

Accountability System Development for 2013 and Beyond
Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

System Safeguards

Underlying the performance index framework are disaggregated performance results. The disaggregated performance results will 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 intent of the safeguards system is to also meet additional federal accountability requirements that are not met in the performance index.

The following template shows the disaggregated performance measures and safeguard targets. Performance rates are calculated from the assessment results used to calculate performance rates in the performance index. A single target will be used for the disaggregated performance rates that correspond to the 2013 target for student achievement in the performance index. (The 2013 targets for the performance index will be set by the commissioner in March 2013.) Participation rates, graduation rates, and caps on use of STAAR Alternate and STAAR Modified are calculated to meet federal indicator definitions. Federal targets have been set for participation rates, graduation rates, and caps. Additional information about each of the safeguard indicators is provided on the following pages.

	All	African American	American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More	Econ. Disadv.	ELL	Special Educ.
Performance Rates											
Reading	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mathematics	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Writing	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Soc. Studies	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
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 Grad. Rates											
4-year	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%
5-year	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%
District Caps											
Reading											
Modified	2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alternate	1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics											
Modified	2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alternate	1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Targets for 2013 will be set by the commissioner in March 2013. The system safeguard performance rates and target will correspond to the performance rates and target for student achievement in the performance index.

Results will be reported for any cell that meets accountability minimum size criteria. Failure to meet the safeguard target for any reported cell must be addressed in the campus or district improvement plan. If the campus or district is already identified for assistance or intervention in the Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) based on the current year state accountability rating or prior year state or

federal accountability designations, 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 performance measures.

Accountability System Safeguard Indicators

Performance Rates

Definition and Calculation: Percent of students performing at the phase-in Level II standard, by subject including retest results. Accountability subset rules apply.

Student Groups: All Students, seven race/ethnicity student groups (African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More), Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, and English Language Learner required for federal approval.

Target: State accountability performance index targets for 2013 will be set by the commissioner in March 2013. The system safeguard targets will correspond to the target for student achievement in the performance index.

Rationale: With a performance index framework, poor performance in one subject or one student groups does not result in an Improvement Required accountability rating. However, disaggregated performance will be reported and districts and campuses are responsible for addressing performance for each subject and each student group. Formalizing this requirement is proposed to meet federal accountability requirements not met in the performance index framework. The safeguards also remove all need to apply floors to the disaggregated performance results as part of the accountability ratings criteria.

Federal Graduation Rates

Definition and Calculation: The federal graduation rate calculation is the same as the state graduation rate calculation with one exception. The statutorily required exclusions from the state graduation rate beginning with the class of 2011 (with the change fully phased in for the class of 2014) are not allowed under the federal graduation rate calculation.

Student Groups: All Students, seven race/ethnicity student groups (African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More), Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, and English Language Learner required for federal approval.

Target: 78% for four-year graduation rate and 83% for five-year graduation rate required for federal approval.

Rationale: The disaggregated graduation rates can provide a safeguard to the state accountability system while meeting federal accountability requirements. The federal rates will not affect accountability ratings but districts and campuses will be required to address any rates that do not meet the federal targets.

STAAR Participation Rates

Definition and Calculation: Calculated for Reading and Mathematics, the federal methodology is updated to reflect changes in assessment program.

- EOC does not provide a test answer document for every high school student every year.
- EOC provides multiple answer documents for some students.
- EOC allows students to retest for any reason, within the current year or in a later year.
- New rules for use of “Other” score code in STAAR.

Student Groups: All Students, seven race/ethnicity student groups (African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More), Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, and English Language Learner required for federal approval.

Target: 95% required for federal approval.

Rationale: District Reading and Mathematics participation rates are very high statewide. With the new calculation, new student groups, and new minimum size criteria, districts and campuses can best address any rates that do not meet the 95 percent target through the campus or district improvement planning process.

STAAR-Modified and STAAR-Alternate Caps

Definition and Calculation: STAAR-M and STAAR-Alt results that meet the Phase-in Level II standard as a percent of total STAAR participation (participation rate denominator). Cap processing is used to determine if districts exceed the cap target. Exceeding the cap target triggers consequences for districts and campuses but performance results used to calculate indicators are not changed.

Student Groups: NA

Target: STAAR Alt 1% plus STAAR-M 2%

Rationale: Under the proposed approach, all districts that exceed the cap, and campuses in those districts, are subject to interventions. Under the former system, adjusted performance data did not necessarily cause campuses and districts to Miss AYP or to enter school improvement (SIP) interventions, or to address use of the modified assessments. If a district or campus did Miss AYP or enter SIP, the interventions were targeted at performance in the subject rather than specifically at use of modified assessments. The proposed approach targets use of STAAR-M. Districts have the opportunity to address performance results that exceed the cap through the district and campus improvement planning process.

Performance-Based Monitoring Data Validation Systems

The Performance-Based Monitoring Assessment Data Validation and Leaver Data Validation systems were designed to ensure data integrity of the data-driven accountability systems. Two additional indicators that have been discussed in relation to state accountability data integrity are recommended

to be incorporated into the PBM Leaver Data Validation System rather than the accountability rating system.

- Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate: The Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) recommended that the Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate be used as a safeguard indicator rather than a performance indicator. Due to small numbers, the Grade 7-8 dropout rate is primarily a district indicator.
- Longitudinal Cohort Graduation Error Rates: From 2003 through 2011 the state accountability system used an annual data quality measure of underreported students for districts as an additional requirement for a Recognized or Exemplary rating. TEA will research use of longitudinal data quality indicators in addition to annual data quality indicators.