

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 2013 ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

November 7, 2013

The 2013 accountability system is built on a performance index framework and offers a new approach to school accountability for Texas. For the first time, multiple perspectives of campus or district performance can be seen through four separate indexes that measure: Student Achievement, Student Progress, Closing Performance Gaps, and Postsecondary Readiness. Providing multiple views of school performance offers parents and educators a comprehensive picture of the many facets of school success and in turn provides incentives for campuses and districts to continue their efforts to improve. The underlying reporting system plus accountability system safeguards offer detailed information to the community, inform school and classroom practice, and enable educators to address individual student needs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

Nearly 5 million students were enrolled in Texas public schools during the 2012-13 school year, and 10.5 million total tests were taken by those students in the subjects Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, and Social Studies on the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR™). Of all tests taken, 77% of the tests met the Phase-in 1 Level II passing standard for 2012-13.

DISTRICTS (Including Charter Operators)

Of the 1,228 districts in the state, 1,140 (92.8%) achieved a rating of *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard*. A total of 76 (6.2%) districts were rated *Improvement Required* and 11 (0.9%) were labeled as *Not Rated*. 1 (0.1%) district received the designation of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

CAMPUSES (Including Charter Campuses)

Of the 8,555 campuses in the state, 7,207 (84.2%) achieved a rating of *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard*. A total of 768 (9.0%) campuses were rated *Improvement Required*, while the remaining 579 (6.8%) campuses were labeled as *Not Rated* and 1 (0.0%) *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

CHARTERS

Charter Operators

Of the 202 Charter Operators that received 2013 accountability ratings, 126 (62.4%) achieved the rating of *Met Standard* while 35 (17.3%) were rated *Met Alternative Standard* and 30 (14.9%) were labeled *Improvement Required*. The remaining 10 (5.0%) Charter Operators were labeled as *Not Rated* and 1 (0.5%) *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

Charter Campuses

Of the 552 total Charter campuses, 288 (52.2%) achieved a rating of *Met Standard* while 91 (16.5%) were rated *Met Alternative Standard* and 98 (17.8%) were labeled as *Improvement Required*. The remaining 74 (13.4%) Charter campuses were labeled as *Not Rated* and 1 (0.2%) *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY (AEA) CAMPUSES

Of the 396 campuses registered to be evaluated under the Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) provisions, 220 (55.6%) achieved a rating of *Met Alternative Standard* and 34 (8.6%) were labeled as *Improvement Required*. The remaining 142 (35.9%) AEA campuses were *Not Rated* which consist of 55 AECs of Choice and 87 Residential Facilities.

Of the 396 campuses registered to be evaluated under the AEA provisions, 143 (36.1%) were charter campuses. 91 (63.6%) of the 143 charter campuses achieved a rating of *Met Alternative Standard* and 10 (7.0%) were labeled as *Improvement Required*. The remaining 42 (29.4%) AEA campuses were *Not Rated* which consist of 1 AEC of Choice and 41 Residential Facilities.

Granted Appeals

Of the 85 appeals received, 4 districts and 11 campuses had rating changes due to granted appeals.

NOT RATED DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES

Of the 1,228 districts evaluated in the state, only 11 (.9%) were labeled *Not Rated*. Of those, 9 (81%) were Residential Facilities, 1 (9%) could not be rated as a result of small numbers analysis, and 1 (9%) was not rated due to extenuating circumstances. 1 (9%) district received the designation of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

Of the 8,555 campuses evaluated in the state, 579 (6.8%) were labeled *Not Rated*. Of those, 408 (70%) were JJAEPs, DAEPs, Early Education, or Residential Facilities, 158 (27%) could not be rated as a result of small numbers analysis, 12 (2%) were not rated due to appeal or extenuating circumstances and 1 (0.2%) *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues*.

DISTINCTION DESIGNATIONS

Only campuses that receive an accountability rating of *Met Standard* are eligible for Distinction Designations in 2013. Districts and AEA campuses are not eligible for distinction designations.

Of the 8,555 campuses in Texas, 1,991 (23.3%) campuses received a distinction for achieving the Top 25% in Student Progress, 2,323 (27.2%) received a distinction for Reading/ELA, and 1,906 (22.3%) received a distinction for Mathematics. In total, 3,599 (42.1%) campuses received one or more Distinction Designations. 759 (8.9%) campuses received Distinction Designations in all three categories (Top 25% Student Progress, Reading/ELA and Mathematics).

SYSTEM SAFEGUARDS

Systems safeguards are designed to evaluate the disaggregated performance results of the state accountability system to ensure that poor performance in one area or one student group is not masked in the performance index. The disaggregated performance measures and safeguard targets are calculated for performance rates (all five subject areas), participation rates (reading and mathematics only), and graduation rates (four-year or five-year federal graduation rates) for eleven student groups: All Students, Seven Racial/Ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races; Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and English language learners (ELLs).

Statewide, of the 55 performance indicators (five subject areas times eleven student groups) evaluated in the system safeguards, 52 (94.5%) achieved the performance target of 50%. Systems safeguards performance rates are calculated from the assessment results and criteria used to calculate performance index (Index 1).

All 22 of the participation indicators (two subject areas times eleven student groups) that were evaluated in the system safeguards met the participation target of 95%.

Of the 11 student groups evaluated in the system safeguards for graduation rates, 9 (81.8%) achieved the graduation rate target of 78% for the four-year rate or 83% for the five-year rate or demonstrated sufficient improvement to achieve the goal of 90%.

System safeguards also include district and state measures on the use of student passing results from STAAR Modified and STAAR Alternate tests in the accountability system based on federal limits on alternative assessments. The state did not exceed the federal limit of 1% on STAAR Alternate or the 2% limit on STAAR Modified results.

