

**Accountability System Development for 2015
Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC)**

Index Target Goals and Target Setting Options

In March 2012, the newly-formed ATAC reviewed and confirmed the goals for the second generation Texas accountability system. These goals provide the backdrop for the discussion of long-term or intermediate Index Target Goals. Below is an excerpt of *Accountability System Goals and Guiding Principles – 2013 and Beyond*.

| |
|--|
| <p>Accountability System Goals and Guiding Principles – 2013 and Beyond</p> <p>GOALS</p> <p>Texas will be among the top ten states in postsecondary readiness by 2020, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving student achievement at all levels in the core subjects of the state curriculum*; • Ensuring the progress of all students toward achieving Advanced Academic Performance *; • Closing Advanced Academic Performance level gaps among groups*; • Closing gaps among groups in the percentage of students graduating under the recommended high school program and advanced high school program*; and, • Rewarding excellence based on other indicators in addition to state assessment results. |
|--|

* These goals are specified in Chapter 39.053(f) of the Texas Education Code.

Required Improvement (RI)

Based on legislative interpretations of the accountability provisions in the Texas Education Code (Chapter 39, Subchapter C. Accreditation), Subsection 39.053(e) requires the commissioner to set accountability targets and required improvement targets.

Options for required improvement were discussed during the December 2014 ATAC meeting. Required improvement statutory requirements were expected to be addressed in the third year of the current rating system by a separate required improvement calculation for campuses and districts that do not meet the accountability target. It was anticipated that underlying indicators of the performance index framework would be fully implemented by 2015 in order to use year-to-year comparisons. Due to the numerous changes in the Texas Assessment Program affecting 2015 accountability, the STAAR results that will be evaluated in 2015 cannot be directly compared to the STAAR results evaluated in 2014 for any of the four performance indexes.

The consensus among the ATAC members following the discussion of December 2014 was not to apply required improvement in 2015 because comparisons cannot be made between 2014 and 2015 STAAR results.

2016 Preview Targets and Goals for the lowest Rating Category

Assuming no changes in the current Texas Assessment Program, the following discussion provides a preview of future accountability targets beginning with the 2016 accountability results. Determining annual targets for each performance index begins with establishing long-term goals of performance for each index, and awareness of the future changes to the accountability rating system and assessment

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

program. Currently, the 2015 accountability system provides two rating outcomes: *Met Standard* and *Improvement Required*. Based on current statute, future accountability rating labels will require higher ratings that are not discussed in this document. In order to establish long-term goals for performance, there must be agreement with establishing targets for the *Met Standard* rating. In this way, the long-term goals for the lowest rating category form the basis of future performance index targets.

Phase-in of Performance Standards

Discussion of the planned changes to the assessment program performance standard is necessary to establish long-term goals for the lowest rating category. The planned phase-in schedule is described below and will be used to determine the long-term goal for Index 1 (at the satisfactory performance standard) and Index 4 (at the Final Level II performance standard). In order to simplify the discussion, the projected goals and targets are described based on projected Phase-in 1 Level II performance in Index 1, 2, and 3. Index 4 goals and targets are based on projected Final Level II performance.

The Commissioner of Education's decision to maintain the Phase-in 1 Level II performance standards through the 2014-15 school year should have no direct effect on 2015 accountability. However, the adjustment for a three-step plan of incremental movement toward the Final Level II performance standard affects projected accountability goals for the future. The three-step phase-in plan for STAAR performance standards calls for:

- Phase-in 1 Level II performance standards maintained for 2014–2015,
- Phase-in 2 Level II performance standards implemented beginning in 2015–2016,
- Phase-in 3 Level II performance standards implemented beginning in 2018–2019, and
- Final Level II performance standards implemented in the 2021–2022 school year.

Table 1: Future Phase-in Plans for STAAR Performance Standards

| Accountability Year: | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| STAAR Performance Standard | Phase-in 1 Level II | Phase-in 2 Level II | Phase-in 2 Level II | Phase-in 2 Level II | Phase-in 3 Level II | Phase-in 3 Level II | Phase-in 3 Level II | Final Level II | Final Level II | Final Level II | Final Level II |

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

For discussion purposes, the following table outlines the goals that are considered for the 2015 Accountability system and beyond.

Table 2: Projected STAAR Performance

| Accountability Year: | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------|
| Projected STAAR Performance Standard at Phase-in 1 Level II | (currently) 77% | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | ? |
| Projected STAAR Performance Standard at Phase-in 2 Level II | n/a | Phase-in 2 Level II | Phase-in 2 Level II | Phase-in 2 Level II | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | ? |
| Projected STAAR Performance Standard at Phase-in 3 Level II | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Phase-in 3 Level II | Phase-in 3 Level II | Phase-in 3 Level II | TBD | TBD | TBD | ? |
| Projected STAAR Performance Standard at Final Level II | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Final Level II | Final Level II | Final Level II | ? |
| Projected STAAR Performance Standard at Advanced Level III | (currently) 15% | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | ? |

Projected STAAR Performance Standards at Phase-in 2 Level II and Phase-in 3 Level II included in the table above are provided for future discussions only. Performance differentials may be estimated to determine projected targets based on STAAR Performance Standard at Phase-in 2 Level II or Phase-in 3 Level II standards.

Accountability index targets may be established based on projected STAAR Performance Standard at Phase-in 1 Level II, Final Level II, and Advanced Level III standards.

Table 3: Projected STAAR Performance for Accountability Goals of the *Met Standard* Rating Level

| Accountability Year: | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Index 1 | TBD | ? |
| Index 2 | TBD | ? |
| Index 3 | TBD | ? |
| Index 4 | TBD | ? |

Establishing Goals for each Index Target

Developing long-term goals for each performance index may be necessary to ensure Texas schools remain on-track toward becoming among the top ten states in postsecondary readiness by 2020. The distribution of index results of campuses and districts helps in determining the progression toward long-term goals. Goals for each performance index may be developed by considering campus index results of at percentile ranges. For the purpose of this discussion, cumulative frequency percentages are used to provide percentiles of campus performance. For example, when Index scores are sorted in ascending order, the 90th percentile represents the Index 1 score attained by a cumulative frequency of 90 percent

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

of campus. By definition, only 10 percent of campuses have a score greater than the score at the 90th percentile.

Establishing a long-term goal for index targets is contingent on the accountability rating criteria. For 2014, all campuses and districts were required to meet specific targets on all indexes for which they have performance results in order to receive a Met Standard or Met Alternative Standard rating. For 2015, the ATAC has recommended modifying modify the 2015 rating criteria to require meeting the index target on either Index 1 or Index 2, plus the other indexes in order to determine accountability ratings. The following summarizes a possible approach to establishing goals for each performance index target in consideration of the ATAC recommendation.

Index 1: Student Achievement. The index measures students at the current year phase-in satisfactory standard, which is also used in the Index 3 evaluation.

Index 2: Student Progress. Regardless of the option to evaluate either Index 1 or Index 2, it may be useful to establish an index target and long-term goals for student progress.

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps. Considered a high priority for Texas, establishing a long-term goal for Index 3 would satisfy the goal for improving student achievement at all levels.

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness. The components of this performance index represent the overall Accountability System goal for postsecondary readiness. Specific indicators used in the index calculation are appropriate for setting long-term goals.

2015 Index Goals and Targets

Index 1 Long-term Goals. Percentile information of the distribution of the statewide 2014 Index 1 scores is displayed below.

2014 Index 1 Scores

| Percentiles | Elementary | Middle School | High School | All Non-AEA Campuses |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| 90 th | 91 | 90 | 92 | 91 |
| 75 th | 85 | 84 | 86 | 85 |
| 50 th | 76 | 76 | 78 | 77 |
| State-level Index 1 Score (all campuses) = 77 | | | | |
| Percentile by Campus Type | 51 st | 53 rd | 44 th | 50 th |
| 2014 State-level Index 1 Target (all campuses) = 55 | | | | |
| Percentile by Campus Type | 6 th | 4 th | 3 rd | 5 th |

Note that throughout this document, percentiles may be rounded to the nearest whole number.

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

The Index 1 calculation relies on the measure of satisfactory performance. The index score may be viewed intuitively as the STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above for All Grades and All Subjects as reported on the Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR), 2013-14 State Performance report.

Long-Term Goal for Index 1. Selective goals can be set for the statewide % *Phase-in Satisfactory and above*. A reasonable long-term goal for the state may be that nearly all students meet the satisfactory standard. For example, the long-term goal for % *Phase-in Satisfactory and above* could be 100% by the year 2025. Additional long or short term goals may be derived from this concept:

| Index 1 Goals | % Met Satisfactory Standard | Actual Index 1 Score (All Grades/Subjects Rate) | 2014 Percentile (All Non-AEA Campuses) |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| 2014 State-level Index 1 (2014 TAPR All Grades/Subjects) | 77% | 77 (77) | 50th |
| 100 th Percentile | 100% | 100 | 100 th |
| Above 95 th (97 nd) Percentile | 95% | 95 | 97 th |
| Above 90 th (92 rd) Percentile | 92% | 92 | 92 nd |
| Above 75 th (83 th) Percentile | 88% | 88 | 83 rd |
| Above 50 th (66 th) Percentile | 82% | 82 | 66 th |
| Below 25 th (10 th) Percentile | 60% | 60 | 10 th |
| <i>2014 5th Percentile</i> | 56% | 56 | 5 th |

2015 Index 1 Target. Two options are available for setting 2015 Index 1 targets.

Option 1: Set an absolute target by incrementing the prior year Index 1 target by five points.

For this option, the 2015 Index 1 target is 60, five points greater than the 2014 Index 1 target of 55.

Pro

- Provides continuous rigor to the expectation of the number of students meeting the Satisfactory performance standard.
- The target is easy to remember and applies to all campus types.

Con

- Long-term goals and projected test performance are not considered.
- May be perceived as too rigorous for elementary and middle schools who are concerned about the impact of the revised TEKS mathematics curriculum on 2015 student performance.

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

Option 2: Set the Index 1 target at the fifth percentile of 2015 student performance of all campuses.

For this option, the 2015 Index 1 target cannot be determined until late July 2015.

Pro

- Establishes a general number of districts and campuses identified with a rating as *Improvement Required*.
- Due numerous changes in 2015 ratings, the fifth percentile target applies an appropriately normative approach to accountability rating outcomes.

Con

- The target is not known until after the end of the current school year.
- A normative-based target means that the five percent of campuses will always be rated as *Improvement Required*.

Index 2 Long-term Goals. Percentile information of the distribution of 2014 Index 2 scores is displayed below.

2014 Index 2 Scores

| Percentiles | Elementary | Middle School | All Non-AEA Campuses |
|-------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------------------|
| 90 th | 55 | 43 | 53 |
| 75 th | 50 | 39 | 47 |
| 50 th | 45 | 35 | 40 |
| (2014 Target) 5 th | 33 | 28 | 15 |

State-level Index 2 Score (all campuses) = 40

| Percentile of State-level Index Score by Campus Type | Elementary | Middle School | All Non-AEA Campuses |
|--|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| | 23 rd | 80 th | 50 th |

State-level Index 2 Targets

| Percentile of State-level Index Score by Campus Type | Elementary | Middle School | All Non-AEA Campuses |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| | 33 | 28 | 16 (District Target) |
| | 5 th | 5 th | 5 th |

Note that throughout this document, percentiles may be rounded to the nearest whole number.

The Index 2 calculation relies on measures two measures of student progress: meeting or exceeding progress and solely exceeding progress. The index score may be viewed intuitively as the average of two percentages for the All Student group.

Long-Term Goal for Index 2. Based on the example above, selective goals can be derived from the combination of *% Met or Exceeded Progress* averaged with *% Exceeded Progress*. A

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

reasonable long-term goal for the state may be that nearly all students meet student or exceed progress, while almost half of all students exceed student progress.

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| % Met or Exceeded Progress | 95% | Average of rates (estimated Index 2 score) |
| % Exceeded Progress | 45% | 70 |

Additional long or short term goals may be derived from this concept:

| Index 2 Goals | % Met or Exceeded Progress | % Exceeded Progress | Index 2 Score (Average of Rates) | 2014 Percentile (All Non-AEA Campuses) |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 2014 State-level Index 2 (2014 TAPR, All Grades, Average of Reading and Math shown) | 61% | 18% | 40 (40) | 50 th |
| Above 95 th Percentile | 95% | 45% | 70 | 99.81 |
| Below 90 th Percentile | 75% | 25% | 50 | 84 th |
| Below 75 th Percentile | 70% | 20% | 45 | 68 th |
| 50 th Percentile | 65% | 15% | 40 | 50 th |
| Above 25 th Percentile | 55% | 10% | 33 | 26 th |
| Below 10 th Percentile | 35% | 6% | 21 | 9 th |
| 2014 5 th Percentile | 30% * | 1% * | 16 | 5 th |

* Several combinations of percent that Meet/Exceed student progress, and percent that Exceed student progress are possible for an overall Index 2 score.

2015 Index 2 Target. Two options are available for setting 2015 Index 2 targets. As mentioned above, the ATAC recommended ratings criteria to evaluate either Index 1 or Index 2 may deem it unnecessary to establish a long-term goal for student progress.

Option 1: Set an absolute target based on 2014 Index 2 results. *Attachment A* provides the 2014 performance index targets.

For this option, the prior year 2014 Index 2 targets that were set at the fifth percentile may be held constant or incremented for 2015.

Pro

- Simplifies the targets.
- Targets are based long-term goals, easy to explain, and defensible.
- Provides continuous rigor to the expectation of the number of students meeting or exceeding student progress.
- Offers an opportunity to set one target over all campus types.

Con

- The number of campuses or districts that do not meet the target cannot be predicted.

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

Option 2: Set the Index 2 target at the fifth percentile of 2015 student performance of all campuses.

For this option, the 2015 Index 2 target cannot be determined until late July 2015.

Pro

- Establishes a general number of districts and campuses identified with a rating as *Improvement Required*.
- Due numerous changes in 2015 ratings, the fifth percentile target applies an appropriately normative approach to accountability rating outcomes.

Con

- The target is not known until after the end of the current school year.
- Up to five targets may be determined for the district, each campus type and AEA campuses/districts.

Index 3 Long-term Goals. Percentile information of the distribution of 2014 Index 3 scores is displayed below.

2014 Index 3 Scores

| Percentiles | Elementary | Middle School | High School | All Non-AEA Campuses |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 90 th | 53 | 49 | 51 | 52 |
| 75 th | 47 | 43 | 45 | 46 |
| 50 th | 41 | 38 | 41 | 40 |
| State-level Index 3 Score (all campuses) = 38 | | | | |
| Percentile by Campus Type | 37 th | 50 th | 32 nd | 38 th |
| State-level Index 3 Targets | | | | |
| | 28 | 27 | 31 | 28 (District Target) |
| Percentile by Campus Type | 6 th | 6 th | 6 th | 6 th |

Note that throughout this document, percentiles may be rounded to the nearest whole number.

The Index 3 calculation relies on measures of both satisfactory and advanced level performance. The index score may be viewed intuitively as the average of two percentages for any specific student group. See *Appendix B: Example of Average Rates for Estimating Index 3 Scores*, found in the document

Long-Term Goal for Index 3. Based on the example above, selective goals can be derived from the combination of % *Phase-in Satisfactory and above* averaged with % *Met Advanced Standard*. As described in Table 2, the long-term goal for % *Phase-in Satisfactory and above* is 100% by the year 2025. A reasonable long-term goal for the state may be that all economically disadvantaged

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

students meet the satisfactory standard, while at least one quarter of all students achieve the advanced performance level.

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|------|--|
| % Phase-in Satisfactory and above | 100% | Average of rates (estimated Index 3 score) |
| % Met Advanced Standard | 25% | 63 |

Additional long or short term goals may be derived from this concept:

| Index 3 Goals | % Met Satisfactory Standard | % Advanced Level III | Index 3 Score (Average of Rates) | 2014 Percentile (All Non-AEA Campuses) |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 2014 State-level Index 3 | 69% | 9% | 38 | 38th |
| 2014 TAPR-STAAAR Percent at Advanced Standard (All Grades/All Subjects) | 77% | 15% | n/a | n/a |
| Below 99 th Percentile | 100% | 25% | 63 | 98.66 |
| Above 95 th Percentile | 95% | 22% | 59 | 97 th |
| Above 90 th Percentile | 90% | 18% | 54 | 93 rd |
| Above 75 th Percentile | 82% | 15% | 49 | 84 th |
| Above 50 th Percentile | 74% | 11% | 43 | 63 rd |
| Below 25 th Percentile | 59% | 7% | 33 | 18 th |
| <i>2014 5th Percentile</i> | 54% * | 2% * | 28 | 5 th |

* Several combinations of performance at the Satisfactory and Advanced levels are possible for an overall Index 3 score.

2015 Index 3 Target. Two options are available for setting 2015 Index 3 targets.

Option 1: Set an absolute target by incrementing the prior year Index 3 target by five points.

For this option, the 2015 Index 3 target is 33; five points greater than the 2014 Index 3 target of 28 Index 3 based on the 5th percentile of all Non-AEA campuses (district target).

Pro

- Provides continuous rigor to the expectation of the number of students meeting the Satisfactory performance standard.
- The target is easy to remember and applies to all campus types.

Con

- Long-term goals and projected test performance are not considered.
- The number of campuses or districts that do not meet the target cannot be predicted.

Option 2: Set the Index 3 target at the fifth percentile of 2015 student performance of all campuses.

For this option, the 2015 Index 3 target cannot be determined until late July 2015.

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

Pro

- Establishes a general number of districts and campuses identified with a rating as *Improvement Required*.
- Due numerous changes in 2015 ratings, the fifth percentile target applies an appropriately normative approach to accountability rating outcomes.

Con

- The target is not known until after the end of the current school year.
- A normative-based target means that the five percent of campuses will always be rated as *Improvement Required*.

Index 4 Long-term Goals. The index represent many of the Accountability System Goals and specific indicators appropriate for setting long-term goals. Index 4 goals are described below in two parts: goals for Index 4 STAAR Component only, and goals for Index 4 All Components (STAAR, Graduation Rate, Graduation Plan, and Postsecondary Indicators).

Percentile information of the distribution of 2014 Index 4 scores for STAAR Components and All Components are displayed below.

Index 4 STAAR Component

2014 Index 4 Scores – STAAR Component Only

Includes campuses evaluated on the STAAR Component Only (n= 6001)

| Percentiles | Elementary | Middle School | All Campuses (Non-AEA) |
|----------------------|------------|---------------|------------------------|
| STAAR Component only | | | |
| 90 th | 54 | 56 | 55 |
| 75 th | 42 | 44 | 43 |
| 50 th | 30 | 32 | 31 |

2014 State-level Index 4 Targets (STAAR Component Only):

| | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| | 12 | 13 | 13 (District Target) |
| Percentile by Campus Type | 5 th | 5 th | 6 th |
| State-level Index 4 STAAR Component = 45.6 (all campuses n=7416) | | | |
| Percentile by Campus Type | 82 nd | 79 th | n/a |

Long-Term Goal for Index 4 – STAAR Component. Selecting a goal for Index 4 must be conducted separately for two components: STAAR components only, and all components. The STAAR Component of the index does not combine two performance levels; however, the component represents an average of performance rates over the All Students groups and seven ethnic/racial student groups. Long or short term goals for the STAAR component represent the average expected performance goal for all ethnic/racial student groups. See the *State-Level 2014 Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness Calculation Report*.

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

Goals for Index 4 STAAR Component

| | % Final Level II Standard/ Index Score | 2014 Percentile (All Non-AEA Campuses*) |
|--|--|---|
| 2014 State-level Index 4 STAAR Component | 45.6 | 79.89 |
| 2014 State-level TAPR - STAAR Percent at Postsecondary Readiness Standard | | |
| Two or More Subjects | 41 | n/a |
| Reading | 45 | n/a |
| Mathematics | 39 | n/a |
| Above 95 th Percentile | 70 | 98 th |
| Above 90 th Percentile | 59 | 92 nd |
| Below 90 th Percentile | 55 | 89 th |
| Above 75 th Percentile | 45 | 78 th |
| Below 50 th Percentile | 30 | 46 th |
| Below 25 th Percentile | 18 | 15 th |
| <i>2014 5th Percentile</i> | 13 | 5 th |

* All Non-AEA Campuses evaluated on the STARR Component only.

Index 4 All Components

2014 Index 4 Scores – All Components

Includes campuses evaluated on the STAAR Component Only (n= 1415)

| Percentiles | Elementary | Middle School | All Campuses (Non-AEA) |
|------------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| All Components | | | |
| 90 th | n/a | n/a | 81 |
| 75 th | n/a | n/a | 75 |
| 50 th | n/a | n/a | 69 |

State-level Index 4 Score = 69

(all campuses n=7416)

Percentile of All Non-AEA Campuses

51st

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

Other components of Index 4 in effect average performance rates over the All Students groups and seven ethnic/racial student groups. The state-level Index 4 Overall Performance shows the statewide performance on each component and the average of those is shown below.

| State-level Index 4 Overall Performance | | |
|--|------|---|
| Graduation Rate | 88.8 | Average of non-STAAR components: 77.2 |
| Graduation Plan | 84.1 | |
| Postsecondary Indicator | 58.6 | |
| <hr/> | | |
| STAAR Component | 45.6 | Average of All Components (Estimated Index 4 Score): 69.3 |

Consideration for the goal of each component within Index 4 is important for goal setting. For example, the attainment of a nationally recognized graduation rate may mean that the Index 4 goal requires emphasis on all other indicators. The compensation effect of Index 4 allows communities to demonstrate community driven goals while meeting an overall expectation for performance. The following table describes the long-term goals for each component of Index 4.

| Long-Term Goals for Index 4 Components | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Graduation Rate | 90 | Average of non-STAAR components: 90 |
| Graduation Plan | 80 | |
| Postsecondary Indicator | 100 | |
| <hr/> | | |
| STAAR Component | 70 | Average of All Components (Estimated Index 4 Score): 85 |

Additional long or short term goals may be derived by considering the average of All Index 4 components.

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

Goals for Index 4 – All Components

| | Index 4 Score | 2014 Percentile (All Non-AEA Campuses*) |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 2014 State-level Index 4 Score | 69 | 50.32 |
| 95 th Percentile | 85 | 95 th |
| Above 90 th | 82 | 92 nd |
| 90 th Percentile | 81 | 90 th |
| 75 th Percentile | 75 | 75 th |
| Above 50 th Percentile | 70 | 55 th |
| Below 20 th Percentile | 62 | 19 th |
| 2014 5 th Percentile | 56 | 5 th |

* All Non-AEA Campuses evaluated on all components.

2015 Index 4 Target. Two options are available for setting 2015 Index 4 targets.

Option 1: Set an absolute target by incrementing the prior year Index 4 target by five points.

For this option, the 2015 Index 4 targets are

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| STAAR Component | 18 |
| All Components | 62 |

These targets are five points greater than the 2014 Index 4 targets based on the 5th percentile of all Non-AEA campuses (district target).

Pro

- Provides continuous rigor to the expectation of the number of students meeting the Satisfactory performance standard.
- The target is easy to remember and applies to all campus types.

Con

- Long-term goals and projected test performance are not considered.
- The number of campuses or districts that do not meet the target cannot be predicted.

Option 2: Set the Index 4 target at the fifth percentile of 2015 student performance of all campuses.

For this option, the 2015 Index 4 target cannot be determined until late July 2015.

Pro

- Establishes a general number of districts and campuses identified with a rating as *Improvement Required*.
- Due numerous changes in 2015 ratings, the fifth percentile target applies an appropriately normative approach to accountability rating outcomes.

2015 ATAC Accountability Development Topics

Con

- The target is not known until after the end of the current school year.
- A normative-based target means that the five percent of campuses will always be rated as Improvement Required.

Attachment A**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 | 16 | 28 | 57 | 13 |
| Campus Targets | | | | | |
| Elementary | 55 | 33 | 28 | n/a | 12 |
| Middle | | 28 | 27 | n/a | 13 |
| High School/K-12 | | n/a | 31 | 57 | 21 |

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 | 11 | 33 | 45 |