

**Accountability System Development for 2013 and Beyond
Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC)**

Index Evaluation

Introduction

In the rationale for the proposed framework adopted by the ATAC, the Performance Index Workgroup described a system that affords multiple views of campus and district performance, providing multiple opportunities for successful performance, and driving school improvement in multiple areas. They specifically recommended against an evaluation that combines the numeric scores on the four indexes to produce a single rating label. Following is a proposed structure for the evaluation of performance across the four indexes.

The proposal is based on the assumption that the four indexes will each have a score of 0 to 100 representing campus/district performance points as a percent of the maximum possible points for that campus/district. The proposed structure and examples describe the 2014 ratings when all of the indexes and all of the indicators are in use. Transition issues for 2013 are addressed separately.

Proposed Structure for Rating System

Performance Groups for Each Index. Campuses and districts are assigned to performance groups on each index. As proposed, each index has four performance groups. If the Index Scores have been converted to percentiles, as was shown in one option for Index 1 and one option for Index 4, campuses and districts will be assigned to performance groups based on the percentiles. If the Index Score is based on index points, the assignment to performance groups can be based on either the Index Score points or on percentiles.

1. Percentiles. Group assignment is based on performance statewide with a predetermined percentage of campuses/districts assigned to each performance group. For some indexes, the assignment may be based on performance statewide, for others it may be more equitable to make the campus assignment by campus type. In the example illustrated on page 3, each group has approximately equal numbers of campuses and districts.

Top 25 percent of campuses/districts, or top 25 percent of campuses by campus type

Next 25 percent of campuses/districts

Next 25 percent of campuses/districts

Bottom 25 percent of campuses/districts

- The number of campuses and districts in each performance group is predetermined and can be set the same for all the indexes.
- If the Index Score is based on index points that are not converted to percentiles, the Index Score range for each performance group is not known in advance.
- Campuses/districts move to a higher performance group on an index by improving their Index Score in relation to other campuses/districts.

- The distribution of campuses/districts across the performance groups is stable, which could be an advantage during the first few years of the new accountability system when initial performance on the new STAAR assessments is lower and more difficult EOC tests are phased in.
 - Annual resetting of the performance group percentiles may not be necessary unless there are changes to accountability or monitoring and interventions policy.
2. Index Score. If the Index Score has not been converted to percentiles, group assignment can be made based on Index Score points on each of the indexes. In the example illustrated on page 3, all four indexes use the same score ranges:
- Index Score 76 to 100: highest performance group
 - Index Score 51 to 75: the next group
 - Index Score 26 to 50: the next group
 - Index Score 0 to 25: lowest performance group
- The number of campuses and districts in each performance group will vary within each index and across indexes.
 - Index score ranges may need to be tailored to performance on each index rather than using the same score ranges across all indexes.
 - The index score range for each performance group is known in advance and campuses/districts can determine where they fall in the rating structure as soon as they receive their data.
 - Campuses/districts move to a higher performance group on an index by improving their index score. There is no limit to the number of campuses/districts that can move to a higher group in any year.
 - During the first few years of the new accountability system, it may be necessary to set index score ranges for the lowest performance groups relatively low to avoid assigning a disproportionate number of campuses/districts to the lower performance groups. Also, it may appear that high school performance is stagnant as TAKS is phased out and more difficult EOC tests are phased in.
 - Index score ranges would likely be reviewed annually as part of the accountability development process. Under the previous state accountability systems, annual review of performance targets was very divisive.
 - Note that this approach is not possible if the index score has been converted to percentiles.

Percentiles Example of State Distribution of Performance in 2014 and Beyond:

	Index 1 Student Achievement	Index 2 Student Progress	Index 3 Closing Performance Gaps	Index 4 Postsecondary Readiness
Highest Performance Percentile 76 to 100	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts
Percentile 51 to 75	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts
Percentile 26 to 50	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts
Lowest Performance Percentile 0 to 25	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts	25% of campuses or districts

Index Score Example of State Distribution of Performance in 2014 and Beyond:

	Index 1 Student Achievement	Index 2 Student Progress	Index 3 Closing Performance Gaps	Index 4 Postsecondary Readiness
Highest Performance Index Score 76 to 100	6%	40% of campuses	10%	1%
	35% of campuses		15% of campuses	20% of campuses
Index Score 51 to 75	48%	30% of campuses	40% of campuses	32% of campuses
Index Score 26 to 50		20% of campuses		
Lowest Performance Index Score 0 to 25	11%	10%		47% of campuses

Example Campus in 2014 and Beyond: As the example shows, the matrix highlights areas of successful performance while focusing on areas in need of improvement. This campus is lowest in student achievement and needs improvement in postsecondary readiness, but is higher in student progress and closing performance gaps.

	Index 1 Student Achievement	Index 2 Student Progress	Index 3 Closing Performance Gaps	Index 4 Postsecondary Readiness
Highest Performance Index Score 76 to 100				
Index Score 51 to 75		Index Score 68	Index Score 52	
Index Score 26 to 50				Index Score 40
Lowest Performance Index Score 0 to 25	Index Score 22			

Acceptable/Unacceptable District and Campus Ratings. To meet state statutory requirements, the accountability system must identify unacceptable campuses and districts and describe conditions that trigger state monitoring and interventions. The proposed structure is flexible enough to support more than one approach to these requirements. In either of the examples below, assignment to the lowest performance group on one index does not necessarily trigger state monitoring and interventions.

- Some combination of performance group assignments could produce an unacceptable label – assignment to the lowest performance group on all four indexes, for example. Under this approach, indexes that complement one another could be evaluated as a pair – a campus/district assigned to the lowest performance group on Index 1 could receive an acceptable rating if assigned to a higher performance group on Index 2, for example. Conditions for an acceptable rating could be tailored to campus type – high schools assigned to the lowest performance group on Index 4 must meet required improvement to avoid an unacceptable rating, for example, while elementary and middle school performance focuses on Index 3.
- Alternatively, or additionally, the unacceptable label might be assigned to the lowest one percent (or two percent or five percent) of campuses and districts on each index.

Recognized and Exemplary Ratings. According to statutory changes made by House Bill 3 (81st Texas Legislature, 2009), the assignment of exemplary and recognized accountability ratings to be assigned in 2014 can proceed in one of two ways.

1. **Separate Distinction Designation Ratings.** The index framework is used to label campuses and districts as unacceptable or acceptable with additional distinction designations attached to the acceptable rating. In addition to identifying unacceptable campuses and districts, performance across the four indexes would be used to determine if a campus/district is eligible for distinction designations. For eligible campuses and districts, performance on separate distinction designation indicators would be evaluated to award the recognized and exemplary distinction designations.
2. **Integrated Rating System.** The index framework is used to identify campuses and districts as unacceptable, acceptable, recognized, or exemplary (the actual labels are not in statute). For example, campuses and districts that are assigned to the highest performance group on all four indexes are assigned the exemplary label.

Campus Top 25 Percent Distinction Designations. Statute provides for additional distinction designations for campuses that are in the top twenty-five percent in the state in student progress and campuses that are in the top twenty-five percent in the state in closing achievement gaps. The index structure might also provide a way to integrate these campus distinction designations into the system. For example, the top twenty five percent of campuses in student progress could be linked to performance on Index 2 and the top twenty-five percent of campuses in closing achievement gaps could be linked to performance on Index 3.