

Summary of 2013 State Accountability Rating Appeals

Of the 1,228 districts that received a 2013 rating, 19 (1.5%) filed an appeal. Of those districts, 6 were rated under the Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) provisions.

Of the 8,555 campuses that received a 2013 rating, 66 (0.8%) filed an appeal. Of those campuses, 6 were rated under AEA provisions.

The following table summarizes the distribution of appeals by index.

Appeals	Number	Percent
Index 1	8	9.4
Index 2	30	35.3
Index 3	12	14.1
Index 4	35	41.2
Total	85	100.0

Index 1 reasons for appeals:

- Campus did not meet the standard for Index 1 due to 10 of its 13 students being given the STAAR Alternate at a Level I complexity as determined by their ARD committees.
- Campus requested consideration of a *Not Rated* designation due to the unique student population served.
- Field test results for six grade 10 students were included in assessments used for accountability ratings. Additionally, 24 tests taken by 19 students were retest results for students who were not mandated to retake the test, but the district was required to permit to retest.
- Campus rating was based on only one student from our district sharing this alternative high school with a highly mobile student enrollment in a shared services arrangement with seven other school districts.
- Requested change in rating to *Not Rated* label due to being in the process of changing curriculum from C-Scope to a locally developed curriculum.

Index 2 reasons for appeals:

- 9th grade campuses were included with high schools, single level and multi-level campuses in calculating Index 2, thus placing them at a disadvantage.
- A mismatch of student identification information for two students resulted in the omission of their results from the Index 2 results.
- Index 2 calculations were based on a small number of students.
- Less than two-thirds of the school's students were evaluated on Index 2, since progress measure results were not available for STAAR Modified and STAAR grades 4 and 7 writing.
- There were inconsistencies between individual STAAR growth score calculations.
- The district's calculations did not match TEA's reported numbers and calculations.
- Methodology notification was too late.
- 2012-13 accountability rules stated initially that Index 2 would not be applicable for 2013 state ratings.

- Index 2 outcomes were negatively impacted by the significant number of grade 7 students taking Algebra I and grade 8 students taking geometry who were not included in the Index 2 calculations.
- The Index 2 scores did not include a full set of data and there were various unintended consequences of the 2013 accountability system.
- Requested definition of minimum size criteria for a student group by the number of students and not the number of tests.
- Claimed that Index 2 methodology disproportionately affects K-4 campuses.

Index 3 reasons for appeals:

- The 2012 STAAR results were intended to provide a baseline for improvement as the first administration with further guidance provided during the 2013 accountability cycle.
- Special circumstances caused a major disruption to testing on a campus.
- Requested recalculation of the index score to include the missing passing scores for TAKS first time testers in 2012-13.
- Requested inclusion of student group that was identified as one of two lowest performing student groups in 2012, but did not meet the minimum size criteria in 2013.
- The campus has made a significant leap in the past two years in all tested areas toward school improvement.
- Requested inclusion of the White student group and the results of two STAAR Alternate students.

Index 4 reason for appeals:

- Did not meet the AEA 75% At-Risk registration criterion or failed to complete the AEA registration form during the registration period.
- Requested to be evaluated under AEA provisions since the majority of graduates in charter district were enrolled in AEA campuses.
- Claimed that the 2012 MHSP graduates had a negative effect.
- The RHSP/DAP rates for the Class of 2012 used in the Index 4 calculation included all students who graduated in Spring of 2012, and not just the Class of 2012 4-year longitudinal cohort.
- Small graduating class and many students placed on MHSP by the ARD committee.
- Requested exclusion of special education students from graduation rate because they did not graduate with their respective cohort due to requirements of their IEP.
- Students moved from RHSP to MHSP in order to avoid a 4th year of science class.
- Exclude students served at the Residential Treatment Facility within the district.
- District was not able to provide adequate foreign language instruction to this class of students directly due to the effects of Hurricane Ike. As a result, three students were not able to complete the foreign language requirements for the RHSP.
- Add an additional student from the Class of 2010 cohort to the Index 4 calculation.
- Exclude students from the National Guard Youth Challenge Program which are served by the district.
- The accountability system development timeline eliminated any opportunity for districts and campuses to make adjustments and strategic improvements to Index 4 performance for 2012 and 2013.