performance ratings are issued for the first time under new system. Ratings will be based on the percent proficient indicators. The percent college-ready indicators will be “report” only.  
 Distinction designations will be issued to districts and campuses with acceptable performance concurrent with the release of performance ratings.  
 Performance ratings issued in 2010-11 and 2012-13 school years will be considered consecutive.
- August 8, 2014** District and campus performance ratings issued for second time. Ratings will be based on both percent proficient and college-ready indicators.  
 Distinction designations will be issued to districts and campuses with acceptable performance concurrent with the release of performance ratings.

# Highlights of House Bill 3 Transition Plan

## Assessment

- The new, more rigorous *State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR)* program will begin in the 2011–2012 school year. A new test design for the STAAR assessments will focus on readiness for success in subsequent grades or courses and, ultimately, for college and career.
- At grades 3–8, STAAR will include assessments in the following grades/subjects:
  - mathematics and reading at grades 3–8, including Spanish versions at grades 3–5
  - writing at grades 4 and 7, including Spanish version at grade 4
  - science at grade 5, including a Spanish version at grade 5
  - science at grade 8
  - social studies at grade 8
- For high school, STAAR assessments will be administered in Algebra I, geometry, Algebra II, biology, chemistry, physics, English I, English II, English III, world geography, world history, and U.S. history. The STAAR EOC assessment scores will account for 15% of a student’s final grade in the course.
- The test design for English I, II, and III will require students to write two essays rather than the one that TAKS required. In reading, greater emphasis will be given to critical analysis rather than literal understanding. The test design will also allow for the reading and writing components to be calibrated, equated, and scaled separately so that the scores on the reading and writing components can be reported separately. This will allow a student to retake only the portion of the English EOC assessment on which he or she did not meet the minimum score requirements. Because of the length of these tests and the desire to embed field-test items to eliminate stand-alone field testing, each of the English EOC assessments will be administered over two days. All other EOC assessments will be administered on one day only during a scheduled assessment window.
- STAAR grades 3-8 assessments will be administered on paper only; STAAR EOC assessments will be offered in both online and paper formats.
- With the implementation of STAAR in the 2011–2012 school year, testing requirements for graduation will significantly increase. While TAKS represented four “hurdles” for students (requiring them to pass exit level tests in mathematics, English language arts, science, and social studies), STAAR represents 12 hurdles for students taking the recommended high school program. To graduate under STAAR, a student must achieve a cumulative score that is at least equal to the product of the number of EOC assessments taken in each foundation content area (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and a scale score that indicates satisfactory performance.
- Performance levels on certain STAAR EOC assessments are now linked to a student’s graduation plan. Different levels of performance are required on the EOC assessments in English III and Algebra II for each of the three graduation plans: minimum, recommended, and distinguished.
- STAAR performance standards will be set so that they require a higher level of student performance than is required on the current TAKS assessments.
  - STAAR performance standards for STAAR EOC will be set in February 2012 and reports will be available in June 2012 after the first May 2012 administration.
  - Performance standards for STAAR at grades 3–8 will be set in fall 2012, after the first spring administration of STAAR. This standard-setting schedule will result in the following:
    - The Student Success Initiative (SSI) promotion requirements will not include use of the STAAR results in the 2011–2012 school year only, since passing standards will not yet be established. Statute continues to require the use of other academic information (teacher recommendations, student grades, etc.) in promotion decisions.
    - Reporting of STAAR grades 3-8 results will be delayed until fall 2012.

- Each general grade 3-8 and EOC STAAR assessment will have a satisfactory cut score and an advanced cut score. There will also be EOC minimum scores set below but within a reasonable range of the satisfactory scores which will be used to determine whether a student's score on a particular EOC assessment may count towards his or her cumulative score in that content area. Performance at the highest cut score will be interpreted differently depending on the assessment. For example, this highest cut will indicate college readiness for Algebra II and English III. It will indicate advanced course readiness for Algebra I, English I, and II, and it will indicate advanced performance for the remaining courses.
- It is anticipated that the satisfactory performance standards for STAAR will be phased in over several years, but the highest performance standard (including the college and career readiness standards for Algebra II and English III) would not be phased in, but applied as approved when STAAR becomes operational.
- Performance standards will be reviewed at least every three years, as required by state statute.
- As with the current modified assessments, the STAAR Modified assessments will cover the same content as the general STAAR assessments, but will be modified in format and test design. Modified assessments will be developed for all content areas for grades 3-8 that are part of the general STAAR program and for nine of the twelve STAAR EOC assessments. Modified assessments are not being developed for Algebra II, chemistry, or physics as these courses are not required on the Minimum High School Program (MHSP) and all students taking STAAR Modified assessments are on the MHSP because they are receiving modified instruction. The new STAAR Modified assessments will reflect the same increased rigor and focus of the general assessments and now will include more rigorous item types. In addition, field-test items will be embedded in the modified assessments.
- The STAAR Alternate assessments will be very similar in design to the current TAKS-Alt assessments. Students will continue to perform standardized assessment tasks linked to the grade-level TEKS that measure student progress on skills aligned with the academic grade-level content standards. However, STAAR Alternate will incorporate a vertical alignment in the program's assessment tasks, and the high school assessments will move from grade-level assessments to course-based assessments. The new STAAR Alternate assessments will reflect the same increased rigor and focus of the general and modified assessments.
- For eligible English language learners (ELLs) in grades 3-8 and high school, plans are being made for the development of computer-based linguistically accommodated versions of STAAR, currently referred to as STAAR L. Spanish versions of STAAR will be implemented for eligible ELLs in grades 3-5. TELPAS will be adjusted as needed to ensure a strong link between academic language proficiency as defined by TELPAS and academic achievement as defined by STAAR.
- TEA is evaluating all testing accommodations to determine which ones will continue in the STAAR program and which accommodations will be added or discontinued. With the STAAR program, TEA is considering the elimination of the separate accommodated form and instead building in some specific accommodations to the general STAAR assessments for these students. Also, TEA is exploring the possibility of standardized oral administrations for the STAAR program using an online testing format.
- Performance standards, test score interpretations, and the uses of STAAR assessment data will be supported by validity evidence that will be obtained by correlating the STAAR assessments with other tests or measures of student performance. To provide external validity evidence based on test content, an analysis will be conducted to compare the assessment content standards on the STAAR assessments with other nationally and internationally administered assessments.
- STAAR significantly increases the number of testing days at the high school level because of the increase in the number of assessments students will be taking. Currently on TAKS there is a total of 25 testing days, including exit level retest administrations. With three testing opportunities each year (fall, winter, and spring), STAAR EOC will require up to 45 testing days when it is fully implemented. Students are allowed by statute to retest for any reason.
- TEA is considering adopting policies to limit the time a student spends taking a STAAR assessment on a given day. This consideration is based on advice from advisory committees to align Texas' testing policies with other state and national assessments and better prepare students for timed tests such as SAT, ACT, and AP.

- Because of the number of high stakes EOC assessments that will be administered at the same time and the provision in statute to allow students to retest an EOC assessment for any reason, there will be much greater security challenges associated with the STAAR program.
- Beginning in 2011-2012, TEA will annually use statistical analyses to identify irregular patterns of test answers that may indicate cheating to augment other detection methods already in use, such as multiple mark analysis. The use of statistical methods will take place within a larger investigative process that includes the collection of additional evidence, such as locally maintained seating charts, reports of testing irregularities, and records of test security and administration training for campuses.
- Districts are required to provide remediation to any student who fails a STAAR assessment, whether in grades 3–8 or high school. This requirement has significant implications for districts, especially at the high school level. Students who pass a course but fail the assessment for that course may require additional instruction in that course even after they are no longer enrolled. Delivering remediation/instruction to students in these instances will present districts with both scheduling and staffing challenges.
- Students, parents, and teachers will be able to access results through a data portal, a secure system that will provide the ability to view reports, track student progress, provide assessment data to institutions of higher education, and provide information to the general public.
- As Texas transitions its assessment program from TAKS to STAAR, different measures of student progress will likely be implemented. Texas will implement a multi-step process to identify the student progress measures that will be used for the STAAR assessment program.
- The overall field-test burden of STAAR on students and school districts has been significantly reduced from that of TAKS through the embedding of field-test items whenever possible beginning with operational assessments in 2012.
- In 2011, 2012, and 2013, selected test items representative of selected grades and subjects assessed on STAAR will be released. The first full release of primary test forms of STAAR will occur in 2014.

## **Accountability**

- A new accountability system based on the STAAR grades 3–8 and STAAR EOC assessments will be developed during the 2011–2012 school year and implemented in 2012-2013.
  - Accountability ratings will not be released in 2011-2012 while student performance standards are set on the STAAR and the new accountability system is developed.
  - Reporting in 2011-2012 will be modified based on the availability of student performance data.
- The new accountability rating system will include the following indicators and other features.
  - Student performance on the STAAR grades 3–8 and EOC assessments, measured against both student passing standards and college-readiness standards. Student progress is also factored in, allowing more students to be identified as meeting or progressing toward meeting these standards.
  - Accountability standards defined by the commissioner of education for the current year and projected for the next two years. Standard for the college-ready performance indicator increases so that by 2019-2020 Texas ranks in the top ten among states nationally on two measures – the percent college-ready and the percent graduating under the recommended or advanced high school program, with no gaps by race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status.
  - Dropout rates (including district completion rates) for grades 9 through 12 and high school graduation rates.
  - Student group performance based on race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status is evaluated.
  - Required Improvement over the prior year is a required feature.
  - Average performance of the last three years is a required feature.
  - Performance on 85 percent of the measures meeting the standard is an optional feature.
  - Accountability rating labels assign districts and campuses to one of two rating categories: “Unacceptable” and “Acceptable.”

- Distinction designations will recognize high performance by students in academics and on broader indicators of excellence beyond results based on state assessments.
  - Recognized and Exemplary ratings are distinction designations for meeting higher college- and career-ready performance standards, rather than higher performance on the same indicators used for accountability ratings.
  - Campus distinction designations will be awarded for campuses in the top 25 percent in annual improvement, campuses in the top 25 percent of those demonstrating ability to close performance gaps, and for academic performance in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies.
  - Campus distinction designations will also be awarded in four new areas: fine arts, physical education, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Workforce development program, and second language acquisition program.
- The intent of the accountability development process is to design a new accountability system rather than modify the current system. The new system may look very different from the current state accountability system. Following are some of the design options that will be explored for the new system.
  - Longitudinal EOC performance measure that tracks a cohort or class of high school students as they progress toward meeting the EOC graduation requirement.
  - Performance Index that combines performance across assessment performance levels and subjects as well as grades, languages, and tests (regular and alternative).
- Accountability development in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 will include several coordinated efforts to simultaneously develop the new state accountability rating system, new federal AYP system, new state distinction designations, a new Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS), new state accountability reports, and possibly new alternative education accountability procedures.
- Development of the new federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system for 2012 and beyond will take place during the 2011-2012 school year as the new state accountability system is developed. The primary consideration that will guide development of the new AYP system will be alignment with the state accountability system to the greatest extent possible. TEA will monitor the ESEA reauthorization process closely but development of the new AYP system will begin and may be completed under the requirements of the current ESEA.
- Phase-in of the new accountability system will begin with the 2013 and 2014 accountability ratings.
  - Final decisions for 2013 ratings will be released in spring 2013. Districts and campuses will not receive advanced notice of performance under the new accountability system.
  - The 2013 ratings will be based on percent of students meeting the satisfactory student performance standard. College-ready performance will be reported in 2012-2013.
  - The 2014 ratings will be based on college-ready performance on STAAR as well as satisfactory performance. Distinction designations for which performance on the college-ready indicator is an eligibility requirement will be introduced with the 2014 ratings.
  - Campus and district ratings and distinction designations will be issued by August 8 beginning with the 2013 ratings. Notification to districts and campuses previously rated “Unacceptable” of a subsequent unacceptable rating will be done as early as possible in 2013 and by June 15 beginning in 2014.

**Accountability Development**

TEA has already begun the process of developing a new state accountability system for Texas, based on the legislative mandates in HB 3. Accountability ratings are suspended for 2012 while student performance standards are set on the new STAAR assessments and the new accountability system is developed. During the development of the new accountability system, the commissioner of education will rely extensively on the detailed review, study, and advice of educators, parents, and business and community leaders in establishing accountability criteria and setting standards. The intent of the upcoming accountability development process is to design a new accountability system rather than to modify the current system to align with the new provisions of HB 3. Advisory committees will reevaluate every aspect of the accountability system. The resulting accountability system may look very different from the current state accountability system.

<b>2011</b>	This year will focus primarily on the final year of the current accountability system. Staff will continue work on the new system for 2013. Activities related to the development of the system for 2013 and beyond are noted to the right as "HB 3."	<b>2011 or HB 3</b>
<b>Early March</b>	Educator Focus Group on Accountability meets to review and make recommendations for 2011 accountability. Focus group will also review transition plan requirements for 2012 and beyond.	<b>Both</b>
<b>Late March</b>	The Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee (CAAC) meets to review and comment on the recommendations for the 2011 accountability system.	<b>2011</b>
<b>Early April</b>	The commissioner of education releases final decisions for the 2011 accountability system.	<b>2011</b>
<b>July 29</b>	Ratings are released for last time under current system.	<b>2011</b>
<b>September</b>	Staff analyzes available data and compiles materials for first HB 3 advisory group meeting.	<b>HB 3</b>
<b>Late October</b>	Initial HB 3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members receive a HB 3 orientation and review guidance for framework of new system.</li> <li>• Review options for HB 3 early indicator reports.</li> </ul>	<b>HB 3</b>

<b>2012</b>	2012 will be devoted to development of the new accountability system.	
<b>January</b>	TEA staff analyzes EOC performance data.	
<b>February</b>	Second HB 3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First opportunity to provide data analyses of EOC data;</li> <li>• Review options for accountability and finalize framework;</li> <li>• Review options for graduation/completion/dropout rate indicators.</li> </ul>	
<b>May/June</b>	Third HB 3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of additional features;</li> <li>• Finalize recommendations on indicators;</li> <li>• Review further analyses of 2011 EOC results.</li> </ul>	
<b>June</b>	Class of 2011 completion rates available, with HB 3 exclusions on one year of cohort.	
<b>September</b>	Modeling can start with partial results: EOC from 2012 is available with standards; STAAR 3–8 is also available from 2012, but with no standards applied.	
<b>October</b>	Fourth HB 3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review distinction designation indicators;</li> <li>• Analyze various accountability standards based on modeling of 2012 EOC and Grades 3–8 results (prior to standard setting).</li> </ul>	
<b>December</b>	Standards for STAAR 3–8 are available. Modeling and analysis begins.	

<b>2013</b>	Year of new ratings release.
<b>February</b>	Fifth HB 3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize recommendations on 2013 accountability standards based on modeling of 2012 EOC and Grades 3–8 results (with standards);</li> <li>• Finalize recommendations on 2013 system features;</li> <li>• Finalize recommendations on projected standards for 2014 and 2015.</li> </ul>
<b>March</b>	Commissioner releases final decisions for 2013 ratings
<b>March</b>	Rulemaking process begins to have standards and procedures for the 2013 accountability system adopted as part of Texas Administrative Code.
<b>April/May</b>	Key chapters of <i>2013 Accountability Manual</i> released.
<b>Early June</b>	Confidential completion and dropout data released to districts.
<b>June 15</b>	If possible, notification reports will be issued to districts for campuses rated as AU in 2011 that are anticipated to be rated as unacceptable in 2013.
<b>August 8</b>	Release of district and campus performance ratings based on percent proficient indicator. Distinction designations are assigned to campuses.
<b>Early September</b>	Appeals window closes
<b>Late September</b>	Appeals Panel meets to consider appeals
<b>Early October</b>	Commissioner determines final ratings; ratings updated.
<b>Late October</b>	List of campuses with additional CIP requirements released

<b>2014</b>	2014 will have additions to the accountability system.
<b>February/March</b>	Annual meeting of HB3 advisory committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review 2013 system;</li> <li>• Finalize recommendations on 2014 accountability standards;</li> <li>• Review and finalize 2014 system features;</li> <li>• Finalize recommendations on 2015 accountability standards;</li> <li>• Finalize recommendations on projected standards for 2016.</li> </ul>
<b>March/April</b>	Commissioner releases final decisions for 2014 ratings.
<b>April/May</b>	Key chapters of <i>2014 Accountability Manual</i> released.
<b>Early June</b>	Confidential completion and dropout data released to districts.
<b>June 15</b>	Notification reports issued to districts for campuses rated as unacceptable in 2013 that are anticipated to be rated as unacceptable in 2014.
<b>August 8</b>	Release of district and campus performance ratings based on percent proficient and percent college-ready indicators. Distinction designations are assigned to districts and campuses.
<b>Early September</b>	Appeals window closes
<b>Late September</b>	Appeals Panel meets to consider appeals
<b>Early October</b>	Commissioner determines final ratings; ratings updated.
<b>Late October</b>	List of campuses with additional CIP requirements released

## Options for Alternative Education Accountability Procedures

As described earlier, an alternative set of performance measures for alternative education campuses (AECs) serving at-risk students were developed in late 1994 and first implemented in the 1995–1996 school year. When the standard procedures for the 2004–2011 accountability system were implemented in 2004, alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures followed in 2005.

During the development of previous and current AEA procedures, the following characteristics of AECs serving at-risk students have been identified that affect many components of the accountability system. These AECs provide non-traditional learning environments that are responsive to the unique needs of students, offer options to enhance student achievement, and ensure that at-risk students demonstrate proficiency on the state assessments and meet graduation requirements.

- Small numbers of test results – AECs are smaller on average than regular campuses.
- Mobility – AECs have higher mobility rates than regular campuses.
- Attribution of data – High mobility rates complicate evaluation of AEC data.
- Residential Facilities – Education services are provided to students in residential programs and facilities operated under contract with the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), detention centers and correctional facilities that are registered with the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), and private residential treatment centers.

In order to address these unique characteristics, AEA procedures were developed based on the following guidelines:

- Base the AEA indicators on data submitted through standard data submission processes [such as the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)] or by the state testing contractor.
- Develop indicators appropriate for alternative education programs offered on AECs rather than just setting lower standards on the same indicators used in the regular accountability ratings. AEA procedures must contain appropriate indicators for AECs with increased rigor phased in over time. However, these indicators must be cognizant that all students are required to demonstrate proficiency on the state assessments in order to graduate.
- Incorporate growth measures in the base indicator.
- Use additional criteria, such as requiring AECs to have a minimum percentage of at-risk students (based on PEIMS data reported on the current year student enrollment records) in order to be evaluated under AEA procedures.

In the 2009–2010 school year, Texas had a total of 689 alternative campuses of which 460 were evaluated under AEA procedures. These 460 AECs served 52,718 students from 199 districts and 75 charter operators. Of the 460 AECs, 187 were charter campuses and 273 were non-charter campuses. NCLB requires that all campuses, including AECs, are evaluated in the federal accountability system. Conversely, the state accountability system has the option of including AEA procedures designed specifically to evaluate AECs.

The following options will be explored during the development of the new accountability system to identify the most suitable way to evaluate AECs:

- Use Same Indicators and Standards as Regular Campuses. This option would require AECs to meet the same criteria as traditional campuses.
- Use Same Indicators, but Different Standards, as Regular Campuses. Like the option above, this option would not require the development of alternative procedures, but would require that AECs be evaluated on the same indicators as regular campuses.
- Develop Alternative Education Accountability Procedures. This option continues the use of AEA procedures that are designed to address the unique challenges of alternative campuses that primarily serve students identified as at-risk of dropping out of school. Table 11-5 provides two possible timelines for the development of new AEA procedures. The first timeline delays implementing new AEA procedures until the 2014 ratings. The second allows for evaluation of registered AECs and charter districts in 2012–2013, possibly with a delayed release in fall 2013.

**Table 11-5: Timeline Options for Development of AEA Procedures**

Date	Option 1 Timeline for New AEA Procedures for 2014	Option 2 Timeline for New AEA Procedures for 2013
2010–2011	2011 ratings are the last issued under the current AEA procedures.	2011 ratings are the last issued under the current AEA procedures.
2011–2012	Performance ratings are suspended while the new accountability system is developed with advice from educator advisory groups.	Performance ratings are suspended while the new accountability system is developed with advice from educator advisory groups.
2012–2013	District and campus performance ratings for regular campuses are issued for the first time under the new system, based on percent proficient indicators. Registered AECs and some charter operators receive a 2013 rating of <i>Not Rated: Alternative Education</i> while new AEA procedures are developed for 2014 and beyond with advice from advisory groups.	District and campus performance ratings for regular campuses are issued for the first time under the new system, based on percent proficient indicators. District and campus performance ratings for registered AECs and some charter operators are issued for the first time under the new AEA procedures, possibly with a delayed release in fall 2013.
2013–2014	District and campus performance ratings for regular campuses are issued for the second time and will be based on both percent proficient and percent college-ready indicators. AEA ratings are issued for the first time under new AEA procedures on the same calendar as ratings assigned under standard procedures.	District and campus performance ratings for regular campuses are issued for the second time and will be based on both percent proficient and percent college-ready indicators. AEA ratings are issued for the second time under new AEA procedures on the same calendar as ratings assigned under standard procedures.