

Indicators:

AADD Mathematics Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K–12
1) Attendance rate	✓	✓	✓	✓
2) Greater Than Expected Student Growth in Mathematics (Algebra I only)	✓	✓		✓
3) Algebra I by Grade 8 Participation		✓		✓
4) Algebra I Performance (Level III)	✓	✓		✓
5) AP/IB Examination Participation: Mathematics	✓			✓
6) AP/IB Examination Performance: Mathematics	✓			✓
7) SAT/ACT Participation	✓			✓
8) SAT Performance: Mathematics	✓			✓
9) ACT Performance: Mathematics	✓			✓
10) Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion Rate: Mathematics <i>NEW</i>	✓			✓
Total Mathematics Indicators	9	4	N/A	10

Methodology: This distinction is determined as follows:

Step 1: Performance on each indicator that applies to the school is determined.

Step 2: Performance for each indicator within the campus comparison group is determined.

Step 3: Determine if the campus is in the top 25 percent of its campus comparison group:

- High schools and combined elementary/secondary schools (K–12) must be in the top quartile for 33 percent or more of their total eligible indicators.
- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of their total eligible indicators.

The methodology, date, and source for each indicator are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Other Information:

- *Exclusion of Grade 3–8 Mathematics.* Due to the exclusion of grade 3–8 mathematics from state accountability for 2015, the Grade 5 Mathematics Performance (Level III) indicator is not available for the AADD in mathematics for 2015.
- *Algebra I by Grade 8 Participation.* Beginning in 2015, the Algebra I by Grade 8 Participation indicator limits the denominator to 8th grade students based on 2014 PEIMS fall enrollment, using Algebra I tests taken in either the current or any prior school year as reported on the Consolidated Accountability File (CAF), cumulative history section.
- *Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion: Mathematics.* Beginning in 2015, the Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion rate for mathematics for students enrolled in grades 11 and 12 has been added to the list of available indicators for the AADD in Mathematics.
- *Assessments.* A complete list of AP and IB assessments used in determining this distinction is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

- **Attendance Rate.** This is based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1–12. The Attendance Rate indicator applies to all four subject areas of the AADDs. Consequently, this indicator cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain an AADD.

Academic Achievement in Science

An AADD is awarded to campuses for outstanding achievement in science based on outcomes of various performance indicators in the top 25 percent of its campus comparison group.

Who is eligible: Campuses assigned a *Met Standard* rating.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for the *All Students* group only.

Minimum Size: Minimum size is determined separately for each indicator:

- **Attendance Rate.** Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If there are fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (e.g., 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be evaluated for this distinction.
- **Assessments (STAAR, AP/IB, and/or ACT).** Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. If there are fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, that indicator cannot be evaluated for this distinction.
- **Participation**
 - **AP/IB: Science.** Minimum size is 10 students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
 - **Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion: Science.** Minimum size is 10 students in grades 11 and 12 who completed at least one course.

Indicators:

AADD Science Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K–12
1) Attendance rate	✓	✓	✓	✓
2) Grade 5 Science Performance (Level III)			✓	✓
3) Grade 8 Science Performance (Level III)		✓		✓
4) EOC Biology Performance (Level III)	✓			✓
5) ACT Performance: Science	✓			✓
6) AP/IB Examination Participation: Science	✓			✓
7) AP/IB Examination Performance: Science	✓			✓
8) Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion Rate: Science <i>NEW</i>	✓			✓
Total Science Indicators	6	2	2	8

Methodology:

Step 1: Performance on each indicator that applies to the school is determined.

Step 2: Performance for each indicator within the campus comparison group is determined.

Step 3: Determine if the campus is in the top 25 percent of its campus comparison group:

- High schools and combined elementary/secondary schools (K–12) must be in the top quartile for 33 percent or more of their total eligible indicators.

- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of their total eligible indicators.

The methodology, dates, and sources are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Other Information:

- *Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion: Science*. Beginning in 2015, the Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion rate for science for students enrolled in grades 11 and 12 has been added to the list of available indicators for the AADD in Science.
- *Assessments*. A complete list of AP and IB assessments used in determining this distinction is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.
- *Attendance Rate*. This is based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1–12. The Attendance Rate indicator applies to all four subject areas of the AADDs. Consequently, this indicator cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain an AADD.

Academic Achievement in Social Studies

An AADD is awarded to campuses for outstanding achievement in social studies based on various outcomes of performance indicators in the top quartile of its campus comparison group.

Who is eligible: Campuses assigned a *Met Standard* rating.

Student Groups: Performance is evaluated for the *All Students* group only.

Minimum Size: Minimum size is determined separately for each indicator:

- *Attendance Rate*. Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If there are fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (e.g., 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be evaluated for this distinction.
- *Assessments (STAAR and/or AP/IB)*. Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. If there are fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, that indicator cannot be evaluated for this distinction.
- *Participation*
 - *AP/IB: Social Studies*. Minimum size is 10 students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
 - *Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion: Social Studies*. Minimum size is 10 students in grades 11 and 12 who completed at least one course.

Indicators:

AADD Social Studies Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K–12
1) Attendance rate	✓	✓	✓	✓
2) Grade 8 Social Studies Performance (Level III)		✓		✓
3) EOC U.S. History Performance (Level III)	✓			✓
4) AP/IB Examination Participation: Social Studies	✓			✓
5) AP/IB Examination Performance: Social Studies	✓			✓
6) Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion Rate: Social Studies <i>NEW</i>	✓			✓
Total Social Studies Indicators	5	2	N/A	6

Methodology:

Step 1: Performance on each indicator that applies to the school is determined.

Step 2: Performance for each indicator within the campus comparison group is determined.

Step 3: Determine if the campus is in the top 25 percent of its campus comparison group:

- High schools and combined elementary/secondary schools (K–12) must be in the top quartile for 33 percent or more of their total eligible indicators.
- Middle schools/junior high schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of their total eligible indicators.

The methodology, date, and source for each indicator are described in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

Other Information:

- *Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion: Social Studies*. Beginning in 2015, the Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion rate for social studies for students enrolled in grades 11 and 12 has been added to the list of eligible indicators for the AADD in Social Studies.
- *Assessments*. A complete list of AP and IB assessments used in determining this distinction is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.
- *Attendance Rate*. This is based on student attendance for the entire school year for students in grades 1–12. The Attendance Rate indicator applies to all four subject areas of the AADDs. Consequently, this indicator cannot be the sole measure used by a campus to attain an AADD.

Top 25 Percent: Student Progress

A distinction designation is awarded to a campus for outstanding student progress if it is ranked in the top 25 percent (Q1) of campuses in its campus comparison group for Index 2.

Who is eligible: Campuses that are evaluated for Index 2 and received a *Met Standard* rating.

Methodology: Campuses are assigned a numeric value for Index 2. Those values are arranged in descending order for the campuses in the campus comparison group. If the Index 2 value for a campus is within the top quartile for its comparison group, it receives a distinction for student progress.

For more information on Index 2, see *Chapters 3 and 4*.

Top 25 Percent: Closing Performance Gaps

A distinction designation is awarded to a campus for outstanding performance in closing student achievement gaps if it is ranked in the top 25 percent (Q1) of campuses in its campus comparison group for Index 3.

Who is eligible: Campuses that are evaluated for Index 3 and receive a *Met Standard* rating.

Methodology: Campuses are assigned a numeric value for Index 3. Those values are arranged in descending order for the campuses in the campus comparison group. If the Index 3 value for a campus is within the top quartile for its comparison group, it receives a distinction for Closing Performance Gaps. For more information on Index 3, see *Chapters 3 and 4*.

Postsecondary Readiness

A distinction designation is awarded to districts and campuses for outstanding academic performance in attainment of postsecondary readiness. Elementary and middle schools must show performance in the top 25 percent of similar schools in their campus comparison group. High schools and K–12 campuses must have at least 33 percent of the indicators in the top quartile. Districts must have at least 70 percent of its campus-level indicators in the top quartile.

Who is eligible: Districts and campuses that receive a *Met Standard* rating, except for districts or charters comprised of only one campus that share the same 2015 performance data as the campus. For these single-campus districts and charters, the campus is eligible to earn the campus postsecondary readiness distinction designation; however, the district or charter is *not* eligible to earn the district postsecondary readiness distinction designation.

Student Groups: Indicators 1–9 use the *All Students* group only. Values used for indicators 1–3 are determined through the calculations for Index 4.

Minimum Size: Indicators 4–9 must have a minimum size of 10 in the denominator. Values used for indicators 1–3 are determined through the calculations for Index 4. See those descriptions for information on minimum size.

Indicators for campuses:

Postsecondary-Readiness Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K–12
1) Index 4 - Percent at STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard	✓	✓	✓	✓
2) Four-Year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	✓			✓
3) Four-Year Longitudinal RHSP/DAP Rate	✓			✓
4) College-Ready Graduates	✓			✓
5) Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion Rate: Any Subject	✓			✓
6) SAT/ACT Participation	✓			✓
7) SAT/ACT Performance	✓			✓
8) AP/IB Examination Performance: Any Subject	✓			✓
9) CTE-Coherent Sequence Graduates	✓			✓
Total	9	1	1	9

Methodology:

Elementary and Middle Schools: Campuses are assigned a numeric value for the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard component of Index 4. Those values are arranged in descending order for the campuses in the campus comparison group. If the STAAR performance for a campus is within the top quartile for its comparison group, it receives a distinction for postsecondary readiness.

High Schools: High schools in the top quartile on at least 33 percent of their eligible measures receive the postsecondary readiness distinction designation.

Districts: A district must have at least 70 percent of its campus-level postsecondary indicators in the top quartile (Q1). See the following example.

Districts with less than five campus-level postsecondary indicators are not eligible for the postsecondary readiness distinction.

Other Information:

- *CTE-Coherent Sequence Graduates.* New for 2015, the CTE-Coherent Sequence Graduates indicator measures the percent of 2013–14 annual graduates who enrolled in and completed a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE course for 3 or more credits. The CTE-Coherent Sequence designation is derived from the summer 2014 PEIMS submission. For more information, see *Appendix K – Data Sources*.
- *Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion.* Beginning in 2015, the Advanced/Dual Enrollment Course Completion rate includes only students enrolled in grades 11 and 12. A list of advanced courses is available in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.
- *Index 4 Construction.* For details on the components for indicators that make up Index 4, see *chapters 3 and 4*.
- *Methodology:* A complete description of the methodology and data sources used in determining each of the indicators in the table above is in *Appendix K – Data Sources*.

<i>Example:</i> Beta High School is fictional, but typical of Texas high schools with varied performance on the nine indicators for this distinction. To determine whether it has earned the distinction, its performance is compared to its unique campus comparison group—made up of itself and 40 other schools—for each of the nine indicators. It must be in the top quartile (Q1) for at least 33% of the indicators for the Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation.										
Step 1	Determine Beta HS performance on its nine indicators.	STAAR Post secondary Readiness Standard 47%*	Graduation Rate 87.7%*	RHSP/DAP Rate 85.9%*	College-Ready Graduates 85%	Advanced/Dual Enrollment Courses 60.9%	SAT/ACT Participation 94.4%	SAT/ACT Met Criterion 49.6%	AP/IB Met Criterion 61.3%	CTE-Coherent Sequence Graduates 28%
Step 2	Compare performance to campuses in Beta HS Comparison Group.			Q1	Q1	Q1	Q1			
		Q2	Q2					Q2		
								Q3		
										Q4
Step 3	Is performance in the top quartile?	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Result		Performance on 4 of 9 indicators is in Q1, which is greater than 33% of indicators; therefore, the Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation is earned.								
* This is the same value as is used for determining Index 4.										

<i>Example:</i> A sample district has 12 campuses. Each campus has either 1 or 9 possible indicators for this distinction.			
School	Grade span	Postsecondary Indicators in top quartile for this school	Maximum Possible Postsecondary Indicators
High School A	9–12	6	9
High School B	9–12	6	9
Middle School C	6–8	0	1
Middle School D	6–8	0	1
Middle School E	6–8	1	1
Middle School F	6–8	1	1
Elementary G	PK–5	1	1
Elementary H	PK–5	1	1

Elementary I	PK-5	1	1
Elementary J	PK-5	1	1
Elementary K	PK-5	0	1
Elementary L	PK-5	1	1
Total		19	28
Result:	Performance on 19 of 28 indicators is in Q1, or 68%, which is less than the 70% standard. The Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation is not earned.		

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 6 – Other Accountability System Processes

The majority of accountability ratings are determined through the process detailed in *Chapters 2–5*. Accommodating all districts and campuses in Texas increases the complexity of the accountability system but also ensures the fairness of ratings assigned. This chapter describes other processes necessary to implement the accountability system.

Required Improvement

For 2015 only, results of STAAR assessments in mathematics for grades 3–8 and STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels will be excluded from 2015 accountability. A separate required improvement calculation at the index level for districts and campuses that do not meet the accountability target for the index will be considered when the underlying indicators can be more appropriately used for year-to-year comparisons.

Pairing

All campuses serving grades prekindergarten (PK) through 12 must receive an accountability rating. Campuses that do not serve grades levels at which STAAR is administered are paired with another campus in the same district for accountability purposes. A campus may pair with the district and be evaluated on the district's results.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) analyzes Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) fall enrollment data to determine which campuses need to be paired. Campuses that only serve students in grades not tested on the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) (*e.g.*, PK, K, grade 1, or grade 2) are paired with either another campus in the district or the district itself.

Charter campuses and alternative education campuses (AECs) registered for evaluation by alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions are not paired with another campus.

Paired data are not used for distinction designation indicators; therefore, paired campuses cannot earn distinction designations.

Pairing Process

Districts may use the prior-year pairing relationship or select a new relationship by completing the pairing form on the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) website. In April, districts with campuses receive instructions on how to access this application on TEASE. Pairing decisions are due by May each year.

If a district fails to inform TEA of its pairing preference, pairing decisions will be made by agency staff. For campuses that have been paired in the past, staff will assume that prior-year pairing relationships still apply. For campuses in need of pairing for the first time, pairing selections are made based on the guidelines given in this section in conjunction with analysis of attendance and enrollment patterns using PEIMS data.

Guidelines

Campuses that are paired should have a "feeder" relationship with the selected campus and the grades should be contiguous. For example, a Kindergarten (K) through grade 2 campus should be paired with the 3–5 campus in which its students will be enrolled following 2nd

grade. An exception to this is when the campus being asked to pair is a pre-kindergarten (PK) or K campus with a “feeder” relationship to a campus that also requires pairing (e.g. a grade 1-2 only campus.) In this case, both the PK-K and grade 1-2 campuses should pair with the same grade 3 and above campus. A campus cannot pair with another paired campus.

Pairing with the district is possible. Campuses may be paired with the district instead of with another campus. This option is often more appropriate if a campus has no clear relationship with another single campus in the district. A campus paired with the district will be evaluated using the district's assessment results (for all grades tested in the district). Note that pairing with the district is not required in these cases. Districts have the choice of selecting another campus or selecting the district. For example, in cases where a K–2 campus feeds into several 3–5 campuses, one of the 3–5 campuses may be selected, or the district can be selected.

Multiple pairings are possible. If several K–2 campuses feed the same 3–5 campus, then all of the K–2 campuses may pair with that 3–5 campus.

Districts may change pairings from year to year; however, these changes should be based on reasonable justification (e.g., a change in attendance zones affecting feeder patterns). As long as pairings are established yearly, any prior-year performance is calculated using the pairing relationships in place for the year in question.

Non-Traditional Educational Settings

Even though districts are responsible for the performance of all their students, statutory requirements affect the rating calculations for residential treatment facilities (RTF), Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD), juvenile justice alternative education program (JJAEP), and disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP) campuses.

Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data

The performance of students served in certain campuses cannot be used in evaluating the district where the campus is located. Texas Education Code (TEC) §§39.054(f) and 39.055 require that students ordered by a juvenile court into a residential program or facility operated by the TJJD, a juvenile board, or any other governmental entity or any student who is receiving treatment in a residential facility be excluded from the district and campus when determining the accountability ratings. See *Appendix G – Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data*.

Student Attribution Codes

Districts with RTF or TJJD campuses are required to submit student attribution codes in PEIMS.

JJAEPs and DAEPs

State statute and statutory intent prohibit the attribution of student performance results to JJAEPs and DAEPs. Each district that sends students to a JJAEP or DAEP is responsible for properly attributing all performance and attendance data to the home campuses according to the *PEIMS Data Standards* and testing guidelines.

Special Education Campuses

Campuses where all students are served in special education programs and tested on STAAR will be rated on the performance of their students.

AEA Provisions

Alternative performance measures for campuses serving at-risk students were first implemented in the 1995–96 school year. Over time, these measures expanded to include charters that served large populations of at-risk students. Accountability advisory groups consistently recommend evaluating AECs by separate AEA provisions due to the large number of students served in alternative education programs on AECs and to ensure these unique campus settings are appropriately evaluated for state accountability.

AEA provisions apply to and are appropriate for

- campuses that offer nontraditional programs, rather than programs within a traditional campus;
- campuses that meet the at-risk enrollment criterion;
- campuses that meet the grades 6–12 enrollment criterion;
- charters that operate only AECs; and
- charters that meet the AEC enrollment criterion.

AEA Campus Identification

AECs, including charter AECs, must serve students at risk of dropping out of school as defined in TEC §29.081(d) and provide accelerated instructional services to these students. The performance results of students at registered AECs are included in the district's performance and used in determining the district's accountability rating.

The following types of campuses have the option to register for evaluation by AEA provisions.

AEC of choice – At-risk students enroll at AECs of choice to expedite progress toward performing at grade level and high school completion.

Residential facility – Education services are provided to students in private residential treatment centers and residential programs, detention centers, and correctional facilities operated by the TJJD.

Dropout recovery school (DRS) – Education services targeted to dropout prevention and recovery of students in grades 9–12, enrollment of which at least 50 percent of the students are 17 years of age or older as reported for the fall semester PEIMS submission.

In this manual, the terms *AEC* and *registered AEC* refer collectively to AECs of Choice, residential facilities, and dropout recovery schools that are registered for evaluation by AEA provisions and meet the at-risk and grades 6–12 enrollment criteria.

DAEPs, JJAEPs, and stand-alone General Educational Development (GED) programs are ineligible for evaluation by AEA provisions. Data for these campuses are attributed to the home campus.

AEA Campus Registration Process

The AEA campus registration process is conducted online using the TEASE Accountability website. AECs rated by 2014 AEA provisions are re-registered automatically in 2015. Filing an *AEA Campus Rescission Form* is required from AECs wishing to discontinue AEA registration. Filing an *AEA Campus Registration Form* is required for each AEC not on the list of registered AECs that wishes to be evaluated by 2015 AEA provisions. The 2015 registration process occurred April 2–16, 2015.

AEA Campus Registration Criteria

Eleven criteria must be met for campuses to register for AEA. However, the requirements in criteria 7–11 may not apply to charter campuses (depending on the terms of the charter) or for community-based dropout recovery campuses established in accordance with TEC §29.081(e).

- 1) The AEC must have its own county-district-campus number for which PEIMS data are submitted and test answer documents are coded. A program operated within or supported by another campus does not qualify.
- 2) The AEC must be identified in AskTED (Ask Texas Education Directory database) as an alternative instructional campus. This is a self designation that districts and charters request via AskTED.
- 3) The AEC must be dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school as defined in TEC §29.081(d).
- 4) At least 50 percent of students at the AEC must be enrolled in grades 6–12.
- 5) The AEC must operate on its own campus budget.
- 6) The AEC must offer nontraditional settings and methods of instructional delivery designed to meet the needs of the students served on the AEC.
- 7) The AEC must have an appropriately certified, full-time administrator whose primary duty is the administration of the AEC.
- 8) The AEC must have appropriately certified teachers assigned in all areas including special education, bilingual education, and/or English as a second language (ESL) to serve students eligible for such services.
- 9) The AEC must provide each student the opportunity to attend a 7-hour school day as defined in TEC §25.082(a), according to the needs of each student.
- 10) If the campus has students served by special education, the students must be placed at the AEC by their Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee. If the campus is a residential facility, the students must have been placed in the facility by the district.
- 11) Students served by special education must receive all services outlined in their current individualized education programs (IEPs). English language learners (ELL) must receive all services outlined by the language proficiency assessment committee (LPAC). Students served by special education or language programs must be served by appropriately certified teachers.

At-Risk Enrollment Criterion

Each registered AEC must have at least 75 percent at-risk student enrollment on the AEC verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data in order to be evaluated by AEA provisions. The at-risk enrollment criterion restricts use of AEA provisions to AECs that serve large populations of at-risk students and enhances at-risk data quality.

Prior-Year Safeguard. If a registered AEC does not meet the at-risk enrollment criterion in the current year, it remains registered for AEA if the AEC meets the at-risk enrollment criterion in the prior year. For example, an AEC with an at-risk enrollment below 75 percent in 2015 that has at least 75 percent in 2014 remains registered in 2015.

Grades 6–12 Enrollment Criterion

In order to be evaluated by AEA provisions, each registered AEC must have at least 50 percent student enrollment in grades 6–12 based on total students enrolled (early education-grade 12) verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data. The grades 6–12 enrollment criterion restricts use of AEA provisions to middle and high schools.

Final AEA Campus List

The final list of AEA campuses is posted on the TEA website in May at which time an email notification is sent to all superintendents.

The *2015 Final AEA Campus List* includes DRS designations. If at least 50 percent of the students enrolled at an AEA campus are 17 years of age or older as of September 1, 2014, then the AEC of choice is designated as a DRS (TEC §39.0545).

AEA Charter Identification

Charter ratings are based on aggregate performance of the campuses operated by the charter. Performance results of all students in the charter are used in determining the charter's accountability rating and for distinction designations.

- Charters that operate only registered AECs are evaluated by AEA provisions.
- Charters that operate both non-AEA campuses and registered AECs are evaluated by AEA provisions if the AEC enrollment criterion described below is met.
- Charters that operate both non-AEA campuses and registered AECs that do not meet the AEC enrollment criterion described below do not qualify for evaluation by AEA provisions.
- Charters that operate only non-AEA campuses do not qualify for evaluation by AEA provisions because the campuses choose not to register for AEA evaluation, do not meet the at-risk criteria, or do not meet the grades 6–12 enrollment criteria.

AEC Enrollment Criterion for Charters

A charter that operates both non-AEA campuses and registered AECs is eligible for evaluation by AEA provisions if at least 50 percent of the charter's students are enrolled at registered AECs. AEC enrollment is based on total students enrolled (early education-grade 12) verified through current-year PEIMS fall enrollment data.

Final AEA Charter Operator List

After the AEA Campus List is finalized, AEA charters eligible for evaluation by AEA provisions are identified. The final list of AEA charter operators is posted on the TEA website in May, at which time an email is sent to all superintendents.

AEA Modifications

Chapter 3 – Performance Index Construction and *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators* describe the separate provisions and targets used to evaluate AEA campuses and charters.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 7 – Appealing the Ratings

The commissioner of education is required to provide a process for any local district or charter to challenge an agency determination of its accountability rating (Texas Education Code [TEC], §39.151).

Appeals Process Overview and Calendar

The state accountability system performance index framework limits the likelihood that a single indicator or measure results in an *Improvement Required* rating. For this reason, the state accountability appeals process is limited to rare cases where a data or calculation error is attributable to the test contractor or the Texas Education Agency (TEA). The compensatory nature of the performance index framework minimizes the possibility that district data coding errors in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) or State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) program negatively impact the overall accountability rating. Online applications provided by TEA and the testing contractor ensure that districts are aware of data correction opportunities, particularly through the use of PEIMS data submissions and the Texas Assessment Management System (TAMS). District responsibility for data quality is the cornerstone of a fair and uniform rating determination.

School district appeals that challenge the agency determination of the accountability rating are carefully reviewed by an external panel of educators. Superintendents may appeal accountability ratings by following the guidelines in this chapter.

Following are the dates for appealing ratings. These deadlines are final. To maintain a fair appeal process, late appeals are denied. See *Chapter 10 – Calendar* for more information.

July 31, 2015	<i>Preview Data Tables.</i> Superintendents may preview confidential accountability data tables for their district and campuses showing all accountability indicator data. Principals and superintendents use these data tables to anticipate their district and campus accountability ratings.
August 7, 2015	<i>Ratings Release.</i> No appeals will be resolved before the ratings release.
August 7 – September 8, 2015	<i>2015 Appeals Window.</i> Appeals may be submitted <i>by the superintendent</i> after receipt of the preview data tables. Districts register their intent to appeal using the TEASE Accountability website and mail their appeal letter with supporting documentation. Appeals not signed by the district superintendent are denied. See the “How to Appeal” section later in this chapter.
September 8, 2015	<i>Appeals Deadline.</i> Appeals must be postmarked or hand-delivered no later than September 8, 2015, in order to be considered.
November 2015	<i>Decisions Released.</i> Commissioner’s decisions are mailed in the form of response letters to each school district and charter that filed an appeal by the September 8 deadline. Letters are posted to the TEASE site.
November 2015	<i>Ratings Update.</i> The outcome of all appeals are reflected in the ratings update scheduled for November 2015. The TEASE and public websites are updated.

General Considerations

The basis for appeals should be a data or calculation error attributable to TEA, regional education service centers (ESC), or the testing contractor. The appeals process is not an appropriate method to correct data that were inaccurately reported by the district. If inaccurate

data are reported, the district must follow the procedures and timelines for resubmitting data, e.g., the PEIMS data standards. Poor data quality is not a valid reason to appeal. Poor data quality can, however, be a reason to lower a district's accreditation status (TEC §39.052(b)(2)(A)(i)). The data tables and other agency performance reports include data that are final and cannot be changed even if an appeal is granted, unless it is an error by TEA and/or the testing contractor.

Appeals Related to Excluded Assessments in 2015

After considering recommendations from the Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC), the Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC), and educators across the state, the commissioner of education announced on April 8, 2015, that assessment results from STAAR mathematics for grades 3–8 and STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels will not be included in the 2015 accountability system. The commissioner's final decisions for 2015 accountability took into consideration the effect of excluding these assessments from the accountability evaluations.

Districts and campuses that are assigned an *Improvement Required* rating in August 2015 as a result of missing the performance target of a required index may determine that including all or some combination of results from STAAR mathematics for grades 3-8, STAAR A, and STAAR Alternate 2 would have resulted in meeting the performance target on that index. The appeal process, however, cannot consider alternate outcomes that may have occurred if the assessments excluded from the 2015 ratings system had been included. The commissioner's decision to exclude these assessments from 2015 accountability precludes a district or campus from appealing its rating based on the assertion that results from the excluded assessments should have been included.

Districts may appeal for any reason. However, the accountability system requires that the rules be applied uniformly. Therefore, requests for exceptions to the rules for a district or campus are viewed unfavorably and most likely denied.

- Only appeals that would result in a changed rating are considered. A district or campus must meet all requirements for a higher rating in order for its appeal to be evaluated.
- Appeals of state and federal system safeguard results are not considered. District or campus intervention requirements are determined in part by the current rating outcome. Requests to waive Professional Service Provider (PSP) requirements are not considered an appeal of the accountability rating and are denied.
- Districts are responsible for providing accurate information to TEA, including information provided on student answer documents or submitted via online testing systems. School districts have several opportunities to confirm and correct data submitted for accountability purposes.
- The appeals process is not a permissible method to correct data that were inaccurately reported by the district. Appeals from districts that missed data resubmission window opportunities are denied. Appeal requests for data corrections for the following submissions are not considered:

PEIMS data submissions for

- Student identification information or program participation,
- Student racial/ethnic categories,
- Student economic status,

- Student at-risk status,
- Student attribution codes,
- Student leaver data, and
- Student grade-level enrollment data

STAAR and TELPAS answer documents, specifically

- Student identification information, demographic, or program participation;
 - Student racial/ethnic categories;
 - Student economic status;
 - Score codes or test version codes;
 - Student year in U.S. schools information reported on TELPAS; and
 - Campus and Group ID (header) sheets
- Requests to modify the 2015 state accountability calculations adopted by commissioner rule are not considered. Commissioner rules are adopted under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) and challenges to a commissioner rule should be made under that statute. Recommendations for changes to state accountability rules submitted to the agency outside of the appeal process may be considered by accountability advisory groups for future accountability cycles.
 - Requests to modify statutorily required implementation rules defined by the commissioner are not considered. PEIMS requirements, campus identifications, and statutorily required exclusions are based on data submitted by school districts. These data reporting requirements are reviewed by the appropriate advisory committee(s), such as the TEA Information Task Force (ITF) and Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI). Recommendations for changes to agency rules submitted outside of the appeals process may be considered as the appropriate advisory groups reconvene annually.
 - Examples of issues unfavorable for appeal are described below.
 - *Late Online Application Requests.* Requests to submit or provide information after the deadline of the online alternative education accountability (AEA) campus registration (12:00 p.m. on April 16, 2015) or the pairing application (2:00 p.m. on May 11, 2015) are denied.
 - *Inclusion or exclusion of specific test results*
 - Grade 3–8 mathematics STAAR, STAAR A, or STAAR L at the 2014 equivalent performance standards (bridge study) or the new performance standards that will be set in summer 2015
 - STAAR A or STAAR Alternate 2 for any subject area or grade level
 - STAAR results for students who took STAAR Modified in 2014
 - Specific administration results used to meet grade 5 or 8 Student Success Initiative (SSI)
 - *Inclusion or exclusion of specific students*
 - English Language Learners (ELLs), Asylees/Refugees and
 - Students receiving special education services.
 - *Requests to modify calculations or methodology applied to all districts and campuses*
 - STAAR Progress Measures, ELL Progress Measure, longitudinal graduation rates, longitudinal or annual RHSP/DAP rates, or annual dropout rates,

- District and campus mobility/accountability subsets,
- Rounding,
- Minimum size criteria, and
- Small numbers analysis
- *Requests to modify provisions or methodology applied to accountability*
 - *AEA Provisions.* Requests for consideration of campus registration criteria, at-risk or grades 6–12 enrollment criteria, prior-year safeguard methodology, Dropout Recovery School (DRS) designations, and to waive the alternative education campus (AEC) enrollment criterion for charters are denied.
 - *School Types.* The four campus types categories used for 2015 accountability are identified based on PEIMS enrollment data submitted in fall 2014. Requests to redefine the grade spans that determine school types are denied.
 - *Campus Configuration Changes.* School districts have the opportunity to determine changes in campus identification numbers and grade configurations. Requests for consideration of state accountability rules based on changes in campus configurations are denied.
 - *New Campuses.* Requests to assign a *Not Rated* label to campuses that are designated *Improvement Required* in their first year of operation are denied.

Data Relevant to the Prior-Year Results

Appeals are considered for the 2015 ratings status based on information relevant to the 2015 evaluation. Appeals are not considered for circumstances that may have affected the prior-year measures, regardless of whether the prior-year results impacted the current-year rating.

No Guaranteed Outcomes

Each appeal is evaluated on the details of its unique situation. Well-written appeals that follow the guidelines are more easily processed but not automatically granted.

Special Circumstance Appeals

- *Rescoring.* If a district requests its writing results be rescored, the district must provide a copy of the dated request to the testing contractor and the outcome of the rescored tests with the appeal. If the rescored results impact the rating, these appeals are necessary since rescored results may not be processed in time to be included in the assessment data used to determine the accountability ratings released by August 7, 2015.
- *Other Issues.* If other serious issues are found, copies of correspondence with the testing contractor, the regional ESC, or TEA should be provided with the appeal.
- *Online Testing Errors.* Appeals based on STAAR or TELPAS online test submission errors must include documentation or validation of the administration of the assessment.

Not Rated Appeals

Districts and campuses assigned *Not Rated* labels are responsible for appealing this rating by the appeal deadline if the basis for this rating was due to special circumstance or error by the testing contractor. If TEA determines that the *Not Rated* label was indeed due to special circumstances, it may assign a revised rating.

Distinction Designations

Decisions regarding distinction designations cannot be appealed. Indicators for these distinctions are reported for most districts and campuses regardless of eligibility for a designation. Districts and campuses rated *Improvement Required* are not eligible for a distinction. However, districts and campuses that appeal an *Improvement Required* rating will automatically receive any distinction designation earned if their appeal is granted and their rating is revised to *Met Standard*.

How to Submit an Appeal

Districts should file their intent to appeal district and campus ratings by using the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) Accountability site. This confidential online system provides a mechanism for tracking all accountability rating appeals and allows districts to monitor the status of their appeal(s).

After filing an intent to appeal, districts must mail an appeal packet including all supporting documentation necessary for TEA to process the appeal. Filing an intent to appeal does not constitute an appeal. To file an intent to appeal

1. Log on to TEASE at <https://sequin.tea.state.tx.us/apps/logon.asp> or TEAL at <https://pryor.tea.state.tx.us>,
2. Click ACCT – Accountability,
3. From the Welcome page, click the *Notification of Intent to Appeal* link and follow the instructions.

The *Notification of Intent to Appeal* website will be available during the appeals window from August 7 through 5:00 p.m. CDT on September 8. The status of the appeal (e.g., intent notification and receipt of documentation) will be available on the TEASE Accountability website.

Superintendents who do not have TEASE access must request access at the TEA Secure Applications Information page at http://tea.texas.gov/About_TEA/Other_Services/Secure_Applications/TEA_Secure_Applications_Information/.

- Districts must submit their appeal in writing via mail to TEA by September 8, 2015. The appeal shall include the following:
 - A statement that the letter is an appeal of a 2015 accountability rating
 - The name and ID number of the district and/or campuses to which the appeal applies
 - The specific indicator(s) appealed
 - The special circumstance(s) regarding the appeal, including details of the data affected and what caused the problem
 - If applicable, the reason(s) why the cause for appeal is attributable to TEA, a regional ESC, or the testing contractor
 - The reason(s) why granting the appeal may result in a revised rating, including calculations that support that rating
 - A statement that all information included in the appeal is true and correct to the best of the superintendent's knowledge and belief
 - The superintendent's signature on official district letterhead

- The appeal shall be addressed to the Division of Performance Reporting as follows:

Your ISD Your address City, TX Zip	postage
Division of Performance Reporting Texas Education Agency 1701 North Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701-1494	
Attn: Accountability Ratings Appeal	

- The letter of appeal should be addressed to Mr. Michael Williams, Commissioner of Education (see example letters, below).
- Appeals for more than one campus, including AECs, within a single district must be included in the same letter.
- Appeals for more than one indicator must be included in the same letter.
- Districts have only one opportunity to appeal for any campus or the district.
- If the appeal will impact the rating of the district or a paired campus, the consequence must be noted.
- When student-level information is in question, supporting documentation must be provided for review, *i.e.*, a list of the students by name and identification number. It is not sufficient to reference indicator data without providing documentation with which the appeal can be researched and evaluated. *Confidential student-level documentation included in the appeal packet will be processed and stored in a secure location and accessible only by TEA staff authorized to view confidential student results. Please clearly mark any page that contains confidential student data.*
- It is the district's responsibility to ensure all relevant information is included in the appeal as districts will not be prompted for additional materials.
- Appeals postmarked after September 8, 2015, are not considered. Appeals delivered to TEA in person must be time-stamped by the Division of Performance Reporting before 5:00 p.m., CDT on September 8, 2015. Overnight courier tickets or tracking documentation must indicate package pickup on or before September 8.
- Only send one copy of the appeal letter and/or supporting documentation.
- Districts are encouraged to obtain delivery confirmation services from their mail courier.

Examples of satisfactory and unsatisfactory appeals are provided for illustration only.

Satisfactory Appeal:	Unsatisfactory Appeals:
<p>Dear Commissioner Williams,</p> <p>This is an appeal of the 2015 accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD.</p> <p>Specifically, I am appealing STAAR reading test results for this campus. This is the only indicator preventing Elm Street Elementary from achieving a rating of <i>Met Standard</i>.</p> <p>During the day of the reading test administration at Elm Street Elementary School, the campus was subjected to a disrupted schedule due to an unusual and unique event. The fifth grade class was disrupted during the test administration by an emergency situation. Documentation of the incident and district personnel adherence to testing irregularity processes is included.</p> <p>Attached is the students' identification information as well as the PEIMS data for the students whose tests were affected.</p> <p>The second attachment shows the recalculated reading percent passing for Elm Elementary.</p> <p>We recognize the appeal process as the mechanism to address these unique issues. By my signature below, I certify that all information included in this appeal is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.</p>	<p>Dear Commissioner Williams,</p> <p>This is an appeal of the 2015 accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD.</p> <p>Specifically, I am appealing STAAR reading for the Hispanic student group. This is the only indicator keeping Elm Street Elementary from achieving a rating of <i>Met Standard</i>.</p> <p>My analysis shows a coding change made to one student's race/ethnicity on the answer document at the time of testing was in error. One 5th grade Hispanic student was miscoded as White on the answer document. Had this student, who passed the reading test, been included in the Hispanic student group, the percent passing for this group would have met the standard. Removing this student from the White student group does not cause the White student group performance to fall below the <i>Met Standard</i> criteria.</p> <p>We recognize the importance of accurate data coding, and have put new procedures in place to prevent this from occurring in the future.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>Attachments</i></p>
<p>Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>Attachments</i></p>	<p>Dear Commissioner Williams,</p> <p>Maple ISD feels that its rating should be <i>Met Standard</i>. The discrepancy occurs because TEA shows that the performance in Index 1 for Writing is 48%.</p> <p>We have sent two compositions back for scoring, and are confident they will be changed to passing.</p> <p>If you have questions, do not hesitate to contact us, at 701-555-1234.</p> <p>Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools</p> <p><i>(no attachments)</i></p>

How an Appeal Is Processed by the Agency

- The Division of Performance Reporting receives an appeal packet.
- Once the appeal is received, TEA staff updates the TEASE Accountability site to reflect the postmark date for each appeal and the date on which each appeal packet is received by the agency. Districts may monitor the status of their appeal(s) using the TEASE Accountability site.
- Researchers evaluate the request using agency data sources to validate the statements made to the extent possible. The agency examines all relevant data, *not just the results for students specifically named in the appeal correspondence.*
- Researchers analyze the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on other campuses in the district (such as paired campuses), even if they are not specifically named in the appeal. Similarly, the effect that granting a campus appeal may have on the district is evaluated, even if the district is not named in the appeal. In single-campus districts, both the campus and district are evaluated, whether the district submits the appeal as a campus or district appeal.
- Staff prepares a recommendation and submits it to an external panel of educators for review.
- The review panel examines all appeals, supporting documentation, staff research, and the staff recommendation. The panel determines its recommendation.
- The panel's recommendations are forwarded to the commissioner.
- The commissioner makes the final decision on all appeals.
- Superintendents receive written notification of the commissioner's decision and the rationale upon which the decision is based. The commissioner's response letters are posted to the TEASE Accountability site at the same time the letters are mailed. Superintendents are also notified via e-mail that appeal decisions are available on TEASE.
- *If an appeal is granted, the data upon which the appeal is based are not modified.* Accountability and performance reports, as well as all other publications reflecting accountability data, must report the data as submitted to the TEA. Accountability data are subject to scrutiny by the Office of the State Auditor.
- The commissioner's decisions are final and not subject to further appeal and/or negotiation.

The letter from the commissioner serves as notification of the official district or campus rating when changed due to a granted appeal. Districts may publicize the changed rating at that time. The agency website and other accountability products are updated in November after the resolution of all appeals. The update reflects only the changed *rating*. The values shown on the report, such as performance index values, are not modified. Between the times of receipt of the commissioner's letter granting an appeal and the update of agency accountability products, the agency sources will not reflect the changed campus or district rating.

Relationship to the Accountability System Safeguards, PBMAS, and TAIS

System safeguards, Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) indicators, and Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) staging requirements are considered when evaluating the appeal. School district data submitted through PEIMS or to the state test contractor are also considered. Certain appeal requests may lead the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions to address potential issues related to data integrity.

Chapter 8 – System Safeguards and Other Federal Requirements

Two separate system safeguard reports are provided to school districts for the 2015 accountability results:

- State system safeguards aligned with 2015 state accountability Index 1 results
- Federal system safeguards aligned with 2015 federal assessment and accountability requirements

As announced by the commissioner of education on April 8, 2015, the 2015 state accountability ratings and distinction designations **exclude** the results of STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels and all STAAR assessments in mathematics, grades 3–8. The state system safeguard performance and participation measures are based on the 2015 state accountability Index 1 results and, therefore, also exclude these assessments. The system safeguard reports for state accountability are planned for release by August 7, 2015.

Assessment results that are used to meet federal accountability requirements must be based on performance and participation data that **include** the results of STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels and all STAAR assessments in mathematics, grades 3–8. The student performance standards for grades 3–8 mathematics that will be set by the commissioner of education in summer 2015 will be applied to the federal accountability performance rate calculations. For this reason, separate system safeguard reports aligned with 2015 federal assessment and accountability requirements are planned for release in late fall 2015.

Background

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) (P.L. 107–110), reauthorized and amended federal programs established under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA). Under NCLB, accountability provisions that formerly applied only to districts and campuses receiving Title I, Part A funds were expanded to all districts and campuses which were evaluated annually for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) from the 2002–03 through the 2011–12 school years.

On September 30, 2013, the U.S. Secretary of Education approved the request of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to waive specific provisions of the ESEA. The U.S. Department of Education (USDE) waived the 2012–13 and 2013–14 AYP calculations, allowing the state's existing systems of interventions to guide the support and improvement of schools. The following year, TEA requested a one-year extension of USDE's approval to implement ESEA flexibility through the end of the 2014–15 school year. On September 19, 2014, the USDE approved the extension request with conditions related to the state's teacher and principal evaluation and support systems.

Under the approved waiver, campuses are identified as either Priority or Focus schools and must engage in the Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) which is aligned with ESEA principles for school improvement. The conditional approval for school year 2014–15 allows Texas to meet the federal accountability requirements that must include STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels and all STAAR assessments in

mathematics, grades 3–8 based on the student passing standard that will be set by the commissioner of education in summer 2015.

State Accountability System Safeguards

The disaggregated performance results of the state accountability system serve as the basis of safeguards for the accountability rating system to ensure that poor performance in one subject area or one student group is not masked in the performance index. The state accountability system safeguard data are released in conjunction with the state accountability ratings.

On August 7, 2015, the state accountability ratings, distinction designations, and system safeguard reports, will be released on the TEA website. These reports provide disaggregated results with the percent of measures and targets met. For 2015, the disaggregated performance measures and safeguard targets are calculated for three components (performance rates, participation rates, and graduation rates) for eleven student groups: All Students, African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races; Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and English language learners (ELLs). The ELL student group includes both ELL students currently identified as limited English proficient (LEP) and ELL students who have met the criteria for exiting bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. These students are no longer classified as LEP for Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) reporting and are in the first or second year of monitoring. District- and campus-level system safeguard results will be reported for any student group that meets minimum size criteria.

State Performance Targets

Performance rates calculated for system safeguards for state accountability are the same disaggregated results used for Index 1 in reading, mathematics (Algebra I only in 2015), writing, science, and social studies. The performance target for the 2015 system safeguard measures correspond to the target of 60 on Index 1: Student Achievement.

State Participation Targets

Test participation rates are included in the system safeguards reports for state accountability, with targets aligned to federal requirements. The target of 95 percent is unchanged from the federal accountability target in place in prior years. Participation measures are based on all students enrolled at the time of testing and defined as the total number of test answer documents submitted by each school district (denominator of the participation rate). The calculation is not limited to students enrolled for the full academic year. Test answer documents that are coded *Absent* or *Other* are not counted as participants and are therefore not included in calculating the participation numerator.

State reading and mathematics participation rates exclude STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels and all STAAR assessments in mathematics, grades 3–8. Therefore, the state participation results for mathematics are based on STAAR EOC Algebra I tests only.

Limits on Use of Alternative Assessments Not Applied

Due to the exclusion of STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels, including EOCs, school district limits on the use of alternate assessments are not applicable to 2015 state system safeguard reports.

Graduation Rate Goals and Targets

Texas is required by state statute to use the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition and the federal calculation for graduation rate.

Goal: The long term statewide goal for the four-year graduation rate is 90.0 percent. High schools and school districts that do not meet this goal must meet either 1) an annual target or a growth target for the four-year graduation rate or 2) an annual target for the five-year graduation rate.

Four-Year Graduation Rate Annual Target: For 2015, the annual target is 83.0 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years.

Four-Year Graduation Rate Growth Target: The growth target is a 10.0 percent decrease in the difference between prior year graduation rate and the 90.0 percent goal.

Five-Year Graduation Rate Annual Target: For 2015, the annual target is 88.0 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in five years.

State Minimum Size Requirements

The minimum size criteria applied to state system safeguards are aligned to the performance indexes to the greatest extent possible. A comparison of state and federal system safeguard minimum size criteria is provided at the end of this chapter.

The table below provides the 2015 performance targets that are used for the state system safeguard reports.

State Accountability System Safeguard Measures and Targets (aligned with Index 1 performance results and targets)											
	All	African Amer.	Hispanic	White	Amer. Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ. Disadv.	Special Ed	ELLs*
Performance Rate Targets - State											
Reading	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%
Mathematics (Alg I only)	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%
Writing	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%
Science	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%
Social Studies	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%
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 Graduation Rates **											
4-year	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%
5-year	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%
District Limits on Use of Alternative Assessment Results <i>Not Applicable for 2015</i>											
Reading-STAAR Alt 2	n/a	Not Applicable									
Mathematics-STAAR Alt 2	n/a	Not Applicable									

* Both current and monitored ELLs are included in the performance rates, current ELLs only are included in the participation rates, and EVER ELLs in high school are included in the federal graduation rates.

** Federal graduation rate targets are applied to state system safeguards and include an improvement target.

Consequences and Interventions

Interventions pertain to activities that result from the issuance of ratings under the state accountability system. State accountability-related interventions require engaging in the continuous improvement process within the Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS). Intervention activities reflect an emphasis on increased student performance, targeted improvement planning, data analysis, needs assessment, and data integrity. Required levels of intervention are determined based on the requirements of the Texas Education Code (TEC), Chapter 39. See the Division of Program Monitoring and Interventions website at <http://tea.texas.gov/pmi/> for more information.

Failure to meet the state accountability safeguard target for any reported cell will be addressed through the TAIS continuous improvement process. If the campus or district is already identified for assistance or intervention in the 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. If the campus or district received a rating of *Met Standard*, performance on the safeguard indicators will be addressed through intervention activities in TEC Chapter 11 improvement plans. The level of intervention and support the campus or district receives is based on performance history as well as current-year state accountability rating and performance on the safeguard measures.

Federal Accountability Requirements

To meet federal requirements, disaggregated performance measures with annual measureable objectives (AMOs) must be reported. For 2015, the federal accountability disaggregated safeguard measures include four components: performance rates, participation rates, graduation rates, and limits on the use of alternative assessments. The federal system safeguards require reporting the results of performance rates, participation rates, and graduation rates for seven student groups: All Students, African American, Hispanic, and White; Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and English language learners (ELLs) that includes both ELL students currently identified as LEP and ELL students in the first or second year of monitoring.

The 2015 federal performance and participation rates must include STAAR A, STAAR Alternate 2, and STAAR assessments in mathematics, grades 3–8, based on the student passing standard that will be set by the commissioner of education in summer 2015. The 2015 federal system safeguard report is planned for release in late fall 2015 following the release of STAAR grades 3–8 mathematics performance results.

The federal targets or AMOs are outlined in the final waiver request approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Targets for participation rates and graduation rates, and limits on use of STAAR Alternate 2 are aligned to federal requirements. District- and campus-level system safeguard results will be reported for any student group that meets minimum size criteria.

The table below provides the 2015 performance targets that are used for the federal system safeguard reports.

Federal Accountability System Safeguard Measures and Targets (aligned with federal AMO targets required by the ESEA waiver)											
	All	African Amer.	Hispanic	White	Amer. Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ. Disadv.	Special Ed	ELLs*
Performance Rate Targets – Federal											
Reading	83%	83%	83%	83%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	83%	83%	83%
Mathematics	83%	83%	83%	83%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	83%	83%	83%
Participation Rates											
Reading	95%	95%	95%	95%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	95%	95%	95%
Mathematics	95%	95%	95%	95%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	95%	95%	95%
Federal Graduation Rates **											
4-year	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	83.0%	83.0%	83.0%
5-year	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%
District Limits on Use of Alternative Assessment Results											
Reading-STAAR Alt 2	1%	Not Applicable									
Mathematics-STAAR Alt 2	1%	Not Applicable									

* Both current and monitored ELLs are included in the performance rates, current ELLs only are included in the participation rates, and EVER ELLs in high school are included in the federal graduation rates.

** Federal graduation rate targets include an improvement target.

In addition to meeting the federal accountability requirements of the ESEA waiver, the federal system safeguard results are used in the district evaluations for Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs), USDE Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) State Performance Plan (SPP), and State Annual Performance Report (APR). These results must also be submitted to the USDE via ED*Facts* to meet federal reporting requirements.

Federal Performance Targets

The federally-approved target of 83 percent is applied to reading and mathematics performance results which include STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels and all STAAR assessments in mathematics, grades 3–8. The student performance standards for grades 3–8 mathematics that will be set by the commissioner of education in summer 2015 will be applied to the federal accountability performance rate calculations. As described in the waiver, the federal target must reflect an increase from the 2014 performance target of 79 percent.

STAAR A: The STAAR A tests that are included in the performance results for the special education student group are for students receiving special education services only. The STAAR A performance results for students who are not receiving special education services are not included in the special education student group.

Federal Participation Targets

Federal reading and mathematics participation rates include STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels and all STAAR assessments in mathematics, grades 3–8. Test participation rates are calculated in the same manner as the state system

safeguards participation rates. The calculation is not limited to students enrolled for the full academic year, and test answer documents that are coded *Absent* or *Other* are not counted as participants.

STAAR Alternate 2: Students who meet the eligibility criteria for STAAR Alternate 2 may not be required to take the STAAR Alternate 2 based on documented decisions in the student's individualized education program (IEP) by his/her admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee. There are two reasons an ARD committee could determine that the STAAR Alternate 2 will not be administered to the student:

- No Authentic Academic Response (NAAR)
- Medical Exception

Detailed information about the participation requirements for STAAR Alternate 2 are available at <http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/special-ed/staaralt/>.

For federal participation rates, students with the NAAR designation are included in the total number of students (denominator) and the total number of participants (numerator), so the participation rate includes these students as participants. Students with the medical exception designation are not included in the total number of students (denominator), so they are not counted as participants or nonparticipants. The participation rate is not affected by the students with the medical exception designation.

STAAR A: The STAAR A tests that are included in the participation results for the special education student group are for students receiving special education services only. The STAAR A participation results for students who are not receiving special education services are not included in the special education student group.

Federal Limits on use of Alternative Assessments

For school districts only, the system safeguard reports for federal accountability indicate whether a school district exceeds the federal limit on use of alternative assessments. Federal limitations require that the number of scores that meet the STAAR Alternate 2 performance standard not exceed one percent of the district's total participation. Due to the discontinuation of the STAAR Modified, there is no application of a two percent limit on proficient results from assessments with modified achievement standards. The measures of STAAR Alternate 2 limits are reported separately for reading and mathematics.

Federal Graduation Rate Goals and Targets

The state and federal system safeguard graduation rate measures are aligned and generate the same results.

Minimum Size Requirements

The following table compares the minimum size criteria for state and federal system safeguards.

Comparison of Minimum Size Criteria for 2015 State and Federal System Safeguards			
		State System Safeguards	Federal System Safeguards*
Performance Rates	All Students	None (Small Numbers Analysis applied)	25 (No Small Numbers Analysis applied)
	Student Groups	25	25 and 10%; or 200
Participation Rates	All Students	None (Small Numbers Analysis applied)	25 (No Small Numbers Analysis applied)
	Student Groups	25	25 and 10%; or 200
Federal Graduation Rates	All Students	None (Small Numbers Analysis applied)	10 (No Small Numbers Analysis applied)
	Student Groups	25	25 and 10%; or 200

* These minimum size criteria are applied to the federal system safeguard results used to meet the assessment and accountability requirements of the ESEA waiver, Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs), and USDE Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

The approved ESEA flexibility waiver is available online at <http://tea.texas.gov/nclb/>.

The current Priority, Focus, and Reward Schools lists, methodology, and student groups evaluated are available at http://tea.texas.gov/Student_Testing_and_Accountability/Monitoring_and_Interventions/School_Improvement_and_Support/Priority,_Focus,_and_Reward_Schools/.

This page is intentionally blank.

circumstances may be to the disadvantage of an *Improvement Required* campus. This should be considered by districts and charters when requesting campus number changes for *Improvement Required* campuses. In the rare circumstance where a campus or charter district receives a new district number, the ratings history is also linked while the data are not linked across the district numbers.

An analysis to screen for the inappropriate use of campus numbers is part of the TEA Data Integrity Activities described in *Chapter 2 – Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets*. TEA can assist in establishing new or retiring old campus numbers.

If a school district enters into a legal agreement with TEA that requires new district or campus numbers, the ratings history will be linked to the previous district or campus number. In this case, both the district and campus will be rated the first year under the new number. Data for districts and campuses in these circumstances will not be linked. This includes the PEIMS data, assessment data, and graduation/dropout data that are used to develop the accountability indicators. Districts or campuses under a legal agreement with TEA cannot take advantage of any improvement calculations or small numbers analysis the first year under a new district or campus number.

Community and Student Engagement

Beginning in the 2013–14 school year, TEC §39.0545 requires districts to annually evaluate and assign to the district and each campus a rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Acceptable*, or *Unacceptable* for performance in community and student engagement. Districts must designate local committee(s) to determine the criteria that districts use both to evaluate performance and assign ratings for community and student engagement and to evaluate and indicate compliance with statutory reporting and policy requirements. Therefore, districts should locally maintain the documents that were developed to determine the performance rating and compliance status for the district and each campus.

By August 7, districts must report each rating to TEA and the public. TEA will report the performance ratings and compliance status for community and student engagement indicators reported by school districts on the agency website no later than October 1.

For more information, please refer to *Requirement for Posting of Performance - Frequently Asked Questions: Community and Student Engagement Posting Requirements*, available on the TEA website at http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/3297_faq.html.

Complementary Local Accountability Systems

Although the statewide accountability system has been designed to address the guiding principles articulated in *Chapter 1 – Introduction*, it is not a comprehensive system of performance evaluation. Communities across Texas have varied needs and goals for the school districts educating their students. Local systems of accountability can best address those priorities.

Districts are encouraged to develop their own complementary local accountability systems to plan for continued student performance improvement. Such systems are entirely voluntary and for local use only. Performance on locally-defined indicators does not affect the ratings determined through the statewide system.

Examples of locally-defined indicators include, but are not limited to

