

Highlights of the 2016 State Accountability Results

November 17, 2016

The public school accountability system in Texas allows for a comprehensive evaluation of district and campus effectiveness by using a framework of four indices that measure the quality of learning from different perspectives. Index 1 provides a snapshot of student performance across all subjects, Index 2 measures year-to-year student improvement, Index 3 emphasizes the academic achievement of certain student groups, and Index 4 emphasizes the importance of a high school diploma for success in postsecondary life. Additionally, distinction designations highlight achievement in specific areas by those districts and campuses that earn a *Met Standard* rating. Finally, system safeguards ensure that—in an aggregated district or campus report—substandard performance in one or more areas or by one or more student groups is not disguised by higher performance in other areas or by other student groups.

The State of Texas

More than five million students were enrolled in Texas public schools in the 2015–16 school year, and they took more than eight million STAAR assessments in reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies. Of all tests taken, 75% met the phase-in satisfactory standard for 2015–16.

Districts (Including Charter Operators)

Of the 1,207 districts in Texas, 1,137 (94.2%) earned a rating of *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard*, and 57 (4.7%) districts were rated *Improvement Required*. The remaining 13 (1.1%) were labeled *Not Rated*.

Campuses (Including Charter Campuses)

Of the 8,673 campuses in Texas, 7,684 (88.6%) earned a *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating, and 445 (5.1%) campuses were rated *Improvement Required*. The remaining 544 (6.3%) of campuses were labeled *Not Rated*.

Charters

Charter Operators

Of the 183 charter operators in Texas, 124 (67.8%) earned a *Met Standard* rating, 30 (16.4%) earned a *Met Alternative Standard* rating, and 18 (9.8%) were rated *Improvement Required*. The remaining 11 (6.0%) charter operators were labeled *Not Rated*.

Charter Campuses

Of the 629 total charter campuses in 2016, 387 (61.5%) earned a *Met Standard* rating, 98 (15.6%) earned a *Met Alternative Standard* rating, and 63 (10.0%) were rated *Improvement Required*. The remaining 81 (12.9%) charter campuses were labeled *Not Rated*.

Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)

Of the 388 AECs evaluated under the alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions, 248 (63.9%) earned a *Met Alternative Standard* rating, and 20 (5.2%) were rated *Improvement Required*. The remaining 120 (30.9%) AECs were labeled *Not Rated*, 11 of which are AECs of choice, 21 are dropout recovery schools, and 88 are residential treatment facilities.

Of the 388 AECs, 142 (36.6%) are charter campuses. Of these, 98 (69.0%) earned a *Met Alternative Standard* rating, and 2 (1.4%) were rated *Improvement Required*. The remaining 42 (29.6%) charter AECs were labeled *Not Rated*, one is an AEC of choice, and 41 are residential treatment facilities.

Highlights of the 2016 State Accountability Results

November 17, 2016

Districts and Campuses Labeled Not Rated

Of the 1,207 districts evaluated, only 13 (1.1%) were labeled *Not Rated*. Of those, 8 (61.5%) were residential treatment facilities (RTFs), and five were not rated for other reasons.

Of the 8,673 campuses evaluated, 544 (6.3%) were labeled *Not Rated*. Of those, 402 (73.9%) were JJAEPs, DAEPs, RTFs; 128 (23.5%) could not be rated because they did not have enough test results to meet minimum-size requirements; and 14 (2.6%) were not rated for other reasons.

Distinction Designations

Only campuses and districts that receive a *Met Standard* rating are eligible for distinction designations. AECs are not eligible for distinction designations.

Of the 8,673 campuses in Texas, 7,435 (85.7%) were evaluated for at least one distinction designation. Of those campuses, 2,192 (29.5%), earned a distinction for postsecondary readiness, 2,059 (27.7%) earned a distinction for closing performance gaps, 2,082 (28.0%) earned a distinction for student progress, 2,043 (27.5%) for achievement in English language arts/reading, 1,964 (26.4%) for achievement in science, 1,880 (25.3%) for achievement in mathematics, and 930 (12.5%) earned a distinction for achievement in social studies.

Altogether, 4,435 (51.1%) campuses earned one or more distinctions, while 423 (4.9%) campuses earned every distinction for which they were eligible. Of the 1,207 districts evaluated, 24 (2.0%) districts earned the distinction for postsecondary readiness.

State System Safeguards

System safeguards were established to meet state accountability-related intervention requirements. The purpose of the system safeguard report is to ensure that—in an aggregated district or campus report—substandard performance in one or more areas or by one or more student groups is not disguised by higher performance in other areas or by other student groups. To accomplish this, performance measures are disaggregated to show the results of each student subgroup on each of the indicators, highlighting any subgroup or area in which there was substandard performance. System safeguards report student performance, participation rates, and graduation rates.

Safeguard measures are calculated and reported (along with the safeguard targets) for performance on STAAR (all five subject areas), participation on STAAR (reading and mathematics only), and graduation rates (four-year and five-year graduation rates). The results are reported by student group: 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).

Statewide, of the 55 STAAR performance indicators (five subject areas for each of the 11 student groups) evaluated for system safeguards, 47 (85%) met the state target of 60% that corresponds to the target for Index I. All 22 of the STAAR participation indicators (two subject areas for each of the 11 student groups) met the participation target of 95%.

Of the 11 student groups evaluated against the system safeguards for graduation rates, seven (64%) either met the graduation-rate target of 88% for the four-year cohort, met the target of 90% for the five-year cohort, or demonstrated sufficient improvement to achieve the goal of 90%.