

## Chapter 13 – Preview

This chapter provides a preview of the 2014 accountability system and beyond.

### Plan for Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets for 2014 and Beyond

Accountability advisory groups will convene in fall 2013 to finalize recommendations for accountability ratings criteria and labels for 2014 and beyond and performance index targets for 2014 through 2016.

- October/November 2013 – Accountability advisory groups convene to develop recommendations to commissioner for accountability ratings criteria and labels for 2014 and beyond and performance index targets for 2014, 2015, and 2016 accountability ratings.
- December 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.

**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	Eng. III Reading** Eng. 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.

\*\* These assessments were administered in the 2012-13 school year, but will not be administered in 2013-14, as required by House Bill 5 (83<sup>rd</sup> Texas Legislature, 2013).

### Required Improvement

Beginning in 2014, the Level III Advanced performance standard will be used to evaluate Index 3 and the final Level II performance standard will be used to evaluate Index 4. A separate required improvement calculation at the index level for campuses and districts that do not meet the accountability target for the index will be considered for 2015 and beyond when the underlying indicators can be more appropriately used for year-to-year comparisons.

## Small Numbers Analysis

Multi-year average performance will be used at the indicator level to calculate indicators for small districts and campuses that do not meet minimum size criteria using current year data. In 2013, two-year-averages were calculated for assessment indicators because only two years of STAAR results were available. The following table shows the indicators for which multi-year average will be applied in 2014 and beyond.

Use of Multi-Year-Average for Small Numbers Analysis	2013 Ratings	2014 Ratings and Beyond
<b>Index 1:</b> STAAR Percent Met Phase-in 1 Level II Performance Standard All Students	2-year average	3-year average
<b>Index 2:</b> Weighted Growth Rate All Students	New*	2-year average
<b>Index 3:</b> Reading Weighted Performance Rate Economically Disadvantaged Student Group (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Mathematics Weighted Performance Rate Economically Disadvantaged Student Group (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Writing Weighted Performance Rate Economically Disadvantaged Student Group (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Science Weighted Performance Rate Economically Disadvantaged Student Group (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Social Studies Weighted Performance Rate Economically Disadvantaged Student Group (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
<b>Index 4:</b> STAAR Percent Met Final Level II Performance Standard on One or More Tests All Students	NA in 2013	3-year average
Four-Year Graduation Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average
Five-Year Graduation Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average
Four-Year Graduation and GED Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average
Five-Year Graduation and GED Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average
Six-Year Graduation and GED Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average
RHSP/DAP Rate All Students	3-year average	2-year average*
Annual Dropout Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average

\* Weighted Growth Rate is a new calculation with no prior year data; RHSP/DAP Rate in 2014 will be based on a new longitudinal calculation for the class of 2013 (2014 ratings) that will be reported for the first time for the class of 2012 in fall 2013.

Use of multi-year-average performance at the index level for campuses and districts that do not meet the accountability target based on current year data will be considered for 2015 and beyond.

### Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps

The following changes are anticipated to be implemented in 2014 and beyond.

#### Methodology

The percent of students at the specified student performance level on the assessment is multiplied by the weight for that performance level. The STAAR weighted performance rate calculation was modified for 2013 because STAAR Level III performance cannot be included until 2014.

- Phase-in 1 Level II (2013 and beyond) – one point for each percent of students at the phase-in 1 Level II performance standard
- Level III Advanced (2014 and beyond) – two points for each percent of students at the final Level III performance standard

#### Index 3 Calculations

Because the indicator will be weighted to give one or two points for closing the performance gap in 2014 and beyond, each indicator contributes from 0 to 200 points to the index for each student group that meets minimum size criteria.

<b>Example 3.1. Calculations to determine Index 3 points for reading performance shown in Example 3.2</b>					
STAAR Weighted Performance Rate	Economically Disadvantaged	Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Group - 1	Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Group - 2	Total Points	Maximum Points
Number of Tests	80	40	25		
# at Phase-in 1 Level II or above % at Phase-in 1 Level II or above	80 100%	20 50%	25 100%		
# at Level III Advanced % at Level III Advanced	40 50%	0 0%	25 100%		
Reading Weighted Performance Rate	<b>150</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>600</b>

<b>Example 3.2. Calculations to determine overall points for Index 3 for 2014 and beyond</b>					
STAAR Weighted Performance Rate	Economically Disadvantaged	Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Group - 1	Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Group - 2	Total Points	Maximum Points
Reading Weighted Performance Rate	<b>150</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>600</b>
Mathematics Weighted Performance Rate	125	100	90	315	600
Writing Weighted Performance Rate	80	90	125	295	600
Science Weighted Performance Rate	120	40	90	250	600
Social Studies Weighted Performance Rate	50	40	80	170	600
Total				1430	3000
Index Score (total points divided by maximum points)					48

## **Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness**

The following changes are anticipated to be implemented in 2014 and beyond.

### **STAAR Level II Performance for Index 4**

In 2014 and beyond, credit will be given for final Level II performance on the same assessments used in Index 1 at final Level III performance standard.

#### ***Subjects Areas Evaluated for STAAR Performance in Index 4***

All subject areas (reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies) are combined. Subject areas are not evaluated separately.

#### ***Student Groups Evaluated for STAAR Performance in Index 4***

Eight student groups are evaluated.

- All Students
- Seven Racial/Ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

### **Index 4 Calculations**

For high schools with a graduation rate the index produces two separate scores, a graduation score and a STAAR score; the final index score is an average of the two scores. Consequently, for most high schools and districts, STAAR final Level II performance and graduation rates weigh equally in the index.

***Graduation Score:*** Combined performance across the graduation rates and Recommended High School and Distinguished Achievement Programs (RHSP/DAP) diploma indicator:

- Class of 2013 Four-Year Graduation Rate for All Students and all student groups, *or*
- Class of 2012 Five-Year Graduation Rate for All Students and all student groups, whichever contributes the higher number of points to the index

Only one of the two graduation rates is used, not a mix of Four-Year Graduation Rate for one student group and Five-Year Graduation Rate for another student group.

- RHSP/DAP Graduates for All Students and racial/ethnic student groups

***STAAR Score:*** STAAR Percent Met final Level II on One or More Tests for All Students and racial/ethnic student groups

- For high schools that do not have a graduation rate, the annual dropout rate and STAAR final Level II performance both contribute points to the index.
- For elementary and middle schools, only STAAR final Level II performance contributes points to the index.

<b>Example 4.1. Districts and campuses with a graduation rate</b>												
Indicator	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
4-year graduation rate	82.8%	74.5%	70.2%	75.4%						82.4%	385.3	500
RHSP/DAP	75.0%	66.1%	51.4%	67.6%							260.1	400
4-year Graduation Total											645.4	900
4-year Graduation Score (graduation total points divided by maximum points)											72	
5-year graduation rate	82.8%	69.1%	68.3%	70.0%		n/a	n/a	n/a		76.6%	366.8	500
RHSP/DAP	75.0%	66.1%	51.4%	67.6%							260.1	400
5-year Graduation Total											626.9	900
5-year Graduation Score (graduation total points divided by maximum points)											70	
STAAR % Met Final Level II on One or More Tests	29%	16%	40%	36%	23%		38%				182	600
STAAR Score (STAAR total points divided by maximum points)											30	
Index Score (average of Graduation Score and STAAR Score: $72 + 30 / 2 = 51$ )											51	

<b>Example 4.2. Districts and campuses with Gr. 9-12 but no graduation rate</b>												
Indicator	All	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
Grade 9-12 Annual Dropout Rate	76 (2.4%)	61 (3.9%)	69 (3.1%)	89 (1.1%)				87 (1.3%)	68 (3.2%)	53 (4.7%)	503	700
RHSP/DAP	82.7%	76.4%	83.6%	83.0%							325.7	400
Graduation Score (dropout and RHSP/DAP total points divided by maximum points)											75	
STAAR % Met Final Level II on One or More Tests	29%	16%		40%	23%		38%	36%			182	600
STAAR Score (STAAR total points divided by maximum points)											30	
Index Score (average of Graduation Score and STAAR Score: $75 + 30 / 2 = 53$ )											53	

Example 4.3. Elementary and middle/junior high schools										
Indicator	All	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Total Points	Max. Points
STAAR % Met Final Level II on One or More Tests	29%	16%	23%	38%		40%		36%	182	600
Index Score (total points divided by maximum points)									30	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above represent student group indicators that do not meet the minimum size criteria.

### Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness for AEA Campuses and Charters

Some alternative and charter schools serve a unique student population that warrants alternative criteria and index targets with regards to Index 4. Further modifications to Index 4 will be reviewed with the accountability advisory groups in fall 2013 to ensure all of the requirements of Senate Bill 1538 (described below) are met.

Graduation and General Educational Development (GED) Score will contribute 75 percent of the points to Index 4 and STAAR Score (Percent Met final Level II on One or More Tests) will contribute 25 percent of the points.

A maximum of 50 bonus points will be added to the final index score. The RHSP/DAP graduates annual rate contributes bonus points (rather than averaging the rates into the Graduation and GED Score). Bonus points are also added for the Continuing Students Success Rates and Excluded Students Credit.

Example 4.4. AEA charter districts and campuses with a graduation and GED rate												
Indicator	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
4-year graduation and GED rate	64.3%	58.8%	58.8%	71.6%				66.0%	59.8%	34.2%	413.5	700
5-year graduation and GED rate	65.1%	58.8%	60.0%	72.1%				64.0%	57.5%	48.9%	426.4	700
6-year graduation and GED rate	62.7%	56.4%	63.6%	63.0%				63.2%	58.0%	52.1%	419.0	700
Graduation and GED Score (graduation and GED total points divided by maximum points)											61	
STAAR % Met Final Level II on One or More Tests	29%	16%	23%	38%		40%		36%			182	600
STAAR Score (STAAR total points divided by maximum points)											30	
Combined Score (Graduation and GED x .75 plus STAAR x .25) (61 x .75 = 45.75) + (30 x .25 = 7.5) = 53.25											53	
Bonus Points: RHSP/DAP	27.0%										27	
Continuing Students Success	5.8%										6	
Excluded Students Credit	4										4	
Total Bonus Points (maximum of 50)											37	
Index Score (Combined Score plus Bonus Points)											90	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above represent student group indicators that do not meet the minimum size criteria.

## Distinction Designations

### 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.

- 2013 and Beyond: 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 earn this distinction designation.
- 2014 and Beyond: 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 earn this distinction designation.

## **District and Campus Distinction Designations**

The district and campus distinction designations will be implemented in 2014. Criteria and targets will be set in fall 2013 when other 2014 accountability targets are set.

## **Academic Achievement Distinction Designations (AADD) Indicators**

In addition to the indicators outlined in Chapter 6, the following new AADD indicators will be evaluated in 2014 and beyond.

### ***Grade 10 (PSAT and PLAN) and Grade 11 (PSAT) Participation.***

A student in grade 10 or 11 can take the Preliminary SAT (PSAT) and the PLAN (Pre-ACT) which are measurements of college readiness. The PSAT consists of three sections that assess a number of academic skill sets: critical reading, mathematics, and writing. PLAN includes four multiple-choice tests: English, math, reading, and science.

### ***PSAT Grade 10 and Grade 11 Performance Indicators: ELA and Mathematics.***

The PSAT is a measurement of college readiness typically taken by students in grades 10 and 11. It consists of three sections that assess a number of academic skill sets: critical reading, mathematics, and writing. Student performance on each section of the PSAT is reported as a scaled score that ranges from 20 to 80 in 1 point increments. A PSAT Performance indicator will be evaluated for both ELA and mathematics.

### ***PLAN Grade 10 Performance Indicators: English and Mathematics.***

The PLAN is a measurement of college readiness typically taken by students in grades 10 and 11. A PLAN Performance indicator will be evaluated for both English and mathematics.

## **83<sup>rd</sup> Regular Legislative Session**

During the 83<sup>rd</sup> legislative session, the following bills were passed that will affect the accountability system in 2014 and beyond. These legislative changes will be reviewed by accountability advisory groups in fall 2013 to develop recommendations to the commissioner for implementation in 2014 and beyond.

### **House Bill (HB) 5**

Under TEC §39.053, indicators of student achievement will include the percentage of students who completed the distinguished level of achievement and received an endorsement for the foundation high school program. Also, three additional indicators of student achievement to evaluate district and campus performance must include either

- 1) the percentage of students who satisfy the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness benchmarks prescribed and designed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) in reading, writing, or mathematics, or
- 2) the number of students who earn postsecondary credit required for the foundation high school program, an associate's degree, or an industry certification.

TEC§39.054 requires district performance ratings of A, B, C, D, or F where A, B, or C reflects acceptable performance and D or F reflects unacceptable performance. Also, campus performance ratings of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable where exemplary, recognized, or acceptable reflects acceptable performance and unacceptable reflects unacceptable performance are required. Districts may not receive a rating of A if any campus is rated unacceptable. These ratings are required to be assigned beginning in the 2016-17 school year.

TEC§39.0545 requires districts to self-evaluate and assign to the district and each campus a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, and unacceptable for performance in community and student engagement. By August 8, districts must report each rating to TEA and the public. These locally-determined ratings are required to be implemented in the 2013-14 school year.

TEC §39.201 clarifies that distinction designations will be awarded in connection with performance ratings (by August 8), but does not change the current process.

TEC §39.202 is expanded to include the following indicators – percentages of students: earning business/industry certification/license, completing a coherent sequence of career and technical courses, completing dual credit courses or articulated postsecondary courses, achieving College Readiness Benchmarks or equivalent on the PSAT, SAT, ACT or ACT-Plan, and receiving college credit on an AP or IB exam. Also, the “Exemplary” and “Recognized” distinction designation labels are removed.

TEC §39.203 is limited to academic achievement in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Fine arts, physical education, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Workforce Development program, and second language acquisition are removed. To the extent possible, preliminary findings by the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Workforce Development Program committee that was convened in 2013 will be reviewed by accountability advisory groups in fall 2013 to examine how new career and technical education measures can be incorporated into the performance index accountability system for 2014 and beyond.

Reporting requirements in TEC §39.301(c) are modified to replace the RHSP/DAP indicators with new indicators for the foundation high school program and endorsements.

TEC §39.309 adds a new requirement to develop and implement a Texas School Accountability Dashboard.

TEC §39.363 requires that TEA publish the ratings assigned and published locally by districts under 39.0545, district and campus performance ratings, distinction designations, and financial accountability ratings on the agency’s website no later than October 1, 2014.

### **HB 866**

TEC §39.023 is amended and could have a significant impact on the state’s assessment system but will only take effect on any date not later than September 1, 2015, if the agency obtains any necessary waiver from federal law or regulation that conflicts with the proposed amendments to TEC §39.023 discussed below, or notification from the United States Department of Education (USDE) that such a waiver is not necessary. If the commissioner does receive a federal waiver,

or notification that a waiver is unnecessary, the commissioner shall publish notice in the Texas Register after receiving the waiver or notification. The act would apply beginning with the first school year that begins after the waiver or notification is received.

The grades 3–8 assessment system defined by HB 866 would include these assessments:

Eleven required administrations (i.e., required for all students):

- reading: grades 3, 5, 8
- mathematics: grades 3, 5, 8
- writing: grades 4 and 7
- science: grades 5 and 8
- social studies: grade 8

Six contingent/optional administrations (i.e., required for students who did not achieve a high enough score on a previous grade's subject test or administered to students in a district that chooses to administer the tests):

- reading: grades 4, 6, 7
- mathematics: grades 4, 6, 7

Added TEC §39.023(a-3) will require the agency to establish a score that could predict, within a three-percent margin of error, whether a student will achieve satisfactory performance on the same content-area assessment in the next grade during the following school year. The minimum satisfactory adjusted scale score is required to be the sum of the scale score that indicates satisfactory performance plus the minimum number of additional points that would produce a score indicating a student will likely pass the same content-area assessment in the next grade.

HB 866 will delete TEC §39.023(a)(6), which stipulates that the state comply with federal testing requirements, adding subsection (a-9) to provide that the commissioner would seek waivers from the USDE if exempting high-performing students from assessments in a subsequent grade or grades under the previous subsections is determined to be contrary to federal law. When applying for the federal waivers, the commissioner would be required to use all relevant data including, but not limited to, data relating to the likelihood that students who score equal to or above the minimum satisfactory adjusted scale score will score above the passing standard in subsequent years, the costs of assessing such students, and the benefits of increased emphasis on low-performing students so they can be successful after one year.

HB 866 also adds subsection TEC §39.023 (a-8), allowing a district or charter school to test at its discretion any students not required to test by TEC §39.023(a-4), (a-5), or (a-6) in grades 4, 6, and 7. The agency will provide and score such assessment materials in the same manner and at the same cost as it does for all required testing. Further, HB 866 prohibits any discretionary testing under TEC §39.023(a-8) to be used in the state accountability system.

HB 866 adds TEC §39.023(a-10), which states that the provisions of proposed TEC §39.023(a-3) through (a-9) described above and (a-10) expire on September 1, 2017. The grades 3–8 assessment program currently in place would be reinstated.

**Senate Bill (SB) 306**

Amends TEC §39.055 relating to consideration of a student receiving treatment in a residential facility for public school accountability.

**SB 377**

TEC §39.027(a-2) is added and requires that an English language learner be enrolled for 60 consecutive days in a school year for that school year to count as one year in the calculation of years in U.S. schools. It is assumed that “during a year” refers to a school year, not a calendar year. This section does not apply to the asylee/refugee exemption of TEC 39.027(a-1).

Per section 81 of HB 5, TEC §39.027(a-2) applies to a student regardless of the date in which the student initially enrolls in a U.S. school.

**SB 1538**

TEC §39.0545 is added to require the evaluation of dropout recovery schools. The commissioner shall designate as a dropout recovery school a school district or an open-enrollment charter school or a campus of a district or of an open-enrollment charter school:

1. that serves students in grades 9-12 and has an enrollment of which at least 50 percent of the students are 17 years of age or older as of September 1 of the school year as reported for the fall semester Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) submission; and
2. that meets the eligibility requirements for and is registered under alternative education accountability procedures adopted by the commissioner.

The alternative completion rate must be used to determine the student achievement indicator for a dropout recovery school. The alternative completion rate shall be the ratio of the total number of students who graduate, continue attending school into the next academic year, or receive a high school equivalency certificate to the total number of students in the longitudinal cohort of students.

In determining the performance rating of a dropout recovery school, the commissioner shall include any student who graduates or receives a high school equivalency certificate in the completion rate.

For a dropout recovery school, only the best result from the primary administration and any retake of an assessment instrument administered to a student in the school year evaluated under the accountability procedures adopted by the commissioner may be considered in determining the performance rating of the school.

This page is intentionally blank.