

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.