

## Accountability System Development for 2013 and Beyond

### Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) Recommendations and Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) Recommendations

The Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) recommendations described in Section 1 below are built on the recommendations of the Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) in Section 2 of this document. The APAC accepted the recommendations contained in the ATAC report with no changes except where specifically noted in Section 1 below.

#### SECTION 1: ACCOUNTABILITY POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (APAC) RECOMMENDATIONS

##### Overall Design: Performance Index

The overall design of the accountability system is a performance index framework. Performance indicators are grouped into four indexes that align with the goals of the accountability system.

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

**Index 2: Student Progress** separates measures of student progress from measures of student achievement to provide an opportunity for diverse campuses to show the improvements they are making independent of overall achievement levels. Growth is evaluated by subject and student group.

At the time the ATAC made their recommendations, the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) growth measure was scheduled to be finalized for 2014 ratings. The commissioner requested that the timeline be accelerated so that the STAAR growth measure can be used for ratings in 2013. Following is an overview of the proposed approach for Index 2.

- Growth measure. The growth measure is based on a change score that is the difference between the student's current year score and the prior year score.
- Growth standard: Students are assigned to one of three growth categories based on change in scale score in relation to growth expectations:
  - Did Not Meet Growth Expectation
  - Met Growth Expectation
  - Exceeded Growth Expectation
- Subjects: Reading and Mathematics, Writing for all available grades
- Student groups: All Students, English language learner student group, special education student group, and seven race/ethnicity student groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, Two or More Races

- Methodology: percent of students at the specified student growth level on the assessment is multiplied by the weight for that growth level,
  - Met – one point for each percent of students at the Met growth expectations level
  - Exceeded – two points for each percent of students at the Exceeded growth expectations level

**Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps** emphasizes advanced academic achievement of economically disadvantaged student group and the lowest performing race/ethnicity student groups at each campus or district.

**Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness** includes measures of high school completion and STAAR performance at the final Level II standard. The intent of this index is to emphasize the importance for students to receive a high school diploma that provides them with the foundation necessary for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military.

### **Ratings Criteria for 2013**

The recommended accountability ratings criteria and targets are based on the following assumptions.

- The 2013 criteria will stand alone because the performance index framework cannot be fully implemented in 2013. The decision for 2013 is not a decision for 2014 and beyond ratings criteria.
- The recommendation applies to campus and district accountability ratings.
- Each of the four indexes will have a score of 0 to 100 representing campus or district performance points as a percent of the maximum possible points for that campus or district.
- Targets identifying the lowest performing campuses and districts will be set for each index.
- The framework of four indexes was designed to evaluate four different views of campus or district performance that communicate strengths and areas in need of improvement. The ATAC strongly recommended against summing or averaging the four index scores because collapsing the scores into a single number reduces transparency and can be easily misinterpreted or misunderstood. The APAC did not consider options for summing or averaging the four index scores.

**APAC Recommendation for 2013 Ratings Criteria:** For 2013 only, to receive a Met Standard rating all campuses and districts must meet the accountability targets on two indexes.

Districts and campuses with students in Grade 9 or above must meet targets on two of the four indexes:

- Index 1: Student Achievement
- Index 2: Student Progress
- Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps
- Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

Districts and campuses with a high grade of Grade 8 or lower must meet targets on two of the three indexes for which they have performance data in 2013:

- Index 1: Student Achievement
- Index 2: Student Progress
- Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps

**APAC Rationale:** The ratings criteria are easy to understand and applied uniformly for all campuses and districts. The ratings criteria are flexible but require campuses and districts to meet standards on at least two broad sets of expectations. Closing performance gaps is emphasized for elementary campuses because they must meet the target on Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps or on Index 2: Student Progress, which measures growth of all student groups. Note that ATAC recommendations on the ratings criteria were proposed prior to the decision to use a measure of Student Progress for Index 2 outcomes in 2013 accountability.

### **Accountability Targets for 2013**

The data available to model the provisions of the new accountability system are not an exact representation of the data that will be used to calculate the indicators for the ratings in 2013. The APAC selected targets that the models estimate will identify about five percent of campuses as Improvement Required. However, those estimates come with the following caveats.

- It is reasonable to expect that student performance will improve between 2012 (used for modeling) and 2013 (used for 2013 ratings).
- Performance improvement will be offset for high schools and districts by the inclusion of more difficult assessment results. The biggest difference is that the model uses STAAR EOC results for only one class of students – English I, Algebra I, Biology and World Geography for the class of 2015, the first class to graduate under the STAAR. The actual 2013 performance will use STAAR EOC results for two classes of students, and include the next higher test in each subject – English II, Geometry, Chemistry, and World History.
- The recommended ratings criteria for 2013 include evaluation of Index 2: Student Progress but performance on that index cannot be modeled. The addition of Index 2 can only improve the outcome – some campuses that do not otherwise meet the required number of targets might meet the Index 2 target.

**APAC Recommendation for 2013 Accountability Targets:** The recommended targets shown in the following table identify about five percent of campuses for the Improvement Required rating. Targets recommended for campuses and districts evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) modifications identify about ten percent of alternative education campuses for the Improvement Required rating.

**APAC Rationale:** The target for Index 1 requires at least 50 percent of students to meet the phase-in Level II satisfactory performance standard on the STAAR assessments. Using the same target for Index 3 emphasizes the goal of closing performance gaps. These targets are reasonable considering this is the first year of the new accountability system. Educators did not receive advance notice of the standards for 2013 and the final decisions on ratings criteria and targets will be released late in the school year. The AEA targets identify about ten percent of AEA campuses under the AEA

modifications that were modeled but additional modifications were recommended (see Additional Comments below).

**APAC Recommendation for 2013 Accountability Targets**

	<b>Index 1: Student Achievement</b>	<b>Index 2: Student Progress</b>	<b>Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps</b>	<b>Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness</b>
non-AEA (7,338 campuses)	50	Index score at 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile of non-AEA campus performance	50	75
AEA (311 campuses)	15	Index score at 2 <sup>nd</sup> percentile of AEA campus performance	15	35

**Model Results**

95% of campuses	met accountability targets on <b>two or more indexes</b> modeled (Index 1, Index 3, Index 4) and receive Met Standard rating
3% of campuses	met accountability target on <b>one index</b> (Index 1, Index 3, or Index 4) and rating depends on Index 2: Student Progress
2% of campuses	<b>did not meet accountability targets on any index</b> modeled (Index 1, Index 3, Index 4) and receive Improvement Required rating

As modeled, the targets identify about five percent of campuses receiving the Improvement Required rating label. With anticipated improvements in student performance and the addition of Index 2, the expectation is that fewer than five percent of campuses will receive the Improvement Required rating label in 2013. This is similar to the ATAC recommendation that set targets that identified about three to four percent of campuses to receive the Improvement Required rating.

Since performance on Index 2 cannot be modeled, the APAC proposed to set the target for Index 2 at about the second percentile of campus performance. This means that about two percent of campuses, or about 150 campuses, will not meet the Index 2 target in 2013.

Under the model for the APAC recommendation shown above, the number of campuses that receive the Improvement Required rating ranges from two percent to five percent. The lowest performing two percent of campuses receive the Improvement Required rating regardless of how high they score on Index 2 because they do not meet the target for another index. About three percent of campuses meet the target on one of the other indexes and their rating depends on whether they meet the target on Index 2.

**APAC Minority Recommendation:** Two APAC members recommended that all campuses and districts must meet the accountability target for two indexes, but one of those targets must be Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps. One member recommended that the accountability targets be set at a level to identify about fifteen percent of campuses for an Improvement Required rating. The other APAC member recommended targets that were similar to the overall committee recommendation that identify about five percent of campuses for an Improvement Required rating.

The primary objection to the minority recommendation is that it identifies a disproportionate number of high schools. The targets that identify fifteen percent of campuses overall for an Improvement Required rating, for example, identify about 35 percent of high schools.

**Additional Comments**

Following are other comments expressed by individual APAC members during the meeting.

APAC Member Comment	TEA Response
The performance index framework is complicated.	Given the greater complexity of the statutory requirements of the new accountability system, the performance index framework was determined to communicate more effectively than a separate indicators system. Nevertheless, there is always a learning curve when a new system is introduced and training efforts at the local and region levels will be critical. The performance index framework lends itself to narrative and graphic reporting as shown on the attached one-page description of the proposed system.

<p>Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps is particularly difficult to understand.</p>	<p>Index 3 emphasizes advanced academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students and the two lowest performing race/ethnicity student groups on the campus or district.</p> <p>The index looks only at performance of these student groups rather than comparing their performance to other student groups. Consequently, the index can be calculated for both diverse campuses and homogeneous campuses. For example, if 100 percent of the students on a campus are economically disadvantaged Hispanic students, that campus participates in closing the state performance gaps for economically disadvantaged and Hispanic students.</p> <p>Performance expectations are set at the STAAR Level III advanced performance standard, rather than at the performance level of other student groups on the campus. The STAAR Level III advanced performance standard is tied to the statutory goal that Texas will be among the top ten states in postsecondary readiness by 2020 with no significant achievement gaps by race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status.</p>
<p>The proposed accountability system suffers from a major weakness of the former accountability system in that student demographics will to a great extent determine how well a campus performs. Like the former system, the new system favors wealthy, low minority school districts.</p>	<p>The performance index framework provides multiple views of student performance; the four indexes give a more balanced view of campus and district performance than the previous system by communicating both strengths and areas in need of improvement. A campus where student achievement is low initially, for example, can demonstrate through Index 2 that students are making or exceeding growth expectations. Controlling for student demographics in the accountability system is not consistent with the goal of closing performance gaps between student groups.</p>

<p>For alternative education campuses (AEC), the preference is to define indicators that allow AECs to excel rather than setting lower accountability targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inclusion of the growth measure in 2013 addresses the need for alternative education campuses and districts to receive credit for progress of their students.</li> <li>○ Give credit for retest results in Index 1: Student Achievement and Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness.</li> <li>○ Do not use the annual dropout rate for AECs that do not have a graduation rate.</li> <li>○ Give credit for continuing students (students who remain in school after their class graduates) in the graduation rate calculation, rather than GED recipients.</li> <li>○ Add credit accrual rate as an indicator for AECs.</li> </ul>	<p>The ATAC report (Section 2) lists eight modifications recommended for AECs, including setting lower accountability targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Index 1 and Index 4 indicators are limited to first administration results because those are the only results that are consistent across all campuses. Index 2 and Index 3 will include retests and use the best result for each test. In addition, a recommended modification for Index 3 gives AECs credit for students who achieve the EOC minimum score as well as those who pass the test.</li> <li>○ Annually reported dropout and graduation rates are the only school leaver indicators available until campuses have five years of data to calculate a graduation rate. Options that would give AECs credit for recovered dropouts are being explored for the 2013 rating system.</li> <li>○ The extended year graduation rates recommended for AECs give credit for continuing students who graduate or receive a GED certificate after five or six years. Research is being done on a 2013 indicator to give AECs additional bonus credit for continuing students who graduate or receive a GED, rather than giving credit for all continuing students.</li> <li>○ Credit accrual is being researched but cannot be used in 2013 ratings. Currently assignment of course credit is a local decision that does not rely on a standard definition from campus to campus.</li> </ul>
<p>Alternative education campuses and districts that receive a Met Standard rating under modified procedures should be clearly labeled so that parents who are comparing campus performance ratings realize AECs are evaluated under modified indicators and targets.</p>	<p>One option is to use a different rating label for AECs, such as Met Alternative Standard.</p>

## SECTION 2: ACCOUNTABILITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ATAC) RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. Overall Design: Performance Index

The overall design of the accountability system is a performance index framework. Performance indicators are grouped into four indexes that align with the goals of the accountability system.

Index 1: Student Achievement

Index 2: Student Progress

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

**Rationale:** The performance index framework addresses the four statutory policy goals for the new accountability system.

- 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.

Communicating campus and district performance to parents, teachers, school administrators, policymakers, and the general public is one of the primary purposes of the accountability system. The performance index framework is a new approach to school accountability for Texas, and explaining a new system always presents communication challenges. Given the greater complexity of the statutory requirements of the new accountability system, however, the performance index framework was determined to communicate more effectively than a separate indicators system. The performance index framework provides multiple views of school performance. For this reason, it lends itself to narrative and graphic reporting that better communicate campus and district strengths and areas in need of improvement.

Providing multiple views of school performance in turn provides incentives for campuses and districts that are working hard to improve. The underlying reporting system and accountability system safeguards will inform school and classroom practice and enable educators to address individual student needs. New reporting timelines will provide data and information about student performance in a timely manner.

The performance indicators framework is considered less punitive than a separate indicators system, not because fewer districts and campuses will be assigned an unacceptable rating label but because the accountability rating will be based on overall performance rather than the lowest performing measure. With a performance index framework, stronger performance in some areas can compensate to some extent for weaker performance in other areas. The accountability system safeguards described below address the concern that areas of weak performance might be neglected under this framework.

The technical document provides more detail on indicator definitions and index construction for each of the four indexes. The following information focuses on issues that were discussed at

Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) meetings, including issues that were the subject of public comment.

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

EOC Retest Results: The indicators in Index 1 and Index 4 include first attempt EOC results from the current accountability year, defined as a cycle that includes the previous summer administration and current year fall and spring administrations. Including the three administrations addresses the needs of innovative programs and students completing courses at different paces. EOC retest results are not included in Index 1 and Index 4 in order to provide a consistent measure of performance across all campuses and districts. Since all high school students are eligible to retest, not just those that failed an EOC, whether and how often students retest will vary from campus to campus and district to district depending on a number of factors, including whether the district can afford to offer more expensive alternative schedule options to students.

**Index 2: Student Progress** separates measures of student progress from measures of student achievement to provide an opportunity for diverse campuses to show the improvements they are making independent of overall achievement levels. Growth is evaluated by subject and student group.

**Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps** emphasizes advanced academic achievement of Economically Disadvantaged student group and the lowest performing Race/Ethnicity student groups at each campus or district.

Performance Expectations. Performance expectations are set at the STAAR Level III advanced performance standard rather than at the performance level of the higher performing student group. This sets performance expectations for the low performing groups to an absolute performance target that does not change every year. In addition, the STAAR Level III advanced performance standard is tied to the statutory and accountability goal that Texas will be among the top ten states in postsecondary readiness by 2020 with no significant achievement gaps by race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status.

The STAAR Level III advanced performance standard focuses on closing performance gaps at the highest performance level. Student performance gaps are greatest at Level III. This index provides a consistent target to attain the 2020 goal of closing performance gaps. Performance in this category indicates that students are well prepared for the next grade or course. Students in this category have a high likelihood of success in the next grade or course with little or no academic intervention. For Algebra II and English III, this level of performance also indicates students are well prepared for postsecondary success.

Weighted Performance Rate. The STAAR Weighted Performance Rate used in Index 3 gives Level III advanced test results twice the weight of phase-in Level II test results in the indicator, acknowledging the greater challenge of achieving the Level III advanced performance standard. The performance rate includes EOC retest results so that districts and campuses receive credit for remediation of students who need to improve their EOC scores.

Student Groups. Most campuses and districts meet minimum size criteria for Economically Disadvantaged student group. Although there is overlap between Race/Ethnicity student groups and the Economically Disadvantaged student group, there are Race/Ethnicity student group performance gaps that exist independent of current socioeconomic status of students. Also, including both Economically Disadvantaged student group and low-performing Race/Ethnicity student groups in Index 3 addresses one of the weaknesses of the performance index framework – the possibility of low performance of one student group being masked by higher performance of other student groups. The inclusion of student groups that may consist of the same students illustrates that the primary purpose of Index 3 is to reward schools that focus their instructional resources on these student populations. Further, the proposed construction of Index 3 will reduce the need for to incorporate performance floors into the accountability ratings criteria to protect student group performance.

**Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness** includes measures of high school completion and STAAR performance at the final Level II standard. The intent of this index is to emphasize the importance for students to receive a high school diploma that provides them with the foundation necessary for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military.

STAAR Results. The index includes final Level II performance. Performance at this level indicates that students are sufficiently prepared for the next grade or course and have a reasonable likelihood of success in the next grade or course. For Algebra II and English III, this level of performance also indicates students are sufficiently prepared for postsecondary success. The index includes final Level II performance for Grades 3-8 as well as high school to emphasize the importance of elementary and middle schools in preparing students to achieve this level of performance in high school. Giving credit for students who meet the final Level II standard on one or more tests recognizes that students have strengths and talents in certain areas but not always in all areas.

Career Readiness. Postsecondary readiness encompasses both college readiness and career readiness and there is an interest in additional measures that focus on career readiness. As required by statute, the criteria for new 21<sup>st</sup> Century Workforce Development Program distinction designations will be developed by an advisory committee of experts, educators, and community leaders appointed by the governor, lieutenant governor, and speaker of the house. The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Workforce Development Program committee will convene through 2013 to develop distinction designations that can be awarded as early as 2014. As distinction designations indicators for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Workforce Development Programs are developed, APAC and ATAC will examine how some career-readiness measures can be incorporated into the performance index accountability system for 2015 and beyond.

## 2. Student Groups and Minimum Size Criteria

The performance indexes include evaluation of performance of All Students and ten student groups: Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, Special Education, and seven Race/Ethnicity groups (African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races). The following table shows which student groups are evaluated for each index and indicator. A single set of minimum size criteria apply across all indicators.

All Students: No minimum size criteria; data are aggregated across three years if the denominator is smaller than ten. Data are also aggregated across three years for the Economically Disadvantaged student group in Index 3.

Student Groups: 25 (denominator greater than or equal to 25). The minimum size criteria for student groups of 25 is an increase from the original ATAC recommendation of 20.

**Student Groups in the Performance Indexes**

<b>Index 1: Student Achievement</b>	
STAAR Percent Met Phase-in Level II Standard	All Students
<b>Index 2: Student Progress</b>	
STAAR Weighted Growth	All Students Race/Ethnicity (seven groups) English Language Learners Special Education
<b>Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps</b>	
STAAR Weighted Performance (Phase-In Level II and Level III)	Economically Disadvantaged Race/Ethnicity (two lowest performing groups)
<b>Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness</b>	
STAAR Percent Met Final Level II on At Least One Test	All Students Race/Ethnicity (seven groups)
RHSP/AHSP Rates (4-year)	
Graduation Rates (4-year and 5-year)	All Students Race/Ethnicity (seven groups) English Language Learners Special Education
Annual Dropout Rates Gr. 9-12	
<b>System Safeguards</b>	
STAAR Percent Met Phase-in Level II Standard	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Race/Ethnicity (seven groups) English Language Learners Special Education
STAAR Participation Rates	
Federal Graduation Rates (4-year and 5-year)	
District 1% and 2% Limits on STAAR-Alternate and STAAR-Modified	

**Rationale:** One of the advantages of the performance index framework is that it can include more student groups with smaller minimum size criteria because accountability ratings are not based on the lowest performing measure.

Minimum Size Criteria. The smaller minimum size criteria provide a more equitable evaluation across campuses with different grade configurations, sizes, and student demographics. Because they are smaller, elementary schools were often not held accountable for the same student group performance as middle schools and high schools under the previous accountability system. In a

performance index, student group performance can help as well as hurt campus or district performance, unlike the former system where additional student groups represented additional accountability hurdles.

### 3. Accountability 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. 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 target for student achievement in the performance index. Participation rates, graduation rates, and limits on use of STAAR Alternate and STAAR Modified are calculated to meet federal requirements and federal targets have been set for these indicators.

Accountability System Safeguard Measures and Targets											
	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 Limits on Use of Alternative Assessment Results											
Reading											
Modified	2%	Not Applicable									
Alternate	1%	Not Applicable									
Mathematics											
Modified	2%	Not Applicable									
Alternate	1%	Not Applicable									

\* 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.

# Federal graduation rate targets include an improvement target.

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.

**Rationale:** With a performance index framework, poor performance in one subject or other indicator, or one student group, does not result in an unacceptable accountability rating. However, disaggregated performance will be reported and districts and campuses are responsible for addressing performance for each subject, other indicator, and student group. The underlying accountability system safeguards formalize this requirement. The safeguards remove the need to apply floors to the disaggregated performance results as part of the accountability ratings criteria in order to ensure that poor performance of one student group or indicator is not ignored. The intent of the safeguards system is to also meet additional federal accountability requirements.

#### 4. Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets

**Rating Labels.** To meet state statutory requirements, the accountability system must identify acceptable and unacceptable campuses and districts. The actual labels are not in statute and the recommendation is to use different labels for the new performance index accountability ratings than those used under the former accountability system. Districts and campuses will be assigned the following rating labels based on the performance index accountability system.

- *Met Standard* – met performance index targets and other accountability rating criteria
- *Improvement Required* – did not meet one or more performance index targets or other accountability rating criteria

**Ratings Criteria and Targets.** Each of the four indexes will have a score of 0 to 100 representing campus/district performance points as a percent of the maximum possible points for that campus/district. Performance targets will be set for each index. Performance across the four indexes will be used to assign accountability rating labels such that failure to meet one target does not necessarily result in an Improvement Required accountability rating.

**2013 Transition Year.** The 2013 ratings criteria and targets will stand alone because the performance index framework cannot be fully implemented in 2013. Recommended accountability ratings criteria and targets for 2013 will be finalized following the March meeting of the Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC).

**Plan for 2014 and Beyond.** The ATAC and APAC will reconvene in fall 2013 to finalize recommendations for accountability ratings criteria for 2014 and beyond and targets for 2014 through 2016.

**Rationale:** The 2013 STAAR results will be used as the baseline for establishing accountability performance targets for 2014 and beyond. The 2013 assessment results will include two cohorts of high school students (class of 2015 and class of 2016) on STAAR EOC graduation plans. The 2012 assessment results will not be used to establish a starting point because in 2012 only one cohort of high school students (class of 2015) is assessed on STAAR EOC, as shown on the following table. In addition, the 2013 assessment results will be used to finalize the STAAR English Language Learner Progress Measure. Consequently, the 2013 assessment results will serve as a baseline for all four indexes.

Baseline Data for Targets

	<b>EOC Courses*</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Grade 9	English I Reading English I Writing Algebra I Biology World Geography	Class of 2015 <b>STAAR EOC</b>	Class of 2016 <b>STAAR EOC</b>	Class of 2017 <b>STAAR EOC</b>
Grade 10	English II Reading English II Writing Geometry Chemistry World History	Class of 2014 TAKS	Class of 2015 <b>STAAR EOC</b>	Class of 2016 <b>STAAR EOC</b>
Grade 11	English III Reading English III Writing Algebra II Physics U.S. History	Class of 2013 TAKS	Class of 2014 TAKS	Class of 2015 <b>STAAR EOC</b>

\*There is not a state-mandated course sequence; however, this represents the typical course sequence that most students follow.

## 5. Distinction Designations

Districts and campuses that receive an accountability rating of Met Standard are eligible for distinction designations. The district and campus recognized and exemplary rating distinction designations, and campus top twenty-five percent in student progress and closing achievement gaps will be determined by performance index scores. Campuses are also eligible for academic achievement distinction designations in reading and mathematics developed by a separate advisory committee. Campus distinction designations will be based on campus performance in relation to a comparison group of campuses.

**District and Campus Recognized and Exemplary Ratings.** The district and campus recognized and exemplary distinction designations will be implemented as part of a comprehensive distinction designation system rather than as higher rating levels. Campus and district exemplary and recognized distinction designations will be based on performance on Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness.

- Labels will be assigned for district and campus exemplary and recognized distinction designations: Distinguished and Commendable.
- Targets for distinguished and commendable performance on Index 4 will be set in fall 2014 when other 2014 accountability targets are set
- Distinguished districts and campuses. Districts and campuses that meet the distinguished performance target on Index 4 and campuses whose performance is in the top ten percent of their campus comparison group in performance on Index 4.
- Commendable districts and campuses. Districts and campuses that meet the commendable performance target on Index 4 and campuses whose performance is in the top twenty percent of their campus comparison group in performance on Index 4.

**Campus Top Twenty-Five Percent Distinction Designations.** Campus top twenty-five percent distinction designations will be based on performance on Index 2 and Index 3 in relation to campuses in the comparison group.

- Top 25% Student Progress. Based on performance on Index 2: Student Progress. Campuses that are in the top quartile of their campus comparison group in performance on Index 2.
- Top 25% Closing Achievement Gaps. Based on performance on Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps. Campuses that are in the top quartile of their campus comparison group in performance on Index 3.

## 6. Alternative Education Accountability

Alternative education campuses and districts will receive accountability ratings under the performance index accountability system. Although a separate alternative education accountability system will not be developed, the following modifications will be made for alternative education campuses and districts.

- In addition to the ten eligibility criteria under the former state accountability system, alternative education campuses of choice must serve students in Grades 6-12. This new rule does not apply to residential facilities.
- In Index 4, the graduation rate calculation is modified to give alternative education campuses and districts credit for general educational development (GED) recipients as well graduates. Four-year, five-year, and six-year graduation and GED rates will be calculated for alternative education campuses and districts.
- Index 4 will be constructed to give more weight to the graduation rates, compared to college-ready performance on STAAR.
- In Index 4, alternative education campuses and districts will get bonus points for students graduating under the Recommended High School Program or Advanced High School Program, rather than averaging those rates into their index scores.
- Accountability targets for each index will be modified as appropriate for alternative education campuses and districts from the targets for regular campuses and districts.

The following modifications are in addition to the original ATAC recommendations:

- Index 3 is credited one point for each percent of students at the Level I minimum score performance standard and above (includes students at Phase-in Level II and Level III Advanced).
- Accountability ratings criteria that specify which combinations of performance index targets must be met to receive a Met Standard rating will be modified as appropriate for alternative education campuses and districts.
- Alternative education campuses and districts identified as Residential Facilities will not be assigned rating labels (in 2013). Performance index results will be reported but no rating label will be assigned.

**Distinction Designations.** Beginning in 2013, AECs will be eligible for recognition under the Academic Achievement Distinction Designations (AADD) system. Current AADD proposals include indicators for completion of advanced/dual enrollment courses, and SAT and ACT performance and participation. Proposals under consideration for the AADD system, as well as other campus distinction designations for 2014 and beyond, are based on comparison groups of similar campuses. Comparison groups of alternative education campuses will be created.

**Accountability Development.** There is a need for more indicators that better measure the progress that students on alternative education campuses make toward the goal of graduation. Additional indicators under consideration would give alternative education campuses and districts credit for credit accrual of high school students and for success of recovered dropouts. Further analyses will be conducted to determine whether districts with alternative education campuses can be credited for the students who are included in the graduation and GED rate results for the alternative campus.

**Rationale:** The performance index framework is flexible enough to include alternative education campuses and districts. Nevertheless, there is a need for further development of indicators that measure the progress that students on alternative education campuses make toward the goal of graduation. Modified accountability targets are necessary and reflect the special circumstances of alternative education campuses and districts.