

Chapter 2 – Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets

2014 Ratings

To meet state statutory requirements, the accountability system must assign ratings that designate acceptable and unacceptable performance for campuses and districts. Districts and campuses are assigned a rating that is based on meeting a target for each performance index.

Met Standard. Acceptable rating assigned to districts and campuses that meet the target on all indexes for which it has performance data in 2014. This rating applies to campuses serving grades prekindergarten (PK) through 12 (including campuses with assessment data due to pairing).

Met Alternative Standard. Acceptable rating assigned to charter operators and alternative education campuses (AECs) that are evaluated by alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions and meet modified targets on all performance indexes for which they have performance data in 2014.

Improvement Required. Unacceptable rating assigned to districts, campuses, charter operators, and alternative education campuses (AECs) that miss the target on one or more performance indexes.

Not Rated. Indicates that a district or campus is not rated for one of the following reasons:

- The district or campus serves only students enrolled in Early Education (EE);
- The district or campus has no data in the accountability subset;
- The district or campus has insufficient data to rate through Small Numbers Analysis;
- The campus is a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP);
- The campus is a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP);
- The campus is a residential facility;
- The district operates only residential facilities; or
- The district or campus faces unusual circumstances (e.g., test documents lost in shipping).

Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues. Indicates that data accuracy and/or integrity have compromised performance results, making it impossible to assign a rating. The assignment of a *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* label may be permanent or temporary pending further investigation.

To receive a *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating, all campuses and districts must meet the following targets on all indexes for which they have performance results in 2014.

2014 Index Targets

Each index is based on a score of 0 to 100 points. The campus or district score is calculated as a percent of the maximum possible points. Whether the score meets or falls short of the target on each performance index determines the rating.

The index targets vary for each index and are established for non-AEA campuses and districts, AEA charter operators and AECs. Campuses are classified into four school types according to the range of grades served. For example, a campus serving kindergarten (KG) through grade 8 is classified as an elementary school. A campus serving grades 7 through 12 is classified as a high school.

For Index 2, Index 3, and Index 4, separate targets are set by school type: elementary, middle school, or high school/K-12. Absolute targets have been set for Index 1 and Index 4. Index 4 also includes differential targets based on the availability of data for the four Index 4 components – STAAR, graduation rate, graduation diploma plan rate, and postsecondary indicator. The targets for Index 2 and Index 3 are set at about the fifth percentile based on 2014 performance and are identified prior to the release of 2014 ratings. The tables below display the 2014 index targets, followed by a school type table illustrating the distribution of grades for each school type used in the 2014 accountability system.

2014 Accountability Performance Index Targets – Non-AEA Districts and Campuses

	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4**	
				All Components	STAAR Component Only
District Targets	55	5 th Percentile*	5 th Percentile*	57***	13
Campus Targets					
Elementary	55	5 th Percentile*	5 th Percentile*	n/a	12
Middle		5 th Percentile*	5 th Percentile*	n/a	13
High School/K-12		n/a	5 th Percentile*	57***	21***

* Targets for non-AEA campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2014 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts correspond to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2014 campus performance across all campus types.

** Index 4 is based on four components **or** the STAAR component only. For a district, high school campus, or campuses serving grades K–12, the four components of Index 4 are: 1) STAAR results; 2) graduation rate/annual dropout rate; 3) graduation diploma plan indicator; and 4) postsecondary indicator. If all four components are available, then Index 4 includes evaluation of all four components with a target of **57**. Otherwise, Index 4 includes only the STAAR component. For elementary and middle school campuses, the Index 4 evaluation is based solely on the STAAR component.

*** STAAR end-of-course (EOC) results are evaluated for students who tested for the first time during the current year accountability cycle (previous summer and current school year fall and spring administrations). The students' first and subsequent retests are used to evaluate Index 4. Therefore, retest results for students who tested for the first time prior to the current accountability cycle are not included.

The following chart identifies the 2014 index targets established for charter districts and AECs evaluated under alternative education accountability provisions.

2014 Accountability Performance Index Targets – AEA Charter Districts and Campuses

	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4**	
				Both Components	Graduation/ Dropout Rate Component Only
AEA Campus and Charter District Targets	30	n/a	5 th Percentile*	33	45

* Targets for both AEA charters and campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2014 campus performance.

** Index 4 evaluates two components **or** the graduation rate/annual dropout rate component only. For AEA charters and campuses, the components of Index 4 are: 1) STAAR results, and 2) graduation rate/annual dropout rate. If both components are available, then Index 4 evaluates both components with a target of **33**. Otherwise, the Index 4 evaluation is based only on the graduation rate/annual dropout rate with a target of **45**. In either case, bonus points are added as described in *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators*.

2014 Accountability System School Types

The number of schools with every possible low and high grade combination based on 2013-14 enrollment data is shown in each cell below. For example, the first row shows there are 1,007 campuses with students enrolled in Early Elementary (EE) grade levels through grade 5.

2014 Accountability System School Types

		High Grade →														
		EE	PK	KG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Low Grade ↓	EE	6	64	56	46	71	49	164	1007	123	2	6	0	1	1	26
	PK		35	17	5	21	31	174	1099	185	7	68	1	1	2	139
	KG			0	9	13	22	141	613	134	6	59	5	4	6	65
	1				1	15	21	8	35	19	0	3	1	2	0	10
	2					0	23	14	21	3	0	0	0	0	4	10
	3						1	16	80	7	3	5	0	0	4	8
	4							3	60	40	2	9	1	0	5	8
	5								13	144	5	85	1	0	7	18
	6									34	12	1088	8	17	21	114
	7										8	269	17	20	27	148
	8											15	9	6	12	37
	9												47	31	20	1303
	10													11	6	35
11														12	29	
12															19	

Who is Rated?

All districts, campuses, and charters with students enrolled in the fall of the 2013-14 school year are assigned a state accountability rating.

Districts

Regular foundation school program (FSP) districts and special statutory districts are rated. Districts and charter operators are evaluated on the aggregate results of the campuses operated by the district and charter operator. New districts, including new charter districts, are evaluated the first year they report fall enrollment.

State-administered school districts, including Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired, Texas School for the Deaf, Texas Juvenile Justice Department, and Windham

School District are not rated. Also, districts with no students enrolled in grades tested (3-12) are not rated.

Campuses

All public school campuses, including AECs and open-enrollment charter schools, are rated. New campuses and new open-enrollment charter schools are evaluated the first year they report fall enrollment. The pairing process is used to issue performance results for campuses (serving any grades from PK to 12) with no students enrolled in the grades tested. See *Chapter 6 – Other Accountability System Processes* for information on the pairing process.

The following campuses are not rated in 2014.

Residential Facilities: AECs identified as residential facilities and AEA charter districts that operate only residential facilities are not evaluated. Performance index results are reported, but a rating label is not assigned. Students enrolled in AECs and charter districts operating as residential facilities are excluded from the reported performance information if Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) student attribution codes were submitted accurately in fall 2013 (Texas Education Code (TEC) §39.055). See *Appendix G – Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data*.

Campuses that close mid-year: Campuses that close before the spring test administration are not rated. However, performance measures for which data exist on campuses that close are included in the district rating. Campuses that close after the end of the school year are evaluated for that school year.

JJAEPs and DAEPs: Campuses identified as JJAEPs and DAEPs are not evaluated. State statute and statutory intent prohibit the attribution of student performance results to JJAEPs and DAEPs. This means that attendance and performance data for students served in JJAEPs and DAEPs are reported to the students' home campuses, and the home campus is evaluated based on the results.

Short-Term campuses: Campuses that serve students in grades 3-12, but have no test results for evaluation (due to the accountability subset) are not rated. This includes AECs with short-term student placements.

Charter campuses with no students in grades tested: Open-enrollment charter schools that do not serve students in grades 3-12 are not rated.

Campuses with students enrolled in grades 3-12 that have no test results: Campuses with students enrolled in grades 3-12 and without test results for evaluation (due to the accountability subset) are not rated.

Notification of Ratings

August 1, 2014: The TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) website will be updated to include campus and district data used to calculate accountability ratings. See *Appendix E – TEASE Accountability*.

August 8, 2014: Campuses and districts will receive notification of accountability ratings on August 8, 2014. Campus and district data tables and summary reports are released publicly on TEA's website.

Early November 2014: Accountability ratings are finalized after review of school district appeals to the rating outcome. Once the appeals process is completed, agency web products for 2014 accountability ratings will reflect the outcome of all appeals.

TEA Data Integrity Activities

TEA conducts a number of activities to ensure the integrity of the accountability system. Protection from purposeful manipulation is crucial, as well as control over data quality for determining ratings.

- **Campus Number Tracking.** Requests for campus number changes are approved in light of prior state accountability ratings. An *Improvement Required* rating for the same campus assigned two different campus numbers may be considered to be consecutive years of low ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions.
- **Data Validation Monitoring.** The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBM system, like the state accountability system, is a data-driven system that relies on data submitted by districts; therefore, the integrity of districts' data is critical. The PBM system includes annual data validation analyses that examine districts' leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, and discipline data. Districts identified with potential data integrity concerns engage in a process to either validate the accuracy of its data or determine that erroneous data were submitted. This process is fundamental to the integrity of all the agency's evaluation systems. For more information, see the Data Validation Manuals on the PBM website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pbm/DVManuals.aspx/>.
- **Test Security.** As part of ongoing efforts to improve security measures surrounding the assessment program, TEA uses a comprehensive set of test security procedures designed to assure parents, students, and the public that test results are meaningful and valid. Among other measures, districts are required to implement seating charts during all administrations, conduct annual training for all testing personnel, and maintain test security materials for five years. Detailed information about test security policies for the state assessment program is available online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/security/>.
- **Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues.** This rating is used in situations where the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised, preventing the assignment of a rating. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation, or may be assigned as the final rating label for the year. It is not equivalent to an *Improvement Required* rating, though the Commissioner of Education has the authority to lower a rating, assign an *Improvement Required* rating due to data quality issues, or consider the rating of *Improvement Required* for purposes of determining consecutive years of low ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

The agency activities above can occur either before or after the ratings release. Sanctions can be imposed at any time. To the extent possible, ratings for the year are finalized when updated ratings are released following the resolution of appeals. A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

Accurate Data

Accurate data is critical to the credibility of the rating system. Responsibility for the quality of data used for the indicators that determine campus and district ratings rests with local districts. The system depends on the responsible submission and collection of assessment and PEIMS information by local school districts.

Chapter 3 – Performance Index Construction

For 2014 and beyond, an accountability framework of four performance indexes will continue to provide a comprehensive evaluation of public education at campuses and districts across Texas. The accountability framework offers four measures of campus and district performance that communicate strengths and areas needing improvement.

With a performance index, each measure of student performance contributes points to an index score. Each of the four indexes has a score of 0 to 100, based on campus or district performance points, calculated as a percent of the maximum possible points for that campus or district. Targets set by the Commissioner of Education determine the minimum score required for meeting a performance standard for each index. The combined scores provide a rating of overall performance for the campus or district rather than reflecting the weakest performance of one student group or subject area. No single indicator can influence a low rating, since index performance is a culmination of all measures. Multiple indexes can be used in the framework to ensure accountability for every student. Any number of indicators and student groups can also be added to the system without creating additional targets for campuses and districts to meet.

Index 1: Student Achievement

Index 1: Student Achievement measures campus and district performance based on satisfactory student achievement combined over all subjects for all students. The total index points and index score are the same: *Index Score = Total Index Points*. Total points are determined by the percentage of assessments that meet the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) Phase-in 1 Level II standard, meet or exceed the English language learner (ELL) progress measure, or achieve the equivalency standard on End-of-Course (EOC) substitute assessments. The four examples below show districts and campuses that test in various subjects, depending upon the grades served. Each percentage of students meeting the phase-in satisfactory performance standard contributes one point to the index. Index scores range from 0 to 100 for all campuses and districts.

Example 1.1 Districts and campuses that test in five subjects: Gr. K-12, Gr. 9-12, Gr. 6-8													
STAAR Performance	R	M	W*	S	SS	Total	% Met Phase-in Satisfactory Standard	Index Points					
# Phase-in Satisfactory Standard	551	+	534	+	27	+	143	+	87	=	1,342	44%	44
Total Tests	984	+	988	+	353	+	354	+	356	=	3,035		
Index 1: Score												44	

*Gr. 4 and 7 only

Example 1.2 Districts and campuses that test in four subjects: Gr. 9-12													
STAAR Performance	R	M	W	S	SS	Total	% Met Phase-in Satisfactory Standard	Index Points					
# Phase-in Satisfactory Standard	551	+	534	+	0	+	143	+	87	=	1,315	49%	49
Total Tests	984	+	988	+	0	+	354	+	356	=	2,682		
Index 1: Score												49	

Example 1.3 Campuses that test in four subjects: Gr. K-5													
STAAR Performance	R	M	W*	S	SS	Total	% Met Phase-in Satisfactory Standard	Index Points					
# Phase-in Satisfactory Standard	551	+	534	+	27	+	143	+	0	=	1,255	47%	47
Total Tests	984	+	988	+	353	+	354	+	0	=	2,679		
Index 1: Score												47	

*Gr. 4 only

Example 1.4 Campuses that test in three subjects: Gr. K-4													
STAAR Performance	R	M	W*	S	SS	Total	% Met Phase-in Satisfactory Standard	Index Points					
# Phase-in Satisfactory Standard	551	+	534	+	27	+	0	+	0	=	1,112	48%	48
Total Tests	984	+	984	+	353	+	0	+	0	=	2,321		
Index 1: Score												48	

*Gr. 4 only

Index 2: Student Progress

Index 2 measures student progress by subject and by student demographics: race/ethnicity, special education, and ELLs. For 2014, progress by subject is available for reading and mathematics and is assessed by STAAR, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate. The ELL progress measure is also used in Index 2 calculations.

In 2014, high schools/K-12 campuses, as well as alternative education campuses and charter districts evaluated by alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions, are not evaluated on Index 2. The progress measure results for high schools/K-12 campuses and AEA campuses are included in the Index 2 evaluation for the district. Evaluation on Index 2 resumes in 2015 for high schools/K-12 campuses and AEA charter districts and AECs.

Points for progress in each subject are weighted by the students' level of performance: one point for each percentage of tests that *Met* or *Exceeded* progress; one additional point for each percentage of tests that *Exceeded* progress. Cumulative performance (met and exceeded progress plus exceeded progress) in each subject therefore contributes from 0 to 200 points to the groups consisting of All Students and each student group that meets minimum size criteria. The maximum number of possible points depends on campus type and student population and demographics. Index 2 is calculated by dividing the total points (cumulative performance) by the maximum number of possible points, resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100 for all campuses and districts.

The following examples show how the weighted progress rate is computed for reading and how the Index 2 outcomes are determined when the reading and mathematics results are combined.

Example 2.1. Index 2 calculation for reading progress												
STAAR Weighted Progress Rate: Reading	All	African Amer.	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
Number of Tests:	931	64	828						75	819		
# Met or Exceeded Progress	605	51	621						49	614		
# Exceeded Progress	186	16	124						4	164		
Percent of Tests: % Met or Exceeded Progress	65%	80%	75%						65%	75%		
% Exceeded Progress	20%	25%	15%						5%	20%		
Reading Weighted Progress Rate	85	105	90						70	95	445	1000

Example 2.2. Index 2 calculation to determine overall score												
STAAR Weighted Progress Rate	All	African Amer.	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
Reading	85	105	90						70	95	445	1000
Mathematics	85	105	90						70	95	445	1000
Total											890	2000
Index 2: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											45	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above represent student group indicators that do not meet the minimum size criteria.

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps

Index 3 emphasizes the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students and the two lowest performing racial/ethnic student groups. Groups are identified by campus or district and are based on prior year (2013) assessment results.

Tests are in reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies achievement. One point is given for each percentage of tests meeting the phase-in satisfactory performance standard or above on the STAAR assessment. New for 2014, one additional point is given for each percentage of tests meeting the advanced performance standard on the STAAR assessment. The maximum number of possible points depends on the student population and demographics. Index 3 is calculated by dividing total cumulative performance points by the maximum possible points, resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100 for all districts and campuses.

The following examples illustrate how the weighted performance rate is computed for reading and how the Index 3 outcomes are determined when the results are combined across all subject areas.

Example 3.1. Index 3 calculation for reading weighted performance					
STAAR Weighted Performance Rate	Economically Disadvantaged	Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Group - 1	Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Group - 2	Total Points	Maximum Points
Number of Tests	80	40	25		
# Phase-in Satisfactory Standard and above	80	20	25		
# Advanced Standard	40	0	25		
% Phase-in Satisfactory Standard and above	100%	50%	100%		
% Met Advanced Standard	50%	0%	100%		
Reading Weighted Performance Rate	150	50	200	400	600

Example 3.2. Index 3 calculations for overall score					
STAAR Weighted Performance Rate	Economically Disadvantaged	Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Group - 1	Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Group - 2	Total Points	Maximum Points
Reading	150	50	200	400	600
Mathematics	125	100	90	315	600
Writing	80	90	125	295	600
Science	120	40	90	250	600
Social Studies	50	40	80	170	600
Total				1430	3000
Index 3: Score (total points divided by maximum points)				48	

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

Index 4: Postsecondary readiness emphasizes the role of elementary and middle schools in preparing students for the rigors of high school, and the importance of earning a high school diploma that provides students with the foundation necessary for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military.

Index 4 is based on all four of the following components. However, when any of the three non-STAAR components are unavailable, Index 4 is based solely on the STAAR component. Elementary and middle school campuses do not report information on graduation rate, graduation diploma plans, or the postsecondary indicator. Elementary and middle school campuses report only STAAR results, therefore, the Index 4 evaluation of these campuses is based solely on the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard component.

For districts, high school campuses, and campuses serving grades K-12, the four components of Index 4 are equally weighted.

Index 4 Components	Weight
1. STAAR at Postsecondary Readiness Standard	25%
2. Graduation Rate	25%
3. Graduation Plan	25%
4. Postsecondary Indicator (College-Ready Graduates)	25%

The **STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard** is determined by the percentage of students with STAAR test results at or above the final Level II performance standard on two or more subject area tests.

Example 4.1: STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard												
STAAR Performance	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
% Meeting Postsecondary Readiness Standard	29%	16%		40%	23%		38%	36%			182	600
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard: Score (total points divided by maximum points)												30.3

The **Graduation Rate Score** reflects the highest number of points possible from the combined performance across graduation rates for grades 9-12. The rate requires tracking the status of a cohort of students from the time they enter grade 9 in 2009-10 through their expected graduation with the Class of 2013. A class consists of all members of a cohort, minus students who leave the Texas public school system for reasons other than graduation, earning a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or dropping out. Points are based on the longitudinal cohort of students used to calculate a four-year graduation rate or a five-year graduation rate, for all students and all students grouped by race/ethnicity, ELL, and special education. If a graduation rate is not available, then the annual dropout rate is used.

Example 4.2: Graduation Rate												
Graduation Rate	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
4-yr. Grad Rate	84.3%	78.8%			78.8%		91.6%	86.0%	44.2%	69.8%	533.5	700
5-yr. Grad Rate	85.1%	78.8%			80.0%		92.1%	84.0%	48.9%	77.5%	546.4	700
Highest Graduation Rate: Score											546.4	700
Graduation Rate: Score (best of total graduation points divided by maximum points)												78.1

The **Graduation Plan Score** is calculated as a rate based on a longitudinal cohort of students graduating under the Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP). If no longitudinal rate is available, the graduation plan score is based on an annual rate of students graduating under the Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP).

Example 4.3: Graduation Plan												
Graduation Plan	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
Longitudinal RHSP/DAP Rate	82.7%	76.4%			83.6%		83.0%				325.7	400
Graduation Plan: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											81.4	

The **Postsecondary Indicator Score** is based on college-ready graduates meeting or exceeding the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) criteria in both reading/English language arts (ELA) and mathematics on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) exit-level test, SAT, or ACT test.

Example 4.4: Postsecondary Indicator												
Postsecondary Indicator	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
College-ready graduates	82%	72%			78%		89%				321	400
Postsecondary Indicator: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											80.3	

The **Overall Index Score** for the four indicators for postsecondary readiness (described above) is multiplied by a weight and added together to determine an overall Index 4 score.

Example 4.5: Overall Index 4 Score				
Index 4 Component	Component Score	Multiply by	Weight of	Total Points
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Score	30.3	X	25%	7.6
Graduation Rate Score	78.1	X	25%	19.5
Graduation Plan Score	81.4	X	25%	20.4
Postsecondary Indicator Score	80.3	X	25%	20.1
Index 4: Score				68

Rounding: Component scores are rounded to one decimal place. Total points for each component are derived by multiplying the component score by 25% and rounding to one decimal place. The overall Index 4 score is the sum of the total points rounded to a whole number.

Example 4.6: Index 4 Calculation												
Overall Index Score												
Overall Performance	Component Score					Multiply by	Weight of			Total Points		
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Score	30.3					X	25%			7.6		
Graduation Rate Score	78.1					X	25%			19.5		
Graduation Plan Score	81.4					X	25%			20.4		
Postsecondary Indicator Score	80.3					X	25%			20.1		
Index 4: Score										68		
Indicator	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	ELL	Special Ed.	Total Points	Max. Points
• STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard												
% Meeting Postsecondary Readiness Standard	29%	16%		40%	23%		38%	36%			182	600
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											30.3	
• Graduation Rate												
4-yr. Graduation Rate	84.3%	78.8%			78.8%		91.6%	86.0%	44.2%	69.8%	533.5	700
5-yr. Graduation Rate	85.1%	78.8%			80.0%		92.1%	84.0%	48.9%	77.5%	546.4	700
Highest Graduation Rate: Score											546.4	700
Graduation Rate: Score (best of total graduation points divided by maximum points)											78.1	
• Graduation Plan												
Longitudinal RHSP/DAP Rate	82.7%	76.4%			83.6%		83.0%				325.7	400
RHSP/DAP: Score (total RHSP/DAP points divided by maximum points)											81.4	
• Postsecondary Indicator												
College-Ready Graduates	82%	72%			78%		89%				321	400
Postsecondary Indicator: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											80.3	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above represent student group indicators that do not meet the minimum size criteria.

AEA Campuses and Charter Districts Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

For alternative education campuses and charter districts evaluated under AEA provisions, the Index 4 score is based on two components:

1. STAAR scores based on the percent at Postsecondary Readiness Standard on two or more subject area tests; and
2. four-, five-, and six-year rates for graduates, continuing students, and GED recipients. If a graduation rate is not available, then annual dropout rate is used.

To reach the target established for Index 4 in 2014, AEA campuses and charter districts apply a weighted evaluation of the two indicators necessary for postsecondary readiness.

Index 4 Components for AEA Campuses and Charters	Weight
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard	25%
Graduation, Continuers, and GED Rate or Annual Dropout Rate	75%

Bonus points are added for a longitudinal cohort of students graduated under a four-year RHSP/DAP, or the annual rate of students graduated under a RHSP/DAP; a College-Ready Graduates measure; and an Excluded Students Credit. A maximum of 30 bonus points will be added to the final index score.

Example 4.7: Index 4 Composition for AEA charter districts and campuses with a graduation, continuer, and GED rate												
Component	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard												
% Meeting Postsecondary Readiness Standard	51%	42%	83%	55%	44%	31%	56%	52%			414	800
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											51.8	
• Graduation, Continuers, and GED Rate												
4-Year Rate	64.3%	58.8%			58.8%		71.6%	66.0%	34.2%	59.8%	413.5	700
5-Year Rate	65.1%	58.8%			60.0%		72.1%	64.0%	48.9%	57.5%	426.4	700
6-Year Rate	66.2%	58.8%			61.0%		72.1%		52.2%	58.2%	368.5	600
Highest Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rate: Score											368.5	600
Graduation, Continuers, and GED Rate: Score (best of total points divided by maximum points)											61.4	
• Bonus Points												
RHSP/DAP Rate (longitudinal/annual)	33.3%										33	
College-ready graduates											0	
Excluded students credit											0	
Total Bonus Points (maximum of 30)											30	

Example 4.8: Overall Index 4 Score for AEA charter districts and campuses with a graduation, continuer, and GED rate				
Overall Performance	Component Score	Multiply by	Weight of	Total Points
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Score	51.8	X	25%	13.0
Graduation, Continuers, GED Rate Score	61.4	X	75%	46.1
Bonus Points	30			30
Index 4: Score				89

Note: Blank cells in the examples above represent student group indicators that do not meet the minimum size criteria.

Rounding: Component scores are rounded to one decimal place. Total points for each component are derived by multiplying the component score by the respective weights and rounding to one decimal place. Bonus points are rounded to a whole number. The overall Index 4 score is the sum of the total points and bonus points rounded to a whole number.

Example 4.9: Index 4 Calculation for AEA charter districts and campuses with Gr. 9-12 but graduation rate not available												
• Overall Index 4 Score												
Overall Performance	Component Score		Multiply by		Weight of		Total Points					
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Score	50.6		X		25%		12.7					
Annual Dropout Rate Score	32.1		X		75%		24.1					
Bonus Points	25						25					
Index 4 Score							62					
Indicator	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
• STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard												
% Meets Postsecondary Readiness Standard	51%	42%	83%	51%	44%	30%	53%	51%			405	800
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard : Score (total points divided by maximum points)											50.6	
• Graduation, Continuers, and GED and Annual Dropout Rate												
Annual Dropout Rate	13.3%	11.3%			12.5%		17.2%					
Dropout Rate Conversion	33.5	43.5			37.5		14.0				128.5	400
Graduation, Continuers, and GED and Annual Dropout Rate: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											32.1	
• Bonus Points												
Annual RHSP/DAP Rate	20.6%										21	
College-ready graduates	3%										3	
Excluded students credit	1										1	
Total Bonus Points (maximum of 30)											25	

See *Appendix F – Sample Accountability Table and Index Calculation* for an example of index calculations.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators

The state accountability system uses a performance index framework, combining a broad set of indicators into a comprehensive evaluation of the entire campus or district. A description of the indicators follows.

Accountability Subset Rule

A subset of test results from both campuses and districts is used to calculate each performance index. The calculation includes only test results for students enrolled in the campus or district in the previous fall, as reported on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) October snapshot. Three test administration periods are considered for accountability purposes:

STAAR results included in the subset of campus/district accountability	If a student was enrolled in the campus/district on this date:
EOC summer 2013 administration	Fall 2012 enrollment snapshot
EOC fall 2013 administration	Fall 2013 enrollment snapshot
EOC spring 2014 administration	
Grades 3-8 spring 2014 administration	

The 2014 accountability subset rules apply to the STAAR performance results evaluated across all four indexes.

- Grades 3-8 – districts and campuses are responsible for students reported as enrolled in the fall (referred to as October snapshot) in the spring assessment results.
- End-of-Course (EOC) – districts and campuses are responsible for:
 - summer 2013 results for students reported as enrolled in fall 2012 snapshot;
 - fall results for students reported as enrolled in the fall 2013 snapshot; and
 - spring 2014 results for students reported as enrolled in the fall 2013 snapshot.

STAAR Retest Performance

The opportunity to retest is available to students who have taken grades 5 and 8 STAAR reading and mathematics, or EOC tests.

- Student Success Initiative (SSI) – For students in grades 5 and 8, performance indexes will include test results for reading and mathematics from the first administration and first re-test administration. The second re-test administration in June 2014 is not used.

The best result in each subject is selected for accountability and applied to campus and district performance. The best result is based on the highest student performance level or progress measure. The calculation for campus and district performance includes only test results for students enrolled in the campus or district in the previous fall, as reported on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) October snapshot.

- EOC – Districts and campuses are accountable for three EOC administrations: 1) summer results for students enrolled on the prior-year fall snapshot; 2) fall results for students

enrolled on the current-year fall snapshot; and 3) spring results for students enrolled on the fall snapshot (current school year). For students who are enrolled and tested on the same campus or district during the 2014 accountability cycle, calculation of the performance indexes will include the best EOC results among tests administered in summer 2013, fall 2013, or spring 2014. The following chart illustrates this process.

Fall 2012 Snapshot	Summer 2013	Fall 2013 Snapshot	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Campus A	CAMPUS A	Campus A	CAMPUS A	CAMPUS A
The best test result is selected. Each test meets the accountability subset rule.				

For students who enrolled and tested at a different campus or district during the 2013-14 school year, the student's single best result for each course is selected. If all test results have the same level of performance, then the most recent test result is selected in calculating the index. The selected test is applied to the campus and district that administered the test, if the student meets the accountability subset rule (discussed above).

Fall 2012 Snapshot	Summer 2013	Fall 2013 Snapshot	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Campus A	CAMPUS A	Campus A	CAMPUS B	CAMPUS B
The best test result is selected. However, only the Summer 2013 test meets the accountability subset rule.				

Index 1: Student Achievement

Index 1 is a snapshot of performance across subjects, on both general and alternative assessments, at the satisfactory performance standard.

Index 1 Targets for Districts and Campuses

Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2014 Index Targets.

Index 1 Student Performance Standards

Index 1 credits students who meet the Phase-in 1 Level II performance standard. ELL students in their second, third, and fourth year of enrollment in U.S. schools are credited for meeting or exceeding expectations on the new ELL Progress Measure. Students meeting the student equivalency standard on substitute assessments are also credited in the Index 1 calculation.

The Index 1 **Phase-in Satisfactory Standard** refers any of the following: meeting the Phase-in 1 Level II standard, meeting or exceeding expectations on the ELL Progress Measure, or meeting the equivalency standard on substitute assessments as a measure of overall student achievement.

Assessments Evaluated in 2014 Accountability Cycle			
	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Index 1: Student Achievement	STAAR End-of-Course		
	<i>Assessments</i>		
		STAAR: Algebra I English I – Reading English II – Reading Biology U.S. History	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Algebra I English I (Reading and Writing combined) English II (Reading and Writing combined) Biology U.S. History
	<i>Student Performance Standards</i>		
		STAAR: Phase-in 1 Level II or above ELL Progress Measures: Not Available Substitute Assessments: Not Available	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Phase-in 1 Level II or above <i>or</i> ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation <i>or</i> Substitute Assessments**: Meets Equivalency Standard
	<i>Retests</i>		
		Performance standards can be met by: End-of-Course (EOC) tests taken for the first time within the 2014 accountability cycle (summer 2013, fall 2013, or spring 2014); or, EOC tests that were retaken within the 2014 accountability cycle following a first attempt in a prior accountability cycle.	
	STAAR Grades 3 – 8		
	<i>Assessments</i>		
		n/a	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Grades 3 – 8 English Grades 3 – 5 Spanish
	<i>Student Performance Standards</i>		
		n/a	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Phase-in 1 Level II or above <i>or</i> ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation
<i>Retests</i>			
	For grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, performance standards can be met by tests taken in either the first administration or the May retest.		

* See following table for inclusion of ELL students based on ELL Progress Measure.

** For more information about the equivalency standard, please see

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter101/ch101dd.html>.

Assessments for English Language Learners

Index 1: Student Achievement	ELL Students		
	Years in U.S. Schools	English assessment	Spanish assessment
	First year	Not included	
	Second year	STAAR ELL Progress Measure	STAAR Phase-in 1 Level II
	Third year		
	Fourth year		
	Fifth year	STAAR Phase-in 1 Level II	
Sixth year or more*			

* Asylees/refugees are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

See *Appendix I – Inclusion of ELL Students in 2014 and Beyond* for more information.

Subjects Evaluated

Test results for all subject areas (Reading/English language arts (ELA), mathematics, writing, science, and social studies) are combined.

Student Groups Evaluated

All students, including ELLs described above, are evaluated as one group.

Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis:

- All students are evaluated; small numbers analysis applies only if STAAR tests consist of fewer than 10 tests, combined across all subjects.
- A three-year average is calculated using three years of Index 1 student achievement data for all students. The Index 1 calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The All Students group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 tests.
- The prior year 2012 and 2013 data used for small numbers analysis are the same results previously reported for those school years.

Accountability Subset

Please see accountability subset rules described earlier in this chapter.

Methodology

Assessment results are summed across all grade levels and subject areas. The number of assessments meeting the Index 1 Phase-in Satisfactory performance standard is divided by the number of assessments taken as described here:

$$\frac{\text{Number of Reading + Mathematics + Writing + Science + Social Studies Tests Meeting Phase-In Satisfactory Standard}}{\text{Number of Reading + Mathematics + Writing + Science + Social Studies Tests Taken}}$$

Rounding

The Index 1 Phase-in Satisfactory Standard calculation is expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.87% is rounded to 60%; 79.49% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

Index Score

Index 1 has one indicator; therefore, the total index points and index score are equivalent: Index Score = Total Points.

See *Appendix F – Sample Accountability Table and Index Calculation* for an example of how to calculate an index score.

Index 2: Student Progress

Index 2 measures student progress and provides an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for improving student performance independent of overall student achievement.

Index 2 Targets for Districts and Campuses

Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2014 Index Targets.

Index 2 Student Progress Standards

Index 2 credits students who meet the student level criteria for progress in either the STAAR Progress Measure or the ELL Progress Measure. Points for progress in each subject are weighted by the students' level of performance: one point for each percentage of tests that Met or Exceeded progress; one additional point for each percentage of tests that Exceeded progress.

The Index 2 **Student Progress Standards** refers to the combination of these results as a measure of overall student progress.

STAAR Progress Measure: Progress is measured at the student-level by the difference between the STAAR scores a student achieved in the prior and current years. A student's progress is then designated as *Did Not Meet*, *Met*, or *Exceeded*, depending upon the degree of difference in the scores.

New for 2014, STAAR progress measures are reported for EOC tests based on a student's first attempt of each EOC test; students who receive accelerated instruction and skip grades or courses, and students who test in a mathematics Spanish-version and subsequently in a mathematics English-version.

Information on how to calculate a STAAR Progress Measure can be found at the Student Assessment website in the STAAR® General Resources section. See: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/staar/>. A [Questions and Answers](#) document on the progress measure is posted at the same location.

ELL Progress Measure: New for 2014, the English Language Learner (ELL) Progress Measure is reported for ELL students. The ELL Progress Measure accounts for the time needed to acquire the English language and to fully demonstrate grade-level academic competency in English. Year-to-year performance expectations for the STAAR content-area tests identify ELL

student progress as meeting or exceeding an individual year-to-year expectation plan. An ELL student's plan is determined by the number of years the student has been enrolled in U.S. schools and the student's Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) composite proficiency level.

Information on how to calculate an ELL Progress Measure can be found at the Student Assessment/State Assessments for English Language Learners website in the General Resources section. See: <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/ell/>. A [Questions and Answers](#) document on the ELL Progress Measure is posted at the same location.

Assessments Evaluated in 2014 Accountability Cycle				
	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	
Index 2: Student Progress	STAAR End-of-Course			
	<i>Assessments</i>			
		STAAR: Algebra I English I – Reading English II – Reading	STAAR, STAAR L*, and STAAR Modified: Algebra I STAAR Alternate Subject Areas: English I (Reading and Writing combined) English II (Reading and Writing combined)	
	<i>Student Progress Standards</i>			
		STAAR Progress Measures: Meets or Exceeds Progress ELL Progress Measures: Not Available	STAAR Progress Measures: Meets or Exceeds Progress <i>or</i> ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation	
	<i>Retests</i>			
		Progress standards can be met by EOC tests taken for the first time within the 2014 accountability cycle (summer 2013, fall 2013, or spring 2014).		
	STAAR Grades 3 – 8			
	<i>Assessments</i>			
		n/a	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Grades 3 – 8 English Grades 3 – 5 Spanish	
<i>Student Progress Standards</i>				
	n/a	STAAR Progress Measures: Meets or Exceeds Progress <i>or</i> ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation		
<i>Retests</i>				
	For grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, progress standards can be met by tests taken in either the first administration or the May retest.			

* See following table for inclusion of ELL students based on ELL Progress Measure.

Assessments for English Language Learners

Index 2: Student Progress	ELL Students		
	Years in U.S. Schools	English assessment	Spanish assessment
	First year	Not included	
	Second year	STAAR ELL Progress Measure	STAAR Progress Measure
	Third year		
	Fourth year		
	Fifth year	STAAR Progress Measure	
Sixth year or more*			

* Asylees/refugees are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

See *Appendix I – Inclusion of ELL Students in 2014 and Beyond* for more information.

For students who take the STAAR reading Spanish-version in 2013, and transition in 2014 to the STAAR reading English version and do not have a STAAR progress measure or ELL progress measure, Index 2 is calculated as follows:

- Phase-in 1 Level II (English-version): One point for each percent of ELL students meeting phase-in 1 Level II or above; and
- Final Level II (English-version): One additional point for each percent of ELL students meeting the Final Level II standard.

Subjects Evaluated: Reading/ELA and mathematics are evaluated for applicable grades.

Student Groups Evaluated: Ten student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Students served by special education
- ELL students identified as having limited English proficiency during the reported school year
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis:

- All students are evaluated; and
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 test results attributable to the group.
- Small numbers analysis applies only if the All Students group consists of fewer than 10 tests.
- A two-year average is calculated for each subject area using two years of student progress data for the all students group. The Index 2 calculation is based on an aggregated two-year uniform average.
- The All Students group is evaluated if the two-year average has at least 10 tests.
- The prior year 2013 data used for small numbers analysis are the same results previously reported for that school year.

Accountability Subset

Please see accountability subset rules described earlier in this chapter.

Methodology: Points are weighted according to performance.

- Met or Exceeded Progress – one point for each percentage of tests at the Met or Exceeded progress level.
- Exceeded Progress – one additional point for each percentage of tests at the Exceeded progress level.

Rounding

The total weighted progress calculation is expressed as a percent: total points divided by maximum points, rounded to a whole number. For example, 479 total points divided by 800 maximum points is 59.87%, which is rounded to 60%; 79.49% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

Index Score

The Index 2 score is the rounded result of total points divided by the maximum points.

See *Appendix F – Sample Accountability Table and Index Calculation* for an example of how to calculate an index score.

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps

Index 3 emphasizes advanced academic achievement of the economically disadvantaged student group and the lowest performing racial/ethnic student groups at each campus and district.

Index 3 Targets for Districts and Campuses

Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2014 Index Targets.

Index 3 Student Performance Standards

Evaluation of Index 3 is based on students who meet the **Phase-in Satisfactory** and **Advanced** performance standards. The **Phase-in Satisfactory** standard for Index 3 refers to the combination of Phase-in 1 Level II performance, and ELL Progress Measure results. *Note that the Phase-in Satisfactory performance results used in Index 3 do not include substitute assessments.*

The Index 3 Advanced standards are based on Level III Advanced performance and given twice the weight of the Phase-in Satisfactory standard. ELL students in their second, third, and fourth year of enrollment in U.S. schools, are also credited two points in Index 3 when the Final Level II performance is met.

Advanced standards are the highest assessment level, where student performance gaps are the greatest, and likely to be a strong indicator of student preparedness for the next grade or course with little to no academic intervention required. Advanced standards are also tied to statutory and accountability goals stating Texas will be among the top 10 states in postsecondary readiness by 2020, with no significant achievement gaps by race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status.

Assessments Evaluated in 2014 Accountability Cycle			
	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps	STAAR End-of-Course		
	<i>Assessments</i>		
		STAAR: Algebra I English I – Reading English II – Reading Biology U.S. History	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Algebra I English I (Reading and Writing combined) English II (Reading and Writing combined) Biology U.S. History
	<i>Student Performance Standards</i>		
		STAAR: Phase-in 1 Level II and Level III Advanced ELL Progress Measures: Not Available	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Phase-in 1 Level II or above and Level III Advanced <i>or</i> ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation and STAAR Final Level II or above
	<i>Retests</i>		
		Performance standards can be met by: EOC tests taken for the first time within the 2014 accountability cycle (summer 2013, fall 2013, or spring 2014); or, EOC tests that were retaken within the 2014 accountability cycle following a first attempt in a prior accountability cycle.	
	STAAR Grades 3 – 8		
	<i>Assessments</i>		
		n/a	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Grades 3 – 8 English Grades 3 – 5 Spanish
<i>Student Performance Standards</i>			
	n/a	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR Modified, and STAAR Alternate: Phase-in 1 Level II or above and Level III Advanced <i>or</i> ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation and STAAR Final Level II or above	
<i>Retests</i>			
	For grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, performance standards can be met by tests taken in either the first administration or the May retest.		

* See following table for inclusion of ELL students based on ELL Progress Measure and STAAR Final Level II.

Assessments for English Language Learners

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps	ELL Students		
	Years in U.S. Schools	English assessment	Spanish assessment
	<i>First year</i>	Not included	
	<i>Second year</i>	One Point: STAAR ELL Progress Measure	One Point: STAAR Phase-in 1 Level II
	<i>Third year</i>		
	<i>Fourth year</i>	Two Points: STAAR Final Level II	
	<i>Fifth year</i>	One Point: STAAR Phase-in 1 Level II	
<i>Sixth year or more*</i>	Two Points: STAAR Advanced Level III		

* Asylees/refugees are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

See *Appendix I – Inclusion of ELL Students in 2014 and Beyond* for more information.

Student Groups Evaluated:

- Economically Disadvantaged
- Two Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic groups determined by comparing performance of racial/ethnic groups on the Index 1 student achievement indicator from the prior year (2012-13). (Racial/ethnic groups are not included in Index 1, but the disaggregated student group rates are reported on the Index 1 data table. In the event that two or more of the lowest performing groups (meeting minimum size) have the same performance rate, the lowest performing groups with the largest denominator will be selected.)

Prior Year Minimum Size Criteria

The following criteria are used to identify the race/ethnicity student groups based on the prior-year (2012-13) performance results.

- 1) Identify the racial/ethnic student groups that have 25 or more tests in reading/ELA and 25 or more tests in mathematics in the prior year.
- 2) Select the lowest performance student group(s) that meet the minimum size above based on all subjects results in the prior year.
 - If the campus or district has three or more racial/ethnic student groups that meet prior year minimum size criteria, performance of the two lowest performing racial/ethnic groups is included in the index if the current year minimum size criteria are met, as described below.
 - If the campus or district has two racial/ethnic student groups that meet minimum size criteria above, performance of the lowest performing racial/ethnic group is included in the index if the current year minimum size criteria are met, as described below.
 - If the campus or district has only one racial/ethnic student group that meets the prior year minimum size criteria, then the racial/ethnic group is not included in the index.

Current Year Minimum Size Criteria

The current year (2013-14) subject area performance results for the identified race/ethnicity student group(s) are included in the Index 3 evaluation if there are at least 25 test results in the subject area.

Campuses and districts that do not meet minimum size criteria in any subject area for the race/ethnicity student groups are evaluated on the economically disadvantaged student group alone.

Small Numbers Analysis:

- Small numbers analysis applies to the Economically Disadvantaged student group by subject. If the number of STAAR results by subject is fewer than 10 in the accountability subset, a two-year average is calculated for the Economically Disadvantaged student group. The Index 3 calculation is based on the aggregated two-year uniform average.
- The prior year 2013 data used for small numbers analysis are the same results previously reported for that school year.
- Small numbers analysis is not applied to racial/ethnic student groups. If there are fewer than 25 test results in a subject area for the identified lowest performing racial/ethnic student groups, that group's performance on that subject area is excluded from Index 3 calculations.

Accountability Subset

See the accountability subset rules described earlier in this chapter.

Methodology: Index 3 results are based on points reflecting STAAR performance.

- Phase-in Satisfactory – one point for each percentage of tests meeting the phase-in Satisfactory standard or the Advanced Standard
- Advanced – one additional point for each percentage of tests meeting the Advanced standard

Rounding

The total performance rate calculation is expressed as a percent, Total points divided by maximum points, rounded to a whole number. For example, 800 total points divided by 1,500 maximum points is 53.33% is rounded to 53%; 79.49% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

Index Score

The Index 3 score is the rounded result of total points divided by the maximum points.

See *Appendix F – Sample Accountability Table and Index Calculation* for an example of how to calculate an index score.

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

Index 4 Postsecondary Readiness emphasizes the role of elementary and middle schools in preparing students for the rigors of high school, and the importance of earning a high school diploma that prepares students for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military. The index includes test performance for high schools and grades 3-8 at the Postsecondary Readiness Standard.

Index 4 Targets for Districts and Campuses

Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2014 Index Targets.

Index 4 Student Performance Standards

Index 4 credits campuses and districts for students who meet Postsecondary Readiness Standards on two or more tests. Students tested in only one subject area are required to meet the Postsecondary Readiness standard on that test for credit in Index 4. The Postsecondary Readiness Standards are based on the combined results of students achieving the Final Level II performance or above and students meeting the student equivalency standard on substitute assessments.

Index 4 includes assessment results for STAAR and STAAR Modified. The inclusion of Final Level II results for STAAR and STAAR Modified indicates that students performing at this level are sufficiently prepared for the next grade or course, including post-secondary endeavors, as long as appropriate supports are provided for the students taking the modified assessments. Students taking STAAR Alternate are excluded from this index for 2014 because there is not an equivalent performance standard to use on this assessment that is comparable to the Final Level II standards included in Index 4 for STAAR and STAAR Modified.

Exclusion of STAAR Alternate from Index 4

The STAAR Alternate, unlike the STAAR and the STAAR Modified, was not designed to directly assess the grade-level curriculum standards. A student with a significant cognitive disability accesses instruction and testing through the instruction and assessment of prerequisite skills that are linked to the grade-level curriculum standards. Unlike the standard setting process for STAAR and STAAR Modified that linked performance on grade-level curriculum standards to post-secondary readiness, the standard setting process for STAAR Alternate—due to the nature of the population assessed—only established a link between Level II or Level III performance standards and student ability to perform on subsequent prerequisite assessment tasks in the following grade or course with instructional support. Because the measurement of a student’s ability to achieve grade-level expectations is integral to assessing a student’s ability to achieve post-secondary readiness, the STAAR Alternate policy definitions do not reference post-secondary success.

When standards are set for the new STAAR Alternate assessment that will be administered in the 2014-2015 school year, options will be explored relative to the validity of establishing post-secondary readiness links when establishing STAAR Alternate standards on the assessment.

Evaluation of Index 4 components

Index 4 is based on all four of the following components **or** solely on the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard component when any of the three non-STAAR components are unavailable. For districts, high school campuses, and campuses serving grades K-12, the four components of Index 4 are equally weighted.

Index 4 Components for Non-AEA Districts and Campuses		Weight
1.	STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard	25%
2.	Graduation Rate	25%
3.	Graduation Plan (Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP) Rate	25%
4.	Postsecondary Indicator (College-Ready Graduates)	25%

Elementary and middle school campuses report only STAAR results, therefore, the Index 4 evaluation of these campuses is based solely on this component.

1. STAAR Component: Postsecondary Readiness Standard

STAAR percent *Met* Final Level II on two or more STAAR subject area tests for all students combined and students grouped by race/ethnicity. If only one subject-area test is taken, the STAAR component for that student is included, based on the single subject-area test only.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard —Student Groups Evaluated: Eight student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Assessments Evaluated in 2014 Accountability Cycle				
	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	
Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness	STAAR End-of-Course*			
	<i>Assessments</i>			
		STAAR: Algebra I English I – Reading English II – Reading Biology U.S. History	STAAR and STAAR Modified: Algebra I English I (Reading and Writing combined) English II (Reading and Writing combined) Biology U.S. History	
	<i>Student Performance Standards</i>			
		STAAR: Final Level II or above Substitute Assessments: Not Available	STAAR and STAAR Modified: Final Level II or above <i>or</i> Substitute Assessments: Meets Equivalency Standard**	
	<i>Retests</i>			
		Performance standards can be met by EOC tests taken for the first time or any subsequent retests in the 2014 accountability cycle (summer 2013, fall 2013, or spring 2014).		
	STAAR Grades 3 – 8*			
	<i>Assessments</i>			
		n/a	STAAR and STAAR Modified: Grades 3 – 8 English Grades 3 – 5 Spanish	
<i>Student Performance Standards</i>				
	n/a	STAAR and STAAR Modified: Final Level II or above		
<i>Retests</i>				
	For grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, performance standards can be met by tests taken in either the first administration or the May retest.			

* See following table for inclusion of ELL students based on ELL Progress Measure.

** For more information about the equivalency standard, please see

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter101/ch101dd.html>.

Assessments for English Language Learners

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness	ELL Students		
	Years in U.S. Schools	English assessment	Spanish assessment*
	<i>First year</i>	Not included	Not included
	<i>Second year</i>		STAAR Final Level II
	<i>Third year</i>		
	<i>Fourth year</i>	STAAR Final Level II	STAAR Final Level II
	<i>Fifth year</i>		
<i>Sixth year or more**</i>			

* ELL students in grades 3 – 5 tested on Spanish versions in *all* subjects.

** Asylees/refugees are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

See *Appendix I – Inclusion of ELL Students in 2014 and Beyond* for more information.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard —Minimum Size Criteria:

- All Students – the group comprising of All Students is evaluated if there are at least 10 students in the STAAR component.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students in the STAAR component.
- Small numbers analysis is not applied to this indicator.

Accountability Subset

Please see the accountability subset rules described earlier in this chapter.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard —Methodology

The percent of students meeting the Final Level II performance standard in two or more subject areas **or** one subject area, if only one subject area test is taken. This component is defined as:

$$\frac{\text{Number of students meeting the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard on at least two subject area tests}}{\text{Number of students with test results in two or more subject areas}} + \frac{\text{Number of students meeting the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard on the subject area test}}{\text{Number of students with test results in only one subject area}}$$

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard —Rounding

The percent *Met* STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard calculation is expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.87% is rounded to 60%; 79.49% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

2. Graduation Rate (or Annual Dropout Rate) Component

High school graduation rates include the four-year and five-year graduation rates or annual dropout rate, if no graduation rate is available.

- Class of 2013 four-year graduation rate is calculated for campuses and districts with students in grade 9 and either grade 11 or 12 in both years one and five of the cohort. Alternatively, the rate can be based on campuses and districts with grade 12 in both years one and five of the cohort.

- Class of 2012 five-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for one additional year.
- 2012-13 annual dropout rate for grades 9-12 is calculated for campuses and districts with students in grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (only if no graduation rate available).

Graduation Rate—Student Groups Evaluated: Ten student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Students served by special education
- ELL student group: Students who were ever identified as limited English proficient since entering grade 9 in the Texas public school system
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Graduation Rate—Minimum Size Criteria:

- All students – All students are evaluated; small numbers analysis applies if fewer than 10 students in the class.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students in the class.

Graduation Rate—Small Numbers Analysis:

- Small numbers analysis applies to all students, if the number of students in the class of 2013 cohort (4-year) or class of 2012 cohort (5-year) is fewer than 10. The total number of students in the class cohort consists of graduates, continuing students, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and dropouts.
- A three-year-average graduation rate is calculated for all students. The calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The All Students group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 students.

Graduation Rate—Methodology

The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort of first-time students in grade 9 through their expected graduation three years later. The five-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for one additional year. A cohort is defined as the group of students who begin grade 9 in Texas public schools for the first time in the same school year plus students who, in the next three school years, enter the Texas public school system in the grade level expected for the cohort. Students who transfer out of the Texas public school system over the four or five years for non-graduate reasons are removed from the class.

The four-year and five-year graduation rate measures the percent of graduates in a class.

$$\frac{\text{Number of Graduates in the Class}}{\text{Number of Students in the Class}} \\ (\text{Graduates} + \text{Continuers} + \text{GED Recipients} + \text{Dropouts})$$

Graduation Rate—Rounding

Four-year and five-year graduation rates used in Index 4 calculations are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 74.875% rounds to 74.9%, not 75%.

Annual Dropout Rate Component

For districts and campuses that serve students enrolled in grades 9-12, the grade 9-12 annual dropout rate is used if a four- or five-year graduation rate is not available.

Annual Dropout Rate—Student Groups Evaluated: Ten student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Students served by special education
- ELL student group: students identified as limited English proficient during the reported school year
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Annual Dropout Rate—Minimum Size Criteria:

- All students – All students are evaluated; small numbers analysis applies if fewer than 10 students enrolled during the school year.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students enrolled during the school year.

Annual Dropout Rate—Small Numbers Analysis:

- Small numbers analysis applies to the group of all students if the number of students enrolled in grades 9-12 during the 2012-13 school year is less than 10.
- A three-year-average annual dropout rate is calculated for all students. The calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The All Students group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 students.

Annual Dropout Rate—Methodology

The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in grades 9-12 designated as having dropped out by the number of students enrolled in grades 9-12 at any time during the 2012-13 school year.

$$\frac{\text{Number of students who dropped out during the school year}}{\text{Number of students enrolled during the school year}}$$

Annual Dropout Rate—Conversion

The annual dropout rate is a measure of negative performance. In order to include annual dropout rate in the index, the rate must be converted to a positive measure.

$$100 - (\text{Grade 9-12 Annual Dropout Rate} \times 10) \text{ with a floor of zero}$$

Annual Dropout Rate—Rounding

Grade 9-12 Annual Dropout Rates used in Index 4 calculations are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 24 dropouts divided by 2,190 students enrolled in grades 9-12 is 1.095% which rounds to 1.1% annual dropout rate.

3. Graduation Plan (RHSP/DAP Rate) Component

- The graduation plan component is based on a four-year longitudinal cohort and represents the percent of students in the class of 2013 who began grade 9 in 2009-10 and graduated under the RHSP or DAP.
- Alternatively, the annual percent of RHSP/DAP graduates for the 2012-13 school year applies to districts or campuses that do not have a four-year longitudinal graduation cohort or do not meet the minimum size requirement. The annual RHSP/DAP graduate rate also applies to new campuses until sufficient data to calculate a longitudinal graduation rate is available.

RHSP/DAP Rate—Student Groups Evaluated: Eight student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

RHSP/DAP Rate—Minimum Size Criteria:

- All Students – All students are evaluated; small numbers analysis applies if there are fewer than 10 graduates.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 graduates.

RHSP/DAP Rate—Small Numbers Analysis:

- Small numbers analysis applies to all students if the total number of graduates is less than 10.
- The class of 2013 RHSP/DAP rate used in 2014 is based on a new longitudinal calculation that was reported for the first time in fall 2013 for the class of 2012. As a result, an aggregated two-year uniform average RHSP/DAP rate is calculated for all students. The annual RHSP/DAP rate will have a similar three-year uniform average.
- The All Students group is evaluated if the uniform average has at least 10 graduates.

RHSP/DAP Rate—Methodology

The RHSP/DAP longitudinal rate applies to high schools and districts with adequate enrollment data. The rate requires tracking the status of a cohort of students from the time they enter grade 9 in 2009-10 through their expected graduation with the class of 2013. A class consists of all members of a cohort, minus students who leave the Texas public school system for reasons other than graduation, earning a GED certificate, or dropping out. The rate is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{Number of RHSP/DAP graduates in the Class}}{\text{Number of graduates in the Class}}$$

When applicable, the RHSP/DAP graduates annual rate is calculated as the percent of prior year graduates reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the RHSP or DAP.

$$\frac{\text{Number of RHSP/DAP annual graduates}}{\text{Number of annual graduates}}$$

RHSP/DAP Rate—Rounding

RHSP/DAP rates are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 540 RHSP/DAP graduates divided by 570 total graduates is 94.736%, which rounds to 94.7%.

4. Postsecondary Component: College-Ready Graduates

This postsecondary component is defined as the percent of graduates meeting the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness standards in both reading/ELA and mathematics; specifically, high school graduates who met the college-ready criteria on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) exit-level test, or the SAT test, or the ACT test, in both English language arts and mathematics. For 2014 accountability, students reported as graduates in the 2012-13 school year are required to test on the TAKS exit-level test; therefore, the indicator definition requires 11th grade TAKS results from the spring of 2012.

College-Ready Graduates—Student Groups Evaluated: Eight student groups are evaluated.

- All students

- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

College-Ready Graduates—Minimum Size Criteria:

- All Students – All students are evaluated; small numbers analysis applies if fewer than 10 graduates in 2012-13.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 graduates in 2012-13.

College-Ready Graduates—Small Numbers Analysis:

- Small numbers analysis applies to all students if the total number of graduates is less than 10.
- A three-year average college-ready graduates rate is calculated for all students. The calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The All Students group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 graduates.

College-Ready Graduates—Methodology: This component is defined as:

$$\frac{\text{Number of annual graduates meeting TSI criteria in both reading/ELA and mathematics}}{\text{Number of annual graduates with results in both subjects to evaluate}}$$

College-Ready Graduates—Rounding

The percent meeting college-ready criteria calculation is expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.87% is rounded to 60%; 79.49% rounds to 79%; and 89.5% rounds to 90%.

Index 4 Score

The Index 4 overall score is the rounded sum of the weighted four component scores: STAAR, graduation rate, graduation plan, and postsecondary/college-ready graduates.

See *Appendix F – Sample Accountability Table and Index Calculation* for an example of how to calculate an index score.

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness for AEA Campuses and Charter Districts

Alternative procedures applicable to the Index 4 calculation are provided for approved campuses and charter districts serving at-risk students in alternative education programs. For more information on the alternative education accountability (AEA) eligibility criteria, please see *Chapter 6 – Other Accountability System Processes*.

Index 4 Targets for AEA Campuses and Charters

Please refer to Chapter 2 for a detailed discussion of 2014 Index Targets.

Index 4 Student Performance Standards

Index 4 credits campuses and districts for students who meet Postsecondary Readiness Standards on two or more tests. Students tested in only one subject area are required to meet the Postsecondary Readiness standard on that test for credit in Index 4. The Postsecondary Readiness Standards are based on the combined results of students achieving the Final Level II

performance or above and students meeting the student equivalency standard on substitute assessments.

For a charter district or alternative education campus (AEC) evaluated by AEA provisions, Index 4 is based on two components, weighted as follows.

	Index 4 Components for AEA Campuses and Charters	Weight
1.	STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard	25%
2.	Graduation/Annual Dropout Rate Component: Four-, Five-, or Six-year Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rate or Annual Dropout Rate	75%

To reach the absolute targets established for Index 4 in 2014, AEA campuses and charters apply a weighted evaluation of two components necessary for postsecondary readiness.

Bonus points, described later in this section, are earned according to either the longitudinal or annual rate of RHSP/DAP graduates, excluded students credit, and the postsecondary indicator. A maximum of 30 bonus points is added to the final index score.

1. STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard

The STAAR component, described above, is calculated in the same manner for AEA campuses and charters.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard —Minimum Size Criteria:

- All Students – All students are evaluated; small numbers analysis applies if fewer than 10 students.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students in the STAAR component.
- Small numbers analysis is not applied to this indicator.

Accountability Subset

Please see the accountability subset rules described earlier in this chapter.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Methodology

The percent of students meeting the Postsecondary Readiness Standard in two or more subject areas **or** one subject area, if only one subject area test is taken.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Rounding

The percent Met Postsecondary Readiness Standard calculation is expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.87% rounds to 60%; 79.49% rounds to 79%; and 89.5% rounds to 90%.

2. Graduation/Annual Dropout Rate Component

The graduation rate calculation is modified to credit AEA campuses and charters for graduates, continuing students (continuers), and GED recipients. Four-year, five-year, and six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rates are calculated for AEA campuses and charters. The grade 9-12 annual dropout rate is used if no combined graduation, continuer, and GED rate is available.

- Class of 2013 four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rates are calculated for AEA campuses and charters with students in grade 9 and either grade 11 or 12 in both years one and year five, or with grade 12 in both years one and year five.

- Class of 2012 five-year graduation, continuer, and GED rates follow the same cohort of students for one additional year; therefore, most AEA campuses and charters that have a four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate in one year will have a five-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate for that cohort in the following year. The five-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate lags behind the four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate by one year.
- Class of 2011 six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rates continue to follow the same cohort of students for one additional year; therefore, most AEA campuses and charters that have a five-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate in one year will have a six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate for that cohort in the following year. The six year graduation, continuer, and GED rate lags behind the four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate by two years.
- Annual Dropout Rate for school year 2012-13 for grades 9-12. If an AEA charter or campus has students enrolled in grade 9, 10, 11, or 12 but does not have a four-year, five-year, or six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate, then grade 9-12 annual dropout rate is used. This calculation is modified to give points to AEA campuses and charters for annual dropout rates lower than 20.0.

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Student Groups Evaluated: 10 student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Students served by special education
- ELL student group: Students who were ever identified as limited English proficient since entering grade 9 in the Texas public school system
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races.

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Minimum Size Criteria:

- All Students – All students are evaluated; small numbers analysis applies if fewer than 10 students in the class.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students in the class.

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Small Numbers Analysis:

- Small numbers analysis applies if there are fewer than 10 students in the Class of 2013 (4-year), Class of 2012 (5-year) or Class of 2011 (6-year). The total number of students in the class cohort consists of graduates, continuers, GED recipients, and dropouts.
- A three-year-average graduation, continuer, and GED rate is calculated for all students. The calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The All Students group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 students.

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Methodology

The four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate follows a cohort of first-time students in grade 9 through their expected graduation three years later. The five-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for one additional year. The six-year graduation rate continues to follow the same cohort of students for one additional year. A cohort is defined as the group of students who begin grade 9 in Texas public schools for the first time in the same school year plus students who, in the next three school years, enter the Texas public school system in the grade level expected for the cohort. Students who transfer out of the Texas public school system over the four, five, or six years due to non-graduate, non-dropout reasons are

removed from the class. The graduation, continuer, and GED rate measures the percent of graduates, continuers, and GED recipients in a cohort.

$$\frac{\text{Number of Graduates + Continuers + GED Recipients in the Class}}{\text{Number of Students in the Class}} \\ (\text{Graduates + Continuers + GED Recipients + Dropouts})$$

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Rounding

Four-year, five-year, and six-year graduation rates used in Index 4 calculations are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%, not 75%.

Annual Dropout Rates Included

The annual dropout rate is modified to give AEA campuses and charters points for rates lower than 20.0. If an AEA charter or campus has students enrolled in grade 9, 10, 11, or 12 but does not have a four-year, five-year, or six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate, then grade 9-12 annual dropout rate is used. This calculation is modified to give points to AEA campuses and charters for annual dropout rates lower than 20.0.

Annual Dropout Rates—Student Groups Evaluated: 10 student groups are evaluated.

- All Students
- Students served by Special Education
- ELL students identified as students with limited English proficiency during the reported school year
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Annual Dropout Rates—Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis

Please refer to the previous section for information on the minimum size criteria and small numbers analysis for this indicator.

Annual Dropout Rates—Methodology

The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in grades 9-12 designated as dropouts by the number of students enrolled in grades 9-12 at any time during the 2012-13 school year.

$$\frac{\text{Number of student who dropped out during the school year}}{\text{Number of students enrolled during the school year}}$$

Annual Dropout Rates—Conversion

The annual dropout rate is a measure of negative performance. In order to include annual dropout rate in the index, the rates must be converted to a positive measure. The conversion calculation is modified for AEA provisions.

$$100 - (\text{Grade 9-12 Annual Dropout Rate} \times 5) \text{ with a floor of zero}$$

Annual Dropout Rates—Rounding

Grade 9-12 annual dropout rates used in Index 4 calculations are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 24 grade 9-12 students reported as dropouts divided by 2,190 students enrolled in grades 9-12 is 1.095% which is rounded to 1.1% annual dropout rate.

Bonus Point Indicators for AEA Campuses and Charters

A maximum of 30 bonus points are added to the Index 4 score for the following indicators.

- RHSP/DAP rates based on the four-year longitudinal cohort. For AEA campuses and districts that use the Annual Dropout Rate, an annual RHSP/DAP rate is calculated for bonus points. The annual rate is also used if the longitudinal RHSP/DAP data does not meet the minimum size requirement.
- College-Ready Graduates rates based on the graduates reported in the 2012-13 school year who met the TSI criteria on the TAKS exit-level test, or the SAT test, or the ACT test in both ELA and mathematics.
- Excluded Students Credit will give AEA campuses and districts bonus points for serving recovered dropouts and other students who graduate or earn a GED, but are statutorily excluded from the graduation and dropout rate calculations.

RHSP/DAP Rate (longitudinal or annual):

- Student Groups: All Students only
- Please refer to the previous section for information on the minimum size criteria, small numbers analysis, and methodology for this indicator.

For AEA campuses and districts that use the Annual Dropout Rate, the RHSP/DAP annual rate is calculated as the percent of prior year graduates reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the RHSP or DAP. Please refer to the previous section for information on the minimum size criteria and small numbers analysis for this indicator.

College-Ready Graduates—Minimum Size Criteria:

- Student Groups: All Students only
- Please refer to the previous section for information on the minimum size criteria, small numbers analysis, and methodology for this indicator.

College-Ready Graduates—Rounding

The percent meeting college-ready criteria calculation is expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.87% is rounded to 60%; 79.49% rounds to 79%; and 89.5% rounds to 90%.

Excluded Students Credit:

- Student Groups: All Students only.
- Minimum Size: None; the AEA excluded students credit is based on the four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate with exclusions which may be subject to small numbers analysis.
- Methodology: Number of graduates, continuers, and GED recipients in the 4-year graduation cohort without exclusions (federal rate) minus the number of graduates, continuers, and GED recipients in the 4-year graduation cohort with exclusions (state rate).

Graduates, continuers, and GED recipients from 4-year graduation cohort *without* exclusions (federal rate) of most recent cohort (Class of 2013)

Graduates, continuers, and GED recipients from 4-year graduation cohort *with* exclusions (state rate) of same cohort (Class of 2013)

With a floor of zero

The number of students derived from this calculation is added as bonus points to the overall Index 4 score.

Index 4 Score for AEA Campuses and Charters

The STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard component contributes 25 percent of the points. The graduation/annual dropout rate component contributes 75 percent of the points. A maximum of 30 bonus points are added to the Index 4 score. The Index 4 score for AEA campuses and charters is the sum of the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard component score, graduation/annual dropout rate score, and bonus points.

As noted, the RHSP/DAP rate along with the college-ready graduates rate and excluded students credit contribute bonus points, which are added to the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard component and the graduation rate component to determine the overall Index 4 score.

See *Appendix F – Sample Accountability Table and Index Calculation* for an example of how to calculate an index score.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 5 – Distinction Designations

Distinction designations are awarded in recognition of outstanding achievement in specific areas. Campus distinctions are based on indicators of student performance in comparison to forty similar campuses.

For 2014, distinction designations are awarded in the following areas:

- Academic Achievement in Reading/English Language Arts (*campus only*)
- Academic Achievement in Mathematics (*campus only*)
- Academic Achievement in Science (*campus only*)
- Academic Achievement in Social Studies (*campus only*)
- Top 25 Percent: Student Progress (*campus only*)
- Top 25 Percent: Closing Performance Gaps (*campus only*)
- Postsecondary Readiness (*campus and district*)

Campuses and charter districts evaluated by alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions are not eligible to earn distinction designations.

Distinction Designation Labels

Reports for campuses and districts show one of the following labels for each distinction designation.

Distinction Earned. The campus or district is rated *Met Standard* and has met the criteria for the distinction designation.

No Distinction Earned. The campus or district did not meet the distinction designation criteria or was rated *Improvement Required*. (Those that are later granted a rating of *Met Standard* on appeal are eligible to be evaluated and may earn distinctions.)

Not Eligible. The campus or district does not have results to evaluate for the distinction designation, is evaluated by AEA provisions, is labeled *Not Rated* or *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*, or is paired.

Campus Comparison Groups

Each campus is assigned to a unique comparison group that consists of schools (from anywhere in the state), that closely match the “target” school. These are first identified by school type: Elementary, Middle School, High School, and Elementary/Secondary. Schools that do not match a typical grade span are in the group that most closely matches it. New for 2014—grade span is also used to identify similar campuses so that campuses with unique grade configurations are more closely matched (See the *School Types* chart in chapter 2 for more information.) Within those categories, schools are grouped with 40 other schools that are most similar on campus size, low grade/high grade, percent economically disadvantaged students, mobility rate, and percent of English language learners.

All distinction designations for a campus are based on performance that is in the top quartile (Q1) of its comparison group.

- For the Academic Achievement Distinction Designations (AADD), there must be at least 20 campuses in the campus comparison group for a particular indicator. That is, if fewer than 20 campuses in the comparison group have an indicator, that indicator cannot be

used to earn the distinction. This may affect schools with an uncommon range of grades

- Because schools do not have access to the performance of other schools until the accountability data tables are released on August 8, a school cannot see where it places within its comparison group and so cannot know whether it has earned a distinction until the ratings are released.

For details on how campus comparison groups are determined, see *Appendix H – Campus Comparison Groups*.

Distinction Designations

Academic Achievement in Reading/English Language Arts

An AADD is awarded to campuses for outstanding academic achievement in reading/English language arts (ELA) based on performance in the top 25 percent of its campus comparison group.

Who is eligible: Campuses that have a rating of *Met Standard*.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for *All Students* only for each indicator.

Minimum Size: Minimum size is determined separately for each indicator:

- *Attendance Rate.* Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If there are fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (e.g., 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be used toward the distinction. Note that attendance rate cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain a distinction.
- *Assessments (STAAR, AP/IB, SAT, and/or ACT).* Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. That is, if there are fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, that indicator cannot be used toward the distinction.
- *Participation*
 - *AP/IB and Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion.* Minimum size is 10 students completing a course.
 - *SAT/ACT Participation.* Minimum size is 10 graduates taking either the SAT or ACT.

Indicators:

AADD Reading/ELA Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K-12
Attendance rate	√	√	√	√
Greater Than Expected Student Growth in Reading/ELA		√	√	
Grade 3 Reading Performance (Level III)			√	√
Grade 4 Writing Performance (Level III)			√	√
Grade 7 Writing Performance (Level III)		√		√
Grade 8 Reading Performance (Level III)		√		√
AP/IB Examination Participation: ELA	√			√
AP/IB Examination Performance: ELA	√			√
SAT/ACT Participation	√			√
SAT Performance: ELA	√			√
ACT Performance: ELA	√			√
Total Reading/ELA Indicators	6	4	4	10

Methodology: This distinction is determined as follows:

Step 1: Performance on each indicator that applies to the school is determined. A school must have at least 1 indicator besides attendance rate.

Step 2: Performance for each indicator within the school’s campus comparison group is determined.

Step 3: To earn the distinction, the following must be met:

- High schools and combined elementary/secondary schools must be in the top quartile for 33 percent or more of their indicators.
- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of their indicators.

The methodology, date, and source for each indicator are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Other Information:

- *Greater Than Expected Student Growth in Reading/ELA.* For 2014, this indicator does not apply to high schools/K-12 campuses because there are limited STAAR student growth measures (Index 2) for grades 9-12.
- *Assessments.* A complete list of AP and IB assessments used in determining this distinction is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.
- *Attendance Rate.* This is based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12. The Attendance Rate indicator applies to all four subject areas of the AADDs. Consequently, this indicator cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain an AADD.
- *Methodology:* The methodology and data sources used in determining each of the indicators in the table above are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

<p><i>Example:</i> Colonial High School is fictional, but typical of Texas high schools with varied performance on the six indicators for this distinction. To determine whether it has earned the distinction, its performance is compared to its unique Campus Comparison Group—made up of itself and 40 other schools—for each of the six indicators. It must be in the top quartile (Q1) for at least 33% of the indicators for the AADD in Reading/ELA.</p>							
Step 1	What is Colonial High School’s performance on its six indicators?	Attendance rate 93.3%	AP/IB ELA Performance 72%	AP/IB ELA Participation 48.9%	SAT/ACT Participation 90%	Average SAT Performance in ELA 1079	Average ACT Performance in ELA 23.5
Step 2	Compare performance to campuses in Colonial HS Comparison Group.			Q1	Q1	Q1	
			Q2				Q2
		Q4					
Step 3	Is its performance in the top quartile?	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Result:		Performance on 3 of 6 indicators is in Q1, which is greater than 33% of indicators; therefore, the AADD in Reading/ELA is earned.					

Academic Achievement in Mathematics

An AADD is awarded to campuses for outstanding academic achievement in mathematics based on performance in the top 25 percent of its campus comparison group.

Who is eligible: Campuses that have a rating of *Met Standard*.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for *All Students* only for each indicator.

Minimum Size: Minimum size is determined separately for each indicator:

- **Attendance Rate.** Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If there are fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (e.g., 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be used toward the distinction. Attendance rate cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain a distinction.
- **Assessments (STAAR, AP/IB, SAT, and/or ACT).** Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. That is, if there are fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, that indicator cannot be used toward the distinction.
- **Participation**
 - **AP/IB and Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion.** Minimum size is 10 students completing a course.
 - **Algebra I by Grade 8-Participation.** Minimum size is 10 students taking the Algebra I EOC in grade 8 or earlier grades.
 - **SAT/ACT Participation.** Minimum size is 10 graduates taking either the SAT or ACT.

Indicators:

AADD Mathematics Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K-12
Attendance rate	√	√	√	√
Greater Than Expected Student Growth in Mathematics		√	√	
Grade 5 Math Performance (Level III)			√	√
Algebra I by Grade 8-Participation		√		√
Algebra I by Grade 8-Performance (Level III)		√		√
AP/IB Examination Participation: Mathematics	√			√
AP/IB Examination Performance: Mathematics	√			√
SAT/ACT Participation	√			√
SAT Performance: Mathematics	√			√
ACT Performance: Mathematics	√			√
Total Mathematics Indicators	6	4	3	9

Methodology: This distinction is determined as follows:

Step 1: Performance on each indicator that applies to the school is determined. A school must have at least 1 indicator besides attendance rate.

Step 2: Performance for each indicator within the school's campus comparison group is determined.

Step 3: To earn the distinction, the following requirement must be met:

- High schools and combined elementary/secondary schools must be in the top quartile for 33 percent or more of their indicators.
- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of their indicators.

The methodology, date, and source for each indicator are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Other Information:

- *Greater Than Expected Student Growth in Mathematics*. For 2014, this indicator does not apply to high schools/K-12 campuses because there are limited STAAR student growth measures (Index 2) for grades 9-12.
- *Assessments*. A complete list of AP and IB assessments used in determining this distinction is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.
- *Attendance Rate*. This is based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12. The Attendance Rate indicator applies to all four subject areas of the AADDs. Consequently, this indicator cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain an AADD.
- *Methodology*: The methodology and data sources used in determining each of the indicators in the table above are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Academic Achievement in Science

New for 2014, an AADD is awarded to campuses for outstanding academic achievement in science based on performance in the top 25 percent of its campus comparison group.

Who is eligible: Campuses that have a rating of *Met Standard*.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for *All Students* only for each indicator.

Minimum Size: Minimum size is determined separately for each indicator:

- *Attendance Rate*. Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If there are fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (e.g., 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be used toward the distinction. Note that attendance rate cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain a distinction.
- *Assessments (STAAR, AP/IB, and/or ACT)*. Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. That is, if there are fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, that indicator cannot be used toward the distinction.
- *Participation (AP/IB)*. Minimum size is 10 students taking at least one AP or IB examination.

Indicators:

AADD Science Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K-12
Attendance rate	√	√	√	√
Grade 5 Science Performance (Level III)			√	√
Grade 8 Science Performance (Level III)		√		√
EOC Biology Performance (Level III)	√			√
ACT Performance: Science	√			√
AP/IB Examination Participation: Science	√			√
AP/IB Examination Performance: Science	√			√
Total Science Indicators	5	2	2	7

Methodology: This distinction is determined as follows:

Step 1: Performance on each indicator that applies to the school is determined. A school must have at least 1 indicator besides attendance rate.

Step 2: Performance for each indicator within the school's campus comparison group is determined.

Step 3: To earn the distinction, the following requirement must be met:

- High schools and combined elementary/secondary schools must be in the top quartile for 33 percent or more of their indicators.
- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of their indicators.

The methodology, date, and source for each indicator are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Other Information:

- *Assessments.* A complete list of AP and IB assessments used in determining this distinction is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.
- *Attendance Rate.* This is based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12. The Attendance Rate indicator applies to all four subject areas of the AADDs. Consequently, this indicator cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain an AADD.
- *Methodology:* The methodology and data sources used in determining each of the indicators in the table above are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Academic Achievement in Social Studies

New for 2014, an AADD is awarded to campuses for outstanding academic achievement in social studies based on performance in the top 25 percent of its campus comparison group.

Who is eligible: Campuses that have a rating of *Met Standard*.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for *All Students* only for each indicator.

Minimum Size: Minimum size is determined separately for each indicator:

- *Attendance Rate.* Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If there are fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (e.g., 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be used toward the distinction. Note that attendance rate cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain a distinction.
- *Assessments (STAAR and/or AP/IB).* Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. That is, if there are fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, that indicator cannot be used toward the distinction.
- *Participation (AP/IB).* Minimum size is 10 students taking at least one AP or IB examination.

Indicators:

AADD Social Studies Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K-12
Attendance rate	√	√	√	√
Grade 8 Social Studies Performance (Level III)		√		√
EOC U.S. History Performance (Level III)	√			√
AP/IB Examination Participation: Social Studies	√			√
AP/IB Examination Performance: Social Studies	√			√
Total Social Studies Indicators	4	2	N/A	5

Methodology: This distinction is determined as follows:

Step 1: Performance on each indicator that applies to the school is determined. A school must have at least 1 indicator besides attendance rate.

Step 2: Performance for each indicator within the school’s campus comparison group is determined.

Step 3: To earn the distinction, the following requirement must be met:

- High schools and combined elementary/secondary schools must be in the top quartile for 33 percent or more of their indicators.
- Middle schools/junior high schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of their indicators.

The methodology, date, and source for each indicator are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Other Information:

- *Eligible Schools.* Because there are no social studies indicators available in grades 1-6, elementary schools are not eligible for this distinction.
- *Assessments.* A complete list of AP and IB assessments used in determining this distinction is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.
- *Attendance Rate.* This is based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1-12. The Attendance Rate indicator applies to all four subject areas of the AADDs. Consequently, this indicator cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain an AADD.
- *Methodology:* The methodology and data sources used in determining each of the indicators in the table above are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Top 25 Percent: Student Progress

A distinction designation is awarded for outstanding improvement in student progress to a campus if it is ranked in the top 25 percent (Q1) of campuses in its campus comparison group for Index 2.

Who is eligible: Campuses that are evaluated for Index 2 and have a rating of *Met Standard*. In 2014, high schools and K-12 campuses are not evaluated for Index 2 and, therefore, are ineligible to receive a distinction designation for Student Progress.

Methodology: Campuses are assigned a numeric value for Index 2. Those values are arranged in descending order for the campuses in the campus comparison group. If the Index 2 value for a campus is within the top quartile for its comparison group, it receives a distinction for Student Progress.

For more information on Index 2, see Chapters 3 and 4.

Top 25 Percent: Closing Performance Gaps

New for 2014, a distinction designation is awarded for outstanding performance in closing student achievement gaps to a campus if it is ranked in the top 25 percent (Q1) of campuses in its campus comparison group for Index 3.

Who is eligible: Campuses that are evaluated for Index 3 and have a rating of *Met Standard*.

Methodology: Campuses are assigned a numeric value for Index 3. Those values are arranged in descending order for the campuses in the campus comparison group. If the Index 3 value for a campus is within the top quartile for its comparison group, it receives a distinction for Closing Performance Gaps.

For more information on Index 3, see Chapters 3 and 4.

Postsecondary Readiness

New for 2014, a distinction designation is awarded to campuses and districts for outstanding academic performance in attainment of postsecondary readiness. Elementary and middle schools must show performance in the top 25 percent of similar schools in their campus comparison group. High schools and K-12 campuses must have at least 33 percent of the indicators in the top quartile. Districts must have at least 70 percent of its campus-level indicators in the top quartile.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that have a rating of *Met Standard*.

Student Groups: Indicators 5-8 use *All Students* performance only. Values used for indicators 1-4 are determined through the calculations for Index 4. See those descriptions for information on student groups.

Minimum Size: Indicators 5-8 must have a minimum size of 10 in the denominator. Values used for indicators 1-4 are determined through the calculations for Index 4. See those descriptions for information on minimum size.

Indicators for campuses:

Postsecondary-Readiness Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K-12
1) Index 4 - Percent at STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard	√	√	√	√
2) Four-Year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	√			√
3) Four-Year Longitudinal RHSP/DAP Rate	√			√
4) College-Ready Graduates	√			√
5) Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion Rate	√			√
6) SAT/ACT Participation	√			√
7) SAT/ACT Performance	√			√
8) AP/IB Examination Performance: Any Subject	√			√
Total	8	1	1	8

Methodology: This distinction is determined as follows:

Elementary and Middle Schools: Campuses are assigned a numeric value for the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard component of Index 4. Those values are arranged in descending order for the campuses in the campus comparison group. If the STAAR performance for a campus is within the top quartile for its comparison group, it receives a distinction for Postsecondary Readiness.

High Schools: High schools in the top quartile on at least 33 percent of their eligible measures receive the postsecondary readiness distinction designation. See the following example.

<p><i>Example:</i> Beta High School is fictional, but typical of Texas high schools with varied performance on the eight indicators for this distinction. To determine whether it has earned the distinction, its performance is compared to its unique Campus Comparison Group—made up of itself and 40 other schools—for each of the eight indicators. It must be in the top quartile (Q1) for at least 33% of the indicators for the Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation.</p>									
Step 1	What is Beta High School's performance on its eight indicators?	STAAR Post secondary Readiness Standard	Graduation Rate	RHSP/DAP Rate	College-Ready Graduates	Advanced/ Dual Enrollment Courses	SAT/ACT Participation	SAT/ACT Met Criterion	AP/IB Met Criterion
		47%*	87.7%*	85.9%*	85%*	60.9%	94.4%	49.6%	61.3%
Step 2	Compare performance to campuses in Beta HS Comparison Group.	Q2	Q2	Q1	Q1	Q1	Q1	Q3	Q2
Step 3	Is its performance in the top quartile?	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Result	Performance on 4 of 8 indicators is in Q1, which is greater than 33% of indicators; therefore, the Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation is earned.								
* This is the same value as is used for determining Index 4.									

Districts: A district must have at least 70 percent of its campus-level postsecondary indicators in the top quartile (Q1). See the following example.

Districts with less than five campus-level postsecondary indicators are not eligible for the postsecondary readiness distinction.

<i>Example:</i> Alpha ISD has 12 campuses. Each campus has either 1 or 8 possible indicators for this distinction.			
School	Grade span	Postsecondary Indicators in top quartile for this school	Maximum Possible Postsecondary Indicators
High School A	9-12	6	8
High School B	9-12	6	8
Middle School C	6-8	0	1
Middle School D	6-8	0	1
Middle School E	6-8	1	1
Middle School F	6-8	1	1
Elementary G	PK-5	1	1
Elementary H	PK-5	1	1
Elementary I	PK-5	1	1
Elementary J	PK-5	1	1
Elementary K	PK-5	0	1
Elementary L	PK-5	1	1
Total		19	26
Result:	Performance on 19 of 26 indicators is in Q1, or 73%, which is greater than the 70% standard. The Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation is earned.		

Other Information:

- *Advanced Course Completion.* A list of advanced courses is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources.*
- *Standards.* For details on the standards for indicators that make up Index 4, see Chapters 3 and 4.
- *Methodology:* A complete description of the methodology and data sources used in determining each of the indicators in the table above is in *Appendix K – Data Sources.*

Chapter 6 – Other Accountability System Processes

The vast majority of accountability ratings are determined through the process detailed in Chapters 2-5. Accommodating all campuses and districts in Texas increases the complexity of the accountability system, but also ensures the fairness of ratings assigned. This chapter describes other processes necessary to implement the accountability system.

Required Improvement

Beginning in 2014, the Level III Advanced performance standard is used to evaluate Index 3 and the Final Level II performance standard is used to evaluate Index 4. A separate required improvement calculation at the index level for campuses and districts that do not meet the accountability target for the index will be considered for 2015 and beyond when the underlying indicators can be more appropriately used for year-to-year comparisons.

Pairing

All campuses serving grades prekindergarten (PK) through 12 must receive an accountability rating. Campuses with no state assessment results due to grades served are paired with another campus within the same district for accountability purposes. A campus may pair with the district and be evaluated on the district's results.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) analyzes enrollment files submitted on the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) submission 1 to determine which campuses need to be paired. Campuses that only serve students in grades not tested on the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) (i.e., PK, K, grades 1, and/or 2) are paired with either another campus in the district or the district itself.

Charter campuses and alternative education campuses (AECs) registered for evaluation by alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions are not asked to pair.

Paired data are not used for distinction designation indicators; therefore, paired campuses cannot earn distinction designations.

Pairing Process

Districts may use the prior year pairing relationship or select a new relationship by completing the pairing form on the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) website. In April, districts with campuses that need to be paired receive instructions on how to access this application on TEASE. Pairing decisions are due in May each year.

If a district fails to inform the state, then pairing decisions are made by agency staff. For campuses that have been paired in the past, staff assume that prior year pairing relationships still apply. For campuses in need of pairing for the first time, pairing selections are made based on the guidelines given in this section in conjunction with analysis of attendance and enrollment patterns using PEIMS data.

Guidelines

Paired campuses should have a "feeder" relationship, and the grades should be contiguous. For example, a K-2 campus should be paired with the 3-5 campus that accepts its students into 3rd grade. An exception is when the campus being asked to pair is a PK or K campus with a "feeder" relationship to a campus that also requires pairing (e.g. a grade 1-2 campus).

In this case, both the PK-K and grade 1-2 campuses should pair with the same grade 3 and above campus. Campuses cannot be paired with another campus that is required to be paired.

Campuses may pair with the district instead of another campus. This option is suggested for cases where the campus has no clear relationship with another single campus in the district. A campus paired with the district is evaluated using the district's assessment results for STAAR (grades 3-8) and end-of-course (EOC) for all grades tested in the district.

Note that pairing with the district is not mandatory in these cases. Districts have the choice of selecting another campus *or* selecting the district. For example, in cases where a K-2 campus feeds into several 3-5 campuses, one of the 3-5 campuses may be selected, or the district.

Multiple pairings are possible. If several K-2 campuses feed the same 3-5 campus, all of the K-2 campuses may be paired with that 3-5 campus.

Districts may change pairings from year to year; however, these changes should be based on reasonable justification (*e.g.*, a change in attendance zones affecting feeder patterns). As long as pairings are established yearly, any prior year performance is calculated using the pairing relationships in place for the year in question.

Non-Traditional Educational Settings

Even though districts are responsible for the performance of all their students, statutory requirements affect the rating calculations for Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD), residential treatment facilities (RTF), juvenile justice alternative education program (JJAEP), and disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP) campuses.

Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data

The performance of students served in certain campuses cannot be used in evaluating the district where the campus is located. Texas Education Code (TEC) §§ 39.054(f) and 39.055 require that students ordered by a juvenile court into a residential program or facility operated by the TJJD, a juvenile board, or any other governmental entity or any student who is receiving treatment in a residential facility be excluded from the campus and district when determining the accountability ratings. See *Appendix G – Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data*.

Student Attribution Codes

Districts with RTF or TJJD campuses are required to submit student attribution codes in PEIMS.

JJAEPs and DAEPs

State statute and statutory intent prohibit the attribution of student performance results to JJAEPs and DAEPs. Each district that sends students to a JJAEP or DAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance and attendance data to the home campuses according to the *PEIMS Data Standards* and testing guidelines.

Special Education Campuses

Campuses where all students are served in special education programs and are tested on STAAR will be rated on the performance on their students.

AEA Provisions

Alternative performance measures for campuses serving at-risk students were first implemented in the 1995-96 school year. Over time, these measures expanded to include charters that served large populations of at-risk students. Accountability advisory groups consistently recommend evaluating AECs by separate and/or different AEA provisions due to the large number of students served in alternative education programs on AECs and to ensure these unique campus settings are appropriately evaluated for state accountability.

AEA Campus Identification

AEA provisions apply to and are appropriate for:

- campuses that offer nontraditional programs, rather than programs within a traditional campus;
- campuses that meet the at-risk enrollment criterion;
- campuses that meet the grades 6-12 enrollment criterion;
- charters that operate only AECs; and
- charters that meet the AEC enrollment criterion.

AEC Eligibility

AECs, including charter AECs, must serve students “at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in TEC §29.081(d) and provide accelerated instructional services to these students. The performance results of students at registered AECs are included in the district’s performance and used in determining the district’s accountability rating.

The following types of campuses have the option to register for evaluation by AEA provisions.

- AEC of Choice – At-risk students enroll at AECs of Choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.
- Residential Facility – Education services are provided to students in private residential treatment centers and residential programs, detention centers, and correctional facilities operated by the TJJD.
- Dropout Recovery School (DRS) – Educational services targeted to dropout prevention and recovery of students in grades 9 -12, enrollment of which at least 50 percent of the students are 17 years of age or older as reported for the fall semester PEIMS submission.

In this manual, the terms “AEC” and “registered AEC” refer collectively to AECs of Choice, Residential Facilities, and Dropout Recovery Schools that are registered for evaluation by AEA provisions and meet the at-risk and grades 6-12 enrollment criteria.

DAEPs, JJAEPs, and stand-alone General Educational Development (GED) programs are ineligible for evaluation by AEA provisions. Data for these campuses are attributed to the home campus.

AEA Campus Registration Process

The AEA campus registration process is conducted online using the TEASE Accountability website. AECs rated by 2013 AEA provisions are re-registered

automatically in 2014. E-filing an *AEA Campus Rescission Form* is required from AECs wishing to discontinue AEA registration. E-filing an *AEA Campus Registration Form* is required for each AEC not on the list of registered AECs that wishes to be evaluated by 2014 AEA provisions. The 2014 registration process occurred April 1-15, 2014.

AEA Campus Registration Criteria

Eleven (11) criteria are required for campuses to register for AEA. However, the requirements in criteria 7-11 may not apply to charter campuses (depending on the terms of the charter) or for community-based dropout recovery campuses established in accordance with TEC §29.081(e). Criterion 10 applies to Residential Facilities only if students are placed in the facility by the district.

- 1) The AEC must have its own county-district-campus number to which PEIMS data are submitted and test answer documents are coded. A program operated within or supported by another campus does not qualify.
- 2) The AEC must be identified in AskTED (Texas School Directory database) as an alternative campus.
- 3) The AEC must be dedicated to serving “students at risk of dropping out of school” as defined in TEC §29.081(d).
- 4) At least 50 percent of students at the AEC must be enrolled in grades 6-12.
- 5) The AEC must operate on its own campus budget.
- 6) The AEC must offer nontraditional settings and methods of instructional delivery designed to meet the needs of the students served on the AEC.
- 7) The AEC must have an appropriately certified, full-time administrator whose primary duty is the administration of the AEC.
- 8) The AEC must have appropriately certified teachers assigned in all areas including special education, bilingual education, and/or English as a second language (ESL) to serve students eligible for such services.
- 9) The AEC must provide each student the opportunity to attend a 7-hour school day as defined in TEC §25.082(a), according to the needs of each student.
- 10) If the campus has students served by special education, the students must be placed at the AEC by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee.
- 11) Students served by special education must receive all services outlined in their current individualized education programs (IEPs). Limited English proficient students must receive all services outlined by the language proficiency assessment committee (LPAC). Students served by special education or language programs must be served by appropriately certified teachers.

At-Risk Enrollment Criterion

Each registered AEC must have at least 75 percent at-risk student enrollment on the AEC verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data in order to be evaluated by AEA provisions. The at-risk enrollment criterion restricts use of AEA provisions to AECs that serve large populations of at-risk students and enhances at-risk data quality.

Prior Year Safeguard. If a registered AEC does not meet the at-risk enrollment criterion in the current year, then it remains registered for AEA if the AEC meets the at-risk enrollment criterion in the prior year. For example, an AEC with an at-risk enrollment below 75 percent in 2014 and at least 75 percent in 2013 remains registered in 2014.

Grades 6-12 Enrollment Criterion

Each registered AEC must have at least 50 percent student enrollment in grades 6-12 verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data in order to be evaluated by AEA provisions. The grades 6-12 enrollment criterion restricts use of AEA provisions to middle and high schools.

Final AEA Campus List

The Final AEA Campus List is posted on the public website in May, at which time an email is sent to all superintendents.

The *2014 Final AEA Campus List* includes DRS designations. If at least 50 percent of the students enrolled at an AEA campus are 17 years of age or older as of September 1, 2013, then the AEC of Choice is designated as a DRS (TEC §39.0545).

AEA Charter Identification

Charter ratings are based on aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. Performance results of all students in the charter are used in determining the charter's accountability rating and for distinction designations.

- Charters that operate only registered AECs are evaluated by AEA provisions.
- Charters that operate both non-AEA campuses and registered AECs are evaluated by AEA provisions if the AEC enrollment criterion described below is met.
- Charters that operate both non-AEA campuses and registered AECs that do not meet the AEC enrollment criterion described below do not qualify for evaluation by AEA provisions.
- Charters that operate only non-AEA campuses do not qualify for evaluation by AEA provisions, because the campuses choose not to register for AEA evaluation or do not meet the at-risk and/or grades 6-12 enrollment criteria.

AEC Enrollment Criterion for Charters

A charter that operates both non-AEA campuses and registered AECs is eligible for evaluation by AEA provisions if at least 50 percent of the charter's students are enrolled at registered AECs. AEC enrollment is verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data.

Final AEA Charter Operator List

After the AEA Campus List is finalized, AEA charters eligible for evaluation by AEA provisions are identified. The final list of AEA charter operators is posted on the public website in May, at which time an email is sent to all superintendents.

AEA Modifications

Chapter 3 – Performance Index Construction and *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators* describe the modifications to the accountability system for AEA campuses and charters.

Adjustments were made to the 2014 AEA provisions to include new statutory requirements prescribed in TEC § 39.0545, such as:

- The Index 4 Graduation/Annual Dropout Rate component includes continuing students. This component evaluates four-, five-, or six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate or annual dropout rate.
- An Excluded Students Credit gives AEA campuses and districts bonus points for serving recovered dropouts and other students who graduate or earn a GED, but are statutorily excluded from the graduation and dropout rate calculations.
- Retest results are included in the appropriate index calculations.

Chapter 7 – Appealing the Ratings

The commissioner of education is required to provide a process for local districts or charters to challenge an agency determination of accountability rating (Texas Education Code (TEC) §39.151).

TEC §39.151. Review By Commissioner: Accountability Determination.

- (a) The commissioner by rule shall provide a process for a school district or open-enrollment charter school to challenge an agency decision made under this chapter relating to an academic or financial accountability rating that affects the district or school.
- (b) The rules under Subsection (a) must provide for the commissioner to appoint a committee to make recommendations to the commissioner on a challenge made to an agency decision relating to an academic performance rating or determination or financial accountability rating. The commissioner may not appoint an agency employee as a member of the committee.
- (c) The commissioner may limit a challenge under this section to a written submission of any issue identified by the school district or open-enrollment charter school challenging the agency decision.
- (d) The commissioner shall make a final decision under this section after considering the recommendation of the committee described by Subsection (b). The commissioner's decision may not be appealed under Section 7.057 or other law.
- (e) A school district or open-enrollment charter school may not challenge an agency decision relating to an academic or financial accountability rating under this chapter in another proceeding if the district or school has had an opportunity to challenge the decision under this section.

Appeals Process Overview and Calendar

The state accountability system performance index framework limits the likelihood that a single indicator or measure results in an *Improvement Required* rating. For this reason, the state accountability appeals process is limited to rare cases where a data or calculation error is attributable to the testing contractor or the Texas Education Agency (TEA). The compensatory nature of the performance index framework and other features of the indexes, such as the use of multiple indicators to derive an overall index score, minimize the possibility that district errors in coding student demographic information in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) or State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) program negatively impact the overall accountability rating. Online applications provided by the agency and testing contractor ensure that districts are aware of data correction opportunities, particularly through the use of PEIMS data submissions and the Texas Assessment Management System (TAMS). District responsibility for data quality is the cornerstone of a fair and uniform rating determination.

School district appeals that challenge the agency determination of the accountability rating are carefully reviewed by an external panel of educators. Superintendents may appeal accountability ratings by following the guidelines in this chapter.

Following are the dates for appealing ratings. These deadlines are final. To maintain a fair appeals process, late appeals are denied. See *Chapter 10 – Calendar* for more information.

June 6, 2014	<i>Graduation/Dropout Summary Reports and Lists.</i> Superintendents may access confidential lists of dropouts and cohort membership. These reports provide a preview of the data that will be used to calculate the Graduation Rate, RHSP/DAP Rate, and Annual Dropout Rate indicators for the accountability ratings.
August 1, 2014	<i>Preview Data Tables.</i> Superintendents may access confidential preview accountability data tables for their district and campuses showing all accountability indicator data. Principals and superintendents can use these data tables to anticipate their campus and district accountability ratings.
August 8, 2014	<i>Ratings Release.</i> No appeals will be resolved before the ratings release.
August 8 – September 9, 2014	<i>2014 Appeals Window.</i> Appeals may be submitted <i>by the superintendent</i> after receipt of the preview data tables. Districts register their intent to appeal using the TEASE Accountability website and mail their appeal letter with supporting documentation via. Appeals not signed by the district superintendent are denied. See “How to Appeal” later in this chapter.
September 9, 2014	<i>Appeals Deadline.</i> Appeals must be postmarked or hand-delivered no later than September 9, 2014, in order to be considered.
Early November 2014	<i>Decisions Released.</i> Commissioner’s decisions are mailed in the form of response letters to each school district. Letters are posted to the TEASE site.
Early November 2014	<i>Ratings Update.</i> The outcome of all appeals will be reflected in the ratings update scheduled for November 2014. The TEASE and public websites are updated.

General Considerations

The basis for appeals should be a data or calculation error attributable to TEA, regional education service centers (ESC), or the test contractor for the student assessment program. The appeals process is not a permissible method to correct data that was inaccurately reported by the district. If the district has reported inaccurate data, it must follow the procedures and timelines for resubmitting the data, e.g., the PEIMS data standards. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal. However, note that poor data quality can be a reason to lower a district’s accreditation (TEC §39.052(b)(2)(A)(i)). The data tables and other agency products or performance reports include data that are final and cannot be changed even if an appeal is granted, unless it is an error by TEA and/or the test contractor.

Districts may appeal for any reason. However, the accountability system requires that the rules be uniformly applied. Therefore, a request to make exceptions for how the rules are applied to a single campus or district is viewed unfavorably, and will most likely be denied.

- Only appeals that would result in a changed rating will be considered. A campus or district must meet all requirements for a higher rating in order for its appeal to be evaluated.
- Appeals are not considered for the Accountability System Safeguard measures that may result in campus or district interventions.
- Districts are responsible for providing accurate information to TEA, including information provided on student answer documents or submitted via online testing systems. School districts have multiple opportunities to confirm and correct data submitted for accountability purposes. Changes to test answer document fields submitted within the correction window will be included in the STAAR data files used in determining the 2014 accountability ratings.

- The appeals process is not a permissible method to correct data that was inaccurately reported by the district. Appeals from districts that missed data resubmission window opportunities are denied. Appeal requests for data corrections for the following submissions are not considered.

PEIMS data submissions for:

- Student identification information or program participation;
- Student racial/ethnic categories;
- Student economic status;
- Student attribution codes; and
- Student leaver data.

STAAR test answer documents, specifically:

- Student identification information, demographic or program participation;
- Student racial/ethnic categories;
- Student economic status; and
- Score code or test version codes.

- Requests to modify the 2014 state accountability calculations adopted by Commissioner Rule are not considered. Commissioner rules are adopted under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) and challenges to a Commissioner Rule should be made under that statute. Recommendations for changes to state accountability rules submitted to the agency outside of the appeal process may be considered by accountability advisory groups for future accountability cycles.
- Requests to modify statutorily required implementation rules defined by the Commissioner will not be considered. PEIMS requirements, campus identifications, and statutorily required exclusions are based on data submitted by school districts. These data reporting requirements are reviewed by the appropriate advisory committee, such as the TEA Information Task Force (ITF) and Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI). Recommendations for changes to agency rules submitted outside of the appeals process may be considered as the appropriate advisory groups reconvene annually.
- Examples of issues unfavorable for appeal include:
 - *Late Online Application Requests.* Requests to submit or provide information after the deadline of the online AEA campus registration (12:00 p.m. on April 15, 2014) or the pairing application (5:00 p.m. on May 8, 2014) are denied.
 - *Inclusion or exclusion of specific test results:*
 - *STAAR Modified, STAAR Alternate, STAAR EOC retests,*
 - *specific administration results used to meet grade 5 or 8 Student Success Initiative (SSI),*
 - *grade-level mathematics rather than Algebra I for middle schools;*
 - *Inclusion or exclusion of specific students:*
 - *ELLs, Asylee/Refugees,*
 - *students served by Special Education programs;*
 - *Requests to modify calculations or methodology applied to all districts and campuses, specifically:*

- *STAAR Progress Measures, ELL Progress Measure, longitudinal graduation rates, longitudinal or annual RHSP/DAP rates, or annual dropout rates*
- *District and campus mobility/accountability subsets*
- *Rounding*
- *Minimum size criteria*
- *Years in U.S. Schools.* Requests to modify the Years in U.S. Schools information submitted by districts on the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessments System (TELPAS) are denied.
- *Student Growth Measures.* Requests to use an alternative student growth measure instead of the STAAR Progress Measure or ELL Progress Measure are denied.
- *Small Numbers Analysis.* Request to modify calculations, methodology, or outcomes of small numbers analysis are denied.
- *Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Provisions.* Requests for consideration of campus registration criteria, at-risk or grades 6-12 enrollment criteria, prior year safeguard methodology, Dropout Recovery School (DRS) designations, and to waive the AEC enrollment criterion for charters are denied.
- *School Types.* The four campus types categories used for 2014 accountability are identified based on PEIMS enrollment data submitted in fall 2013. Requests to redefine the low or high grade designations for a specific category are denied.
- *Campus Configuration Changes.* School districts have the opportunity to determine changes in campus identification numbers and grade configurations. Requests for consideration of state accountability rules based on changes in campus configurations are denied.
- *New Campuses.* Requests to assign a *Not Rated* label to campuses that are designated *Improvement Required* in their first year of operation are denied.
- *Professional Service Providers (PSP).* District or campus intervention requirements are based in part by the current rating outcome. Requests to waive PSP requirements are not considered an appeal of the accountability rating and are denied.

Data Relevant to the Prior Year Results

Appeals are considered for the 2014 ratings status based on information relevant to the 2014 evaluation. Appeals are not considered for circumstances that may have affected the prior year measures, regardless of whether the prior year results impacted the current year rating.

No Guaranteed Outcomes

Each appeal is evaluated on the details of its unique situation. Well-written appeals that follow the guidelines are more easily processed, but are not automatically granted.

Special Circumstance Appeals

- If the district has requested that writing results be rescored, districts must provide a copy of the dated request to the test contractor and the outcome of the rescored tests with the appeal. If the rescored results impact the rating, these appeals are necessary since rescored results may not be processed in time to be included in the assessment data used to determine the accountability ratings released by August 8, 2014.

- If other serious problems are found, copies of correspondence with the test contractor or the regional ESC should be provided with the appeal.
- Appeals based on STAAR or TELPAS online test submission errors must include documentation or validation of the administration of the assessment.

Not Rated Appeals

Districts and campuses rated *Not Rated* are responsible for appealing this rating by the scheduled appeal deadline, if the basis for this rating was due to special circumstance or error by the testing contractor. If the agency determines that the *Not Rated* rating was indeed due to special circumstances, the agency can assign a revised rating.

Distinction Designations

Academic Achievement Distinction Designations (AADD), Top 25 Percent Student Progress, Top 25 Percent Closing Performance Gaps, and Postsecondary Readiness distinctions cannot be appealed. Indicators for these distinctions are reported for most campuses and districts regardless of eligibility for a designation. Campuses rated *Improvement Required* are not eligible for a distinction. However, campuses that appeal an *Improvement Required* rating will automatically receive any distinction designation earned, if their appeal is granted and their rating is revised to *Met Standard*.

How to Submit an Appeal

Districts should e-file their intent to appeal district and/or campus ratings by using the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Application site. This online system provides a mechanism for tracking all accountability rating appeals and allows districts to monitor the status of their appeals.

After e-filing an intent to appeal, districts must mail an appeal packet, including all supporting documentation necessary for TEA to process the appeal. E-filing an intent to appeal does not constitute an appeal.

To e-file an intent to appeal:

1. Log on to TEASE at <https://sequin.tea.state.tx.us/apps/logon.asp> or TEAL at <https://pryor.tea.state.tx.us>.
2. Click on ACCT – Accountability.
3. From the Welcome page, click on the *Notification of Intent to Appeal* link and follow the instructions.
4. The Notification of Intent to Appeal application website will be available during the appeals window from August 8 through 5:00 p.m. CDT on September 9.
5. The status of the appeal, e.g., intent notification and receipt of documentation, will be available on the TEASE Accountability website.

Superintendents who do not have TEASE access must request access at the TEASE Applications Reference Page at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2684>

Districts must submit their appeal in writing via mail to TEA by September 9, 2014. As in past years, the appeal shall include:

- A statement that the letter is an appeal of a 2014 accountability rating;
- The name and ID number of the district and/or campuses to which the appeal applies;

- The specific indicator(s) appealed;
- The special circumstance(s) regarding the appeal, including details of the data affected and what caused the problem;
- If applicable, the reason(s) why the cause for appeal is attributable to TEA, a regional ESC, or the test contractor;
- The reason(s) why granting the appeal may result in a revised rating, including calculations that support that rating;
- A statement that all information included in the appeal is true and correct to the best of the superintendent's knowledge and belief; and,
- The superintendent's signature on official district letterhead.
- The appeal shall be addressed to the Division of Performance Reporting as follows:

Your ISD Your address City, TX Zip	postage
Division of Performance Reporting Texas Education Agency 1701 North Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701-1494	
Attn: Accountability Ratings Appeal	

- The letter of appeal should be addressed to Mr. Michael Williams, Commissioner of Education (see example letters, below).
- Appeals for more than one campus, including alternative education campuses, within a single district must be included in the same letter.
- Appeals for more than one indicator must be included in the same letter.
- Districts have only one opportunity to appeal for any campus or the district.
- If the appeal will impact the rating of a paired campus, that consequence must be noted.
- If the appeal will impact the rating of the district, that consequence must be noted.
- When student-level information is in question, supporting documentation must be provided for review, *i.e.*, a list of the students by name and identification number. It is not sufficient to reference indicator data without providing documentation with which the appeal can be researched and evaluated. *Confidential student-level documentation included in the appeal packet will be processed and stored in a secure location and will be accessible only by TEA staff authorized to view confidential student results. Please clearly mark any page that contains confidential student data.*
- It is the district's responsibility to ensure all relevant information is included in the appeal as districts will not be prompted for additional materials.
- **Appeal letters must be postmarked on or before September 9, 2014.** Appeals postmarked after this date will not be considered. Appeals delivered to TEA in person must be time-stamped by the Division of Performance Reporting before 5:00 p.m., CDT on September 9, 2014. Overnight courier tickets or tracking documentation must indicate package pickup on or before September 9.
- **Only send one copy of the appeal letter and/or supporting documentation.**
- Districts are encouraged to obtain delivery confirmation services from their mail courier.

Examples of satisfactory and unsatisfactory appeals are provided only for illustration.

Satisfactory Appeal:	Unsatisfactory Appeals:
<p>Dear Commissioner Williams,</p> <p>This is an appeal of the 2014 accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD.</p> <p>Specifically, I am appealing STAAR mathematics for this campus. This is the only indicator preventing Elm Street Elementary from achieving a rating of <i>Met Standard</i>.</p> <p>During the day of mathematics testing at Elm Street Elementary School, the campus was subjected to a disrupted schedule due to an unusual and unique event. The fifth grade class was disrupted during the test administration by an emergency situation. Documentation of the incident and district personnel adherence to testing irregularity processes is included.</p> <p>Attached is the students' identification information as well as the PEIMS data for the students whose tests were affected.</p> <p>The second attachment shows the recalculated mathematics percent passing for Elm Elementary.</p> <p>We recognize the appeal process as the mechanism to address these unique issues. By my signature below, I certify that all information included in this appeal is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>Attachments</i></p>	<p>Dear Commissioner Williams,</p> <p>This is an appeal of the 2014 accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD.</p> <p>Specifically, I am appealing STAAR mathematics for the Hispanic student group. This is the only indicator keeping Elm Street Elementary from achieving a rating of <i>Met Standard</i>.</p> <p>My analysis shows a coding change made to one student's race/ethnicity on the answer document at the time of testing was in error. One 5th grade Hispanic student was miscoded as White on the answer document. Had this student, who passed the mathematics test, been included in the Hispanic student group, the percent passing for this group would have met the standard. Removing this student from the White student group does not cause the White student group performance to fall below the <i>Met Standard</i> criteria.</p> <p>We recognize the importance of accurate data coding, and have put new procedures in place to prevent this from occurring in the future.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>Attachments</i></p>
	<p>Dear Commissioner Williams,</p> <p>Maple ISD feels that its rating should be <i>Met Standard</i>. The discrepancy occurs because TEA shows that the performance in Index 1 for Writing is 48%.</p> <p>We have sent two compositions back for scoring, and are confident they will be changed to passing.</p> <p>If you have questions, do not hesitate to contact us, at 701-555-1234.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>(no attachments)</i></p>

How an Appeal Is Processed by the Agency

- The Division of Performance Reporting receives an appeal packet.
- The TEASE Application site is updated to reflect the postmark date for each appeal and the date on which each appeal packet is received by the agency. Districts may monitor the status of their appeal(s) using the TEASE Application site.
- Researchers evaluate the request using agency data sources to validate the statements made to the extent possible. The agency examines all relevant data, *not just the results for the students specifically named in the correspondence*.
- Researchers analyze the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on other campuses in the district (such as paired campuses), even if they are not specifically named in the appeal. Similarly, the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on the district is evaluated, even if the district is not named in the appeal. In single-campus districts, both the campus and district are evaluated, whether the district submits the appeal as a campus or district appeal.
- Staff prepares a recommendation and submits it to an external panel of educators for review.
- The review panel examines all appeals, supporting documentation, staff research, and the staff recommendation. The panel determines its recommendation.
- The panel's recommendations are forwarded to the commissioner.
- The commissioner makes the final decision on all appeals.
- Superintendents receive written notification of the commissioner's decision and the rationale upon which the decision is made. The commissioner's response letters are posted to the TEASE site at the same time the letters are mailed. Superintendents are also notified via e-mail that the appeal decision is available on TEASE.
- *If an appeal is granted, the data upon which the appeal is based will not be modified.* Accountability and performance reports, as well as all other publications reflecting accountability data, must report the data as they are submitted to the TEA. Accountability data are subject to scrutiny by the Office of the State Auditor.
- The commissioner's decisions are final and not subject to further appeal and/or negotiation.

The letter from the commissioner serves as notification of the official district or campus rating, when changed due to a granted appeal. Districts may publicize the changed rating at that time. The agency website and other accountability products will be updated in November 2014, after the resolution of all appeals. The update will reflect only the changed *rating*; the values shown on the report, such as performance index values, will not be modified. Between the time of receipt of the commissioner's letter granting an appeal and the update of agency accountability products, the agency sources will not reflect the changed campus or district rating.

Relationship to the Accountability System Safeguards, PBMAS, and TAIS

The Accountability System Safeguard measures, Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) indicators, and Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) staging requirements will be considered when evaluating the appeal. School district data submitted through PEIMS or to the state assessment contractor is also considered. Please note that certain appeal requests may lead to Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions to address potential issues related to data integrity.

Chapter 8 – System Safeguards and Other Federal Requirements

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) (P.L. 107-110), reauthorized and amended federal programs established under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA). Under NCLB, accountability provisions that formerly applied only to districts and campuses receiving Title I, Part A funds were expanded to all districts and campuses. All public school districts, campuses, and the state were evaluated annually for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) from the 2002-03 through the 2011-12 school years.

On February 28, 2013, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) requested that the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) waive specific provisions of the ESEA. The U.S. Secretary of Education approved the Texas waiver request on September 30, 2013, which waived the 2012-13 AYP calculations and allowed the state's existing systems of interventions to guide the support and improvement of schools. As a result of the approved ESEA Flexibility Wavier, the state accountability System Safeguard information was used to meet federal accountability requirements to identify Priority and Focus Schools that are eligible for additional federal funding while subject to a series of federally-prescribed interventions.

State Accountability System Safeguards

The disaggregated performance results of the state accountability system serve as the basis of safeguards for the accountability rating system to ensure that poor performance in one area or one student group is not masked in the performance index. The state accountability system safeguard data are released in conjunction with the state accountability ratings.

The disaggregated performance measures and safeguard targets are calculated for performance rates, participation rates and graduation rates of eleven student groups: All Students and seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races; Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and English language learners (ELLs). Beginning in 2014, the ELL student group includes ELL students currently identified as limited English proficient (LEP) plus additional ELL students who have met the criteria for exiting bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. These students are no longer classified as LEP for Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) reporting and are in the first or second year of monitoring as required by state statute.

Performance rates calculated for the safeguard system are the disaggregated performance rates used for Index 1. A single target will be used that corresponds to the 2014 target for student achievement in Index 1. Targets for participation rates, graduation rates, and limits on use of State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) Alternate and STAAR Modified are aligned to federal requirements. District and campus level system safeguard results will be reported for any cell that meets accountability minimum size criteria.

The *Accountability System Safeguard Measures and Targets* table below contains detailed information about the 2014 performance targets that are used for the state system safeguards and federal accountability evaluations.

Accountability System Safeguard Measures and Targets											
	All	African Amer.	Hispanic	White	Amer. Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ. Disadv.	Special Ed	ELL
Performance Rate Targets - State											
Reading	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
Mathematics	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
Writing	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
Science	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
Soc. Studies	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
Performance Rate Targets - Federal											
Reading - Federal	79%	79%	79%	79%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	79%	79%	79%
Mathematics - Federal	79%	79%	79%	79%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	79%	79%	79%
Participation Rates											
Reading	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Mathematics	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Federal Graduation Rates *											
4-year	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
5-year	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%
District Limits on Use of Alternative Assessment Results											
Reading - Modified	2%	<i>Not Applicable</i>									
Reading - Alternate	1%	<i>Not Applicable</i>									
Mathematics - Modified	2%	<i>Not Applicable</i>									
Mathematics - Alternate	1%	<i>Not Applicable</i>									

* Federal graduation rate targets include an improvement target.

2014 System Safeguards Reports

On August 8, 2014, the state accountability ratings, distinction designations, and System Safeguard reports, will be released on the TEA website. The System Safeguard reports provide disaggregated results with the percent of measures and targets met. The information serves as the basis for the accountability rating system and ensures that poor performance in one area or one student group is not masked in the overall performance index. For 2014, the state accountability disaggregated safeguard measures include four components: 1) performance rates, 2) participation rates, 3) graduation rates, and 4) limits on use of alternative assessments. The performance rates, participation rates and graduation rates are calculated for 11 student groups: All Students; seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races; Economically Disadvantaged, students receiving Special Education services, and the current or monitored ELL student group.

Performance Targets

Performance rates calculated for the state accountability safeguard system are the same disaggregated results used for Index 1 in reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies. The performance target for the 2014 System Safeguard measures correspond to the 55 percent target on Index 1: Student Achievement.

Federal Participation Rates

Test participation rates are included in the accountability System Safeguards reports. The target of 95 percent is unchanged from the federal accountability target in place in prior years. Participation measures are based on all students enrolled at the time of testing and defined as the total number of test answer documents submitted by each school district (denominator of the participation rate). The calculation is not limited to students enrolled for the full academic year. Test answer documents that are coded “Absent” or “Other” are not counted as participants and are therefore not included in calculating the participation numerator.

Federal Limits on use of Alternative Assessments

For school districts only, the System Safeguard reports indicate whether a school district exceeded the federal limit on use of alternative assessments. Federal limitations require that the number of scores that meet the STAAR Alternate Phase-in Satisfactory Standard not exceed one percent of the district’s total participation. Similarly, the use of proficient results from STAAR Modified is limited; the number of test scores that meet the STAAR Modified Phase-in Satisfactory Standard may not exceed two percent of the district’s total participation. The measures for STAAR Alternate and STAAR Modified are reported separately for reading and mathematics.

Federal Graduation Rate Goals and Targets

Texas is required by state statute to use the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition and federal graduation rate calculation.

Goal: The long term statewide goal for the four-year graduation rate is 90.0 percent. High schools and school districts that do not meet the 90.0 percent graduation rate goal must meet either an annual target or a growth target for the four-year graduation rate, or an annual target for the five-year graduation rate.

Four-Year Graduation Rate Annual Target: For 2014, the annual target is 80.0 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years.

Four-Year Graduation Rate Growth Target: The growth target is a 10.0 percent decrease in difference between prior year graduation rate and the 90.0 percent goal.

Five-Year Graduation Rate Annual Target: For 2014, the annual target is 85.0 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in five years.

Consequences and Interventions

Interventions pertain to activities that result from the issuance of ratings under the state accountability system. State accountability-related interventions are those activities conducted by the Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS). Intervention activities reflect an emphasis on increased student performance, focused improvement planning, data analysis, and data integrity. Required levels of intervention are determined based on the requirements of the Texas Education Code (TEC), Chapter 39. See the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi> for more information.

Failure to meet the safeguard target for any reported cell will be addressed through the TAIS. If the campus or district is already identified for assistance or intervention in the TAIS based on the current year state accountability rating or prior year state or federal accountability designations, then performance on the safeguard indicators will be incorporated into that

improvement effort. The TAIS determines the level of intervention and support the campus or district receives based on performance history as well as current year state accountability rating and performance on the safeguard measures.

Federal Accountability Requirements

The state accountability System Safeguard information is used to meet federal accountability requirements such as identification of Priority and Focus Schools, Title III evaluations, and special education reporting requirements. Along with differences in the performance targets, the minimum size criteria applied for federal accountability requirements also differ.

The underlying data used to report state accountability system safeguards is also used for federal accountability requirements such as district evaluations for Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) and USDE Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) State Performance Plan (SPP) and State Annual Performance Report (APR). These federal accountability requirements are limited to the Reading/English language arts and Mathematics performance and participation indicators for the required ELL and Special Education programs at the 2013-14 federally approved performance target of 79 percent.

Federal Performance Targets

The federally approved target of 79 percent is applied to performance results. Performance rates calculated for the state accountability safeguard system are the same disaggregated results used for Index 1. The federal target must reflect an increase from the prior year performance target of 75 percent.

Minimum Size Requirements

The following table provides the minimum size criteria applied to the state system safeguards and the federal accountability requirements.

2014 System Safeguard Minimum Size Criteria		
Minimum Size Criteria	State System Safeguard	Federal Accountability Requirements
Performance Rates	All Students: None, Small Numbers Analysis applied Student Groups: 25	All Students*: None, Small Numbers Analysis applied Student Groups: 25 and 10%; or 200
Participation Rates	All Students: None, Small Numbers Analysis applied Student Groups: 25	All Students: Not Applicable Student Groups (for Title III AMAOs and OSEP): 25 and 10%; or 200
Federal Graduation Rates	All Students: None, Small Numbers Analysis applied Student Groups: 25	All Students*: None, Small Numbers Analysis applied Student Groups: n/a

*Note that Priority School Identification requires a minimum of 25 tests for a campus to be ranked by All Students performance, and a minimum of ten students in the class to be ranked by All Students graduation rates.

The approved ESEA flexibility waiver is available online at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/>.

The Priority and Focus Schools Lists, methodology and student groups evaluated are available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ESEAFlex_Principle2.aspx.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 9 – Responsibilities and Consequences

State Responsibilities

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is responsible for the state accountability system and other statutory requirements related to its implementation. As described in Chapters 8 and 9, TEA applies a variety of system safeguards to ensure the integrity of the system. TEA is also charged with taking actions to intervene when conditions warrant.

District Accreditation Status

State statute requires the Commissioner of Education to determine an accreditation status for districts and charters. Accreditation statuses were first assigned to districts under this statute in 2007. To determine accreditation status and sanctions, TEA takes into account the district's state and financial accountability ratings. There are other factors that may be considered in the determination of accreditation status. These include, but are not limited to, the integrity of assessment or financial data used to measure performance, the reporting of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data, and serious or persistent deficiencies in programs monitored in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS). Accreditation status can also be lowered as a result of data integrity issues or special accreditation investigations. The four possible accreditation statuses are: *Accredited*, *Accredited-Warned*, *Accredited-Probation*, and *Not Accredited-Revoked*.

Rules that define the procedures for determining a district's accreditation status, as well as the prior accreditation statuses for all districts and charters in Texas are available at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/accredstatus>.

Determination of Multiple-Year *Improvement Required* Status

In determining consecutive years of *Improvement Required* ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions, only years that a campus is assigned an accountability rating shown below will be considered.

- 2014: *Met Standard, Met Alternative Standard, Improvement Required*;
- 2013: *Met Standard, Met Alternative Standard, Improvement Required*;
- 2012: *No State Accountability Ratings Issued*;
- 2004-2011: *Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, Academically Unacceptable, AEA: Academically Acceptable, AEA: Academically Unacceptable*.

While no ratings were issued in 2012, an *Improvement Required* rating assigned in 2013 and *Academically Unacceptable/AEA: Academically Unacceptable* ratings assigned in 2011 are considered as consecutive years. In addition, the consecutive years of *Improvement Required/Academically Unacceptable* ratings may be separated by one or more years of temporary closure or *Not Rated* ratings. This policy applies to districts and charters as well as campuses when *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* and *Not Rated: Other* ratings are assigned.

PEG Program Campus List

TEA is responsible for annually producing the list of campuses identified under the Public Education Grant (PEG) criteria. By early December 2014 the list of 2015-16 PEG campuses will be released publicly. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html.

Local Responsibilities

Districts have responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. Primarily these involve following statutory requirements, collecting and submitting accurate data, properly managing campus identification numbers, and implementing an optional local accountability system.

Statutory Compliance

A number of state statutes direct local districts and/or campuses to perform certain tasks or duties in response to the annual issuance of the state accountability ratings. Key statutes are discussed below.

- Public Discussion of Ratings [TEC §11.253 (g)] – Each campus site-based decision-making committee must hold at least one public meeting annually after the receipt of the annual campus accountability rating for the purpose of discussing the performance of the campus and the campus performance objectives. The confidentiality of the performance results must be ensured before public release. The accountability data tables available on the TEA public website have been masked to protect confidentiality of individual student results.
- Notice in Student Report Card and on Website (TEC §39.361 and TEC §39.362) – Districts are required to publish accountability ratings on their websites and include the rating in the student report cards. These statutes require districts:
 - to include, along with the first written notice of a student’s performance that a school district gives during a school year, a statement of whether the campus has been awarded a distinction designation or has been rated *Improvement Required* and an explanation, and
 - by the 10th day of the new school year to have posted on the district website the most current information available in the campus report card and the information contained in the most recent performance report for the district.

A document addressing frequently asked questions regarding these requirements is available on the TEA website at http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/3297_faq.html.

- Public Education Grant (PEG) Program (TEC §§29.201 - 29.205) – In 1995, the Texas Legislature created the PEG program which permits parents with children attending campuses that are on the PEG list to request that their children be transferred to another campus within the same district or to another district. If a transfer is granted to another district, funding is provided to the receiving district. A list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria is generated and transmitted to districts annually. By February 1 following the release of the list, districts must notify each parent of a student assigned to attend a campus on the PEG list. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions*, available at http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/peg_faq.html.
- Actions Required Due to Low Ratings or Low Accreditation Status – Districts with an *Improvement Required* rating (campus or district) or *Accredited Probation/Accredited Warned* accreditation status will be required to follow directives from the commissioner designed to remedy the identified concerns. Requirements will vary depending on the circumstances for each individual district. Commissioner of Education rules that define the implementation details of these statutes are available on the website for the TEA Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions in the Accountability Monitoring link, at

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi>, and on the TEA Accreditation Status website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/accredstatus>.

Campus Identification Numbers

In a given year, districts may need to change, delete, or add one or more campus identification numbers, the unique 9-digit county-district-campus (CDC) number, due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grades or populations served by an existing school. Unintended consequences can occur when districts "recycle" CDC numbers.

Because performance results of prior years is a component of the accountability system in small numbers analysis and required improvement calculations in future years, and merging prior year files with current year files is driven by campus identification numbers, comparisons may be inappropriate when a campus configuration has changed. The following example illustrates this situation.

Example: A campus served grades 7 and 8 in 2013, but in 2014, serves as a 6th grade center. The district did not request a new CDC number for the new configuration. Instead, the same CDC number used in 2013 was maintained (recycled). Therefore, in 2014, grade 6 performance on the assessments may be combined for small numbers analyses purposes with performance index results which included grade 7 and 8 performance.

Whether or not to change a campus number is a serious decision for local school districts. Districts should exercise caution when either requesting new numbers or continuing to use existing numbers when the student population or the grades offered change significantly. Districts are strongly encouraged to request new CDC numbers when school organizational configurations change dramatically.

TEA policy requires school districts and charters to request campus number changes of existing campuses for the current school year by October 1 to ensure time for processing before the PEIMS fall snapshot date in late October. Changes for a subsequent school year will not be processed before November 1. This policy does not apply to new active campuses opening mid-year or campuses under construction.

School districts and charters must consult with the TEA Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions (PMI) to change the campus number of a campus rated *Improvement Required*. The consolidation, deletion, division, or addition of a campus identification number does not absolve the district of the state accountability rating history associated with campuses newly consolidated, divided or closed, nor preclude the requirement of participation in intervention activities for campuses that received a rating of *Improvement Required* in August. Should the campus identification number change for a campus with an *Improvement Required* rating, the PMI Division will work with the district to determine specific intervention requirements.

Although the ratings history may be linked across campus numbers for purposes of determining consecutive years of *Improvement Required* ratings, data will not be linked across campus numbers. This includes PEIMS data, assessment data, and graduation/dropout data that are used to develop the accountability indicators. Campuses with new campus numbers cannot take advantage of the planned Required Improvement provisions, when applicable, of the accountability system in which the performance index

outcomes may be compared under a new number. Therefore, changing a campus number under these circumstances may be to the disadvantage of an *Improvement Required* campus. This should be considered by districts and charters when requesting campus number changes for *Improvement Required* campuses. In the rare circumstance where a campus or charter district receives a new district number, the ratings history is also linked while the data are not linked across the district numbers.

An analysis to screen for the inappropriate use of campus numbers is part of the TEA Data Integrity Activities described in *Chapter 2 – Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets*. TEA can assist in establishing new or retiring old campus numbers.

If a school district enters into a legal agreement with TEA that requires new district or campus numbers, the ratings history will be linked to the previous district or campus number. In this case, both the district and campus will be rated the first year under the new number. Data for districts and campuses in these circumstances will not be linked. This includes the PEIMS data, assessment data, and graduation/dropout data that are used to develop the accountability indicators. Districts or campuses under a legal agreement with TEA cannot take advantage of any planned Required Improvement provisions or small numbers analysis the first year under a new district or campus number.

Community and Student Engagement

Beginning in the 2013-14 school year, TEC §39.0545 requires districts to evaluate and assign to the district and each campus a rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Acceptable*, or *Unacceptable* for performance in community and student engagement. Districts must designate a local committee(s) to develop locally-determined criteria that will be used to determine the performance rating and compliance status for the district and each campus. Therefore, districts should locally maintain the documents that were developed to determine the performance rating and compliance status for the district and each campus.

By August 8, districts must report each rating to TEA and the public. TEA shall report the performance ratings and compliance status for community and student engagement indicators reported by school districts on the agency website no later than October 1.

Complementary Local Accountability Systems

Although the statewide accountability system has been designed to address the guiding principles articulated in *Chapter 1 – Introduction*, it is not a comprehensive system of performance evaluation. Communities across Texas have varied needs and goals for the school districts educating their students. Local systems of accountability can best address those priorities.

Districts are encouraged to develop their own complementary local accountability systems to plan for continued student performance improvement. Such systems are entirely voluntary and for local use only. Performance on locally-defined indicators does not affect the ratings determined through the statewide system.

Examples of locally-defined indicators include, but are not limited to:

- level of parent participation;
- progress on locally administered assessments;
- progress on goals identified by campus improvement plans;

- progress compared to other campuses in the district;
- progress on professional development goals; and
- school safety measures.

As a different approach, districts may choose to expand the state-designated accountability ratings. For example, they may wish to further differentiate among campuses rated *Met Standard*.

A third approach might be to examine the accountability indicators that comprise the performance indexes, both currently in use and planned for implementation, that fall short of local expectations. Additional performance measures could be constructed to track efforts to improve performance in those areas.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, local accountability systems should be designed to serve the needs of the local community and to improve performance for all students.

This page is intentionally blank.