

**Accountability System Development for 2013 and Beyond
Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC)**

Plan for Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets for 2014 and Beyond

The best data available to model the 2014 and beyond provisions of the new accountability system are not a good match to the data that will be used to calculate the indicators for the ratings in 2014. In the case of Index 2: Student Progress, there are no STAAR student growth data for modeling. The proposal is to reconvene the Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) and Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) in fall 2013 to finalize recommendations for accountability ratings criteria for 2014 and beyond and targets for 2014 through 2016.

August/September 2013 – models of 2014 accountability performance indexes developed.

October 2013 – ATAC and APAC convene to develop recommendations to commissioner for accountability ratings criteria for 2014 and beyond and targets for 2014, 2015, and 2016 accountability ratings.

November 2013 – commissioner announces accountability ratings criteria for 2014 and beyond and final 2014 targets, preliminary 2015 targets, and preview 2016 targets.

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. For most students this includes only the first EOC assessment in each subject.

Baseline Data for Targets

	EOC Courses*	2012	2013	2014
Grade 9	English I Reading English I Writing Algebra I Biology World Geography	Class of 2015 STAAR EOC	Class of 2016 STAAR EOC	Class of 2017 STAAR EOC
Grade 10	English II Reading English II Writing Geometry Chemistry World History	Class of 2014 TAKS	Class of 2015 STAAR EOC	Class of 2016 STAAR EOC
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 STAAR EOC

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

A through F Grading System

Following are some of the issues that must be addressed if an A through F grading system is adopted for 2014 and beyond. Discussion of these issues will assist in developing materials for the fall 2013 meetings.

- A system of five rating levels discriminates among campuses and districts. This changes the role of the distinction designations.
 - Distinction designations have a lower profile because they are no longer the primary mechanism for discriminating among campuses and districts.
 - The Commended and Distinguished district and campus distinction designation ratings might be incorporated into the A through F grading system. Some of the distinction designations available only to campuses might also be incorporated into the A through F grading system.
- The rating labels of Met Standard and Improvement Required, and possibly the Commended and Distinguished labels, would probably be replaced by the A through F grades.
- Two rating levels can only be implemented with a single target for performance on each index. Five rating levels can be implemented with a single target for each index or with multiple targets.
 - With a single target for each index, the A through F grades could be assigned based on the number of index targets met, such as the following example.
 - A = met targets on four indexes OR met targets on Index 3 and two other
 - B = met targets on any three indexes
 - C = met targets on two indexes
 - D = met target on one index
 - F = did not meet target on any index
 - With two targets on each index, the A through F grades would emphasize the higher target for the A and B grades and the lower target for the D and F grades, such as the following example.
 - A = met high target on Index 1 or Index 2 and on Index 3 or Index 4
 - B = met low target on all indexes and high target on at least one index
 - C = met low target on all indexes
 - D = met low target on some indexes
 - F = did not meet low target on any index