Chapter 2 – Ratings Criteria and Index Targets

The *2016 Accountability Manual* describes the 2016 accountability system and explains how information from different sources is used to calculate and assign accountability ratings and award distinction designations. The manual attempts to address all possible scenarios; however, because of the number and diversity of districts and campuses in Texas, there could be some unforeseen circumstances that are not anticipated in the manual. In the event that a data source used to determine district or school performance is unintentionally affected by unforeseen circumstances, including natural disasters or test administration issues, the commissioner of education will consider those circumstances and their impact in determining whether or how that data source will be used to assign accountability ratings and award distinction designations. In such instances, the commissioner will interpret the manual as needed to assign the appropriate ratings and/or award distinction designations that preserve both the intent and the integrity of the accountability system.

2016 Ratings

The accountability system assigns ratings that designate acceptable and unacceptable performance for districts and campuses. In 2016, one of the following ratings is assigned to each district and campus based on its performance on the required indices. Unless otherwise noted, the term districts includes open-enrollment charters.

Met Standard indicates acceptable performance and is assigned to districts and campuses that meet the targets on all required indices for which they have performance data.

Met Alternative Standard indicates acceptable performance and is assigned to eligible CHARTER DISTRICTS AND ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION CAMPUSES (AECs) that are evaluated by ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY (AEA) provisions. To receive this rating, eligible charter districts and AECs must meet modified targets on all required indices for which they have performance data.

Improvement Required indicates unacceptable performance and is assigned to districts and campuses, including charter districts and AECs evaluated under AEA provisions, that do not meet the targets on all required indices for which they have performance data.

In a few specific circumstances, a district or campus does not receive a rating. When this occurs, a district or campus is given one of the following two labels.

Not Rated indicates that a district or campus did not receive a rating for one or more of the following reasons:

- The district or campus serves only students enrolled in early education (EE).
- The district or campus has no data in the ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET.
- The district or campus has insufficient data to assign a rating.
- The district operates only residential facilities.
- The campus is a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP).
- The campus is a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP).
- The campus is a residential facility.
- The test documents for either the district or campus were lost in transit between the district and the test contractor.

Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues indicates data accuracy or integrity have compromised performance results, making it impossible to assign a rating. The assignment of a *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* label may be permanent or temporary pending investigation.

2016 Index Targets

Each index has a specific target, and districts and campuses must meet an index's target to show acceptable performance for that index. Districts and non-AEA campuses (campuses not evaluated under alternative education accountability provisions) have separate targets from charter districts and AECs evaluated under alternative education accountability provisions. In addition, for non-AEA campuses only, separate targets are identified for each SCHOOL TYPE for Index 2, Index 3, and Index 4. Please see the explanation of school type later in this chapter.

The 2016 targets for Index 1 and Index 4 are provided in the table below. The 2016 targets for Index 2 and Index 3 for campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of 2016 campus performance by campus type and will be identified prior to the release of the 2016 accountability ratings. The 2016 Index 2 and Index 3 targets for non-AEA districts is set at about the fifth percentile of 2016 campus performance across all non-AEA campuses and will be identified prior to the release of the 2016 accountability ratings.

For non-AEA districts and campuses, Index 4 is comprised of four components: STAAR results, graduation rate, graduation-plan rate, and college and career readiness. Because not all districts and campuses have data for each of these components, Index 4 has two separate targets: one based on all four components and one based on STAAR results only. The target that a district, campus, or charter is required to meet is determined by whether it has data for each of the four components. For a district, high school campus, or campus serving grades K–12 (elementary/secondary), the target for Index 4 is based on all four components. For elementary campuses, middle school campuses, and any district or campus that does not have data for each of the four components, the target is based on the STAAR component only.

For AEA campuses and charter districts, Index 4 is comprised of two components: STAAR results and the graduation rate/dropout rate. Because not all AEAs have data for both of these components, Index 4 has two separate and distinct targets: one based on both components and one based on graduation rate/dropout rate only. AEAs can also earn bonus points towards their Index 4 score. Please see *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators* for a complete description of bonus points.

2016 Accountability Performance Index Targets for Non-AEA Districts and Campuses

Target	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
				All Components	STAAR Component Only
Districts	60	5th Percentile*	5th Percentile*	60	13
Campuses					
Elementary	60	5th Percentile*	5th Percentile*	n/a	12
Middle		5th Percentile*	5th Percentile*	n/a	13
High School/K–12 and Elementary/Secondary		5th Percentile*	5th Percentile*	60	21

* Targets for non-AEA campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts correspond to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance across all campus types.

2016 Accountability Performance Index Targets – AEA Charter Districts and Campuses

Target	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
				Both Components	Graduation/ Dropout Rate Component Only
AEA Charter Districts and Campuses	35	5th Percentile*	5th Percentile*	33	45

* Targets for both AEA charter districts and campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2016 campus performance.

Index Targets for Single-Campus Districts or Charters

A district or charter comprised of only one campus that shares the same 2016 performance data with that campus must meet the index target required for the campus in order to demonstrate acceptable performance. For these single-campus districts and charters, the 2016 index targets applied to the campus will also be applied to the district, ensuring that both the district and campus receive identical ratings. Districts or charters that meet the definition above are considered single-campus districts or charters in any criteria outlined in this manual.

2016 Ratings Criteria

To receive a *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating, districts and campuses must meet the performance index target on the following indices if they have performance data:

Index 1 **OR** Index 2 **AND** Index 3 **AND** Index 4

For example, a campus with performance data for all four indices must meet the target on either Index 1 or Index 2 and the targets on Index 3 and Index 4. A campus with performance data for Index 1, Index 3, and Index 4 must meet the target on all three of those. A campus with performance data for only Index 1 and Index 3 must meet the target on both indices. A campus with performance data for only Index 1 and Index 2 needs only to meet the target on either one.

2016 Accountability System School Types

Every campus is labeled as one of four school types according to its grade span based on 2015–16 enrollment data reported in the fall PEIMS submission. The four types—elementary, middle school, elementary/secondary (also referred to as K–12), and high school—are illustrated by the table on the following page. The table shows every combination of grade levels served by campuses in Texas and the number of campuses that serve each of those combinations. The shading indicates the school type to which each grade span corresponds.

To find out how a campus that serves a certain grade span is labeled, find the lowest grade level reported as being served by that campus along the left column and the highest grade level reported as being served along the top row. The shading of the cell where the two grade levels intersect indicates which of the four school types that campus is considered. The number inside the cell indicates how many campuses in Texas serve that grade span. For example, a campus that serves early elementary (EE) through fourth grade only is labeled elementary; there are 170 campuses that serve only that grade span. A campus that serves grades five and six only is labeled middle school, and there are 146 such campuses statewide.

2016 Accountability System School Types

(8,673 Total Campuses)

Elementary	Middle School	Elementary/Secondary	High School
4,700 Campuses	1,694 Campuses	495 Campuses	1,784 Campuses

Highest Grade Level Served →

Lowest Grade Level Served ↓

	EE	PK	KG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
EE	7	70	52	44	72	42	170	1024	101	2	12	0	1	0	31
PK		43	16	12	27	18	169	1123	190	9	67	1	3	4	135
KG			3	4	11	25	138	675	118	11	58	6	4	5	56
1				1	13	24	6	35	23	0	3	1	1	5	13
2					2	20	14	22	3	1	2	0	0	2	5
3						0	15	87	9	1	4	3	1	0	5
4							1	56	34	2	5	0	1	3	11
5								11	146	1	86	1	3	5	7
6									39	10	1108	13	22	19	142
7										5	254	10	5	19	134
8											9	5	14	20	33
9												60	33	23	1334
10													14	3	41
11														10	21
12															20

TEA Division of Performance Reporting

Who is Rated?

Districts and campuses that have students enrolled in the fall of the 2015–16 school year are assigned a state accountability rating.

Districts

Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, districts and charter operators are rated based on the aggregate results of their campuses. Districts without any students enrolled in the grades for which STAAR assessments are administered (3–12) are assigned the rating label of *Not Rated.*

State-administered school districts, including Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired, Texas School for the Deaf, Texas Juvenile Justice Department, and Windham School District are not assigned a state accountability rating.

Campuses

Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, campuses, including AECs and open-enrollment charter schools, are rated based on the performance of their students. For the purposes of assigning accountability ratings, campuses that do not serve any of the grade levels for which the STAAR assessments are given are PAIRED with campuses in their district that serve students who take STAAR. Please see *Chapter 6 – Other Accountability System Processes* for information on pairing.

The following campuses are assigned the rating label of *Not Rated* in 2016:

- **Residential facilities:** For AECs identified as residential facilities, and AEA charter districts that operate only residential facilities, performance index results are reported, but a rating label is not assigned. Students enrolled in AECs and charter districts operating as residential facilities are excluded from accountability only if the student attribution codes are entered and submitted accurately during the fall 2015 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) submission. Please see *Appendix G – Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data.*
- **Campuses that close mid-year:** If data for an accountability index exists for a campus that closes mid-year, the data are included in the district's accountability rating. A campus that closes after the end of the school year is assigned a rating for that school year.
- **JJAEPs and DAEPs:** Attendance and performance data for students served in JJAEPs and DAEPs are reported to the students' home campuses, and the HOME CAMPUS is evaluated based on the results.
- **Campuses that have no students in the accountability subset:** Campuses that serve students in grades 3–12, but have no test results due to the accountability subset are not rated. This includes AECs with short-term student placements.
- **Charter campuses with no students in grades tested:** Open-enrollment charter schools without any students enrolled in the grades for which STAAR assessments are administered (3–12) are not rated.

Timeline for Ratings Release

- **Friday, August 12, 2016:** The 2016 accountability ratings are released to districts and campuses through the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) website. Please see *Appendix E – TEASE Accountability*.
- **Monday, August 15, 2016:** Accountability ratings are released to the public on the TEA website.
- **By Friday, August 26, 2016:** Data tables released through TEASE (unmasked) and public website (masked)
- **By Friday, September 16, 2016:** System safeguards, distinction designations, and accountability summaries released through TEASE (unmasked) and public website (masked)
- **December 2016:** Final accountability ratings that reflect the outcome of any ratings appeals are released to the public on the TEA website.

Ensuring Data Integrity

Accurate data is fundamental to accountability ratings. The system depends on the responsible collection and submission of assessment and PEIMS information by school districts and charter operators. Responsibility for the accuracy and quality of data used to determine district and campus ratings, therefore, rests with local authorities. Any appeal of an *Improvement Required* rating that is based on a district's submission of inaccurate data will be denied.

Because accurate and reliable data are the foundation of the accountability system, TEA has established several steps to protect the quality and integrity of the data and the accountability ratings that are based on that data.

- **Campus Number Tracking:** Requests for campus number changes are approved in light of prior state accountability ratings. An *Improvement Required* rating for the same campus assigned two different campus numbers may be considered to be consecutive years of low ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions.
- **Data Validation Monitoring:** The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBM system, like the state accountability system, is a data-driven system based on data submitted by districts; therefore, the integrity of districts' data is critical. The PBM system includes annual data validation analyses that examine districts' leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, and discipline data. Districts identified with potential data integrity concerns engage in a process to either validate the accuracy of their data or determine that erroneous data were submitted. This process is fundamental to the integrity of all the agency's evaluation systems. For more information, see the Data Validation Manuals on the PBM website at http://tea.texas.gov/pbm/DVManuals.aspx.
- **Test Security:** As part of ongoing efforts to improve security measures surrounding the assessment program, TEA uses a comprehensive set of test security procedures designed to assure parents, students, and the public that test results are meaningful and valid. Among other measures, districts are required to implement seating charts during all administrations, conduct annual training for all testing personnel, and maintain test security materials for five years. Detailed information about test security policies for the state assessment program is available online at http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/security/.

- ***Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues:*** This rating is used when the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised, preventing the assignment of a rating. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be the final rating for the year. It is not equivalent to an *Improvement Required* rating, though the commissioner of education has the authority to lower a rating, assign an *Improvement Required* rating due to data quality issues, or consider the rating of *Improvement Required* for purposes of determining consecutive years of low ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

These steps can occur either before or after the ratings release, and sanctions can be imposed at any time. To the extent possible, ratings for the year are finalized when updated ratings are released following the resolution of appeals. A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

Special Processing for Spring 2016 Testing Issues

The results of the grade 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, grade 4 and 7 writing, and EOC English I and English II tests affected by the online testing issues that occurred in March will be excluded from 2016 state accountability. In addition, any grades 5 and 8 results from the May retest administration for the affected students will also be excluded. If, however, including the results from either the March or May test administration would change a district or campus rating from *Improvement Required* to *Met Standard,* that district or campus will receive a *Met Standard* rating. The data will remain the same; only the rating will change. TEA will conduct this analysis prior to the release of the ratings on August 12. The results evaluated for distinction designations and system safeguards will also exclude the affected tests.

This page is intentionally blank.

Chapter 3 – Performance Index Construction

The state accountability system for public education in Texas is built on a framework of four performance indices. Each index measures a different aspect of district or campus performance and identifies areas of strength and needed improvement.

For each of the four indices a district or campus earns a score of 0 to 100, calculated as the percentage of total possible points. Each measure of student performance contributes points to an index score. Targets set by the commissioner of education determine the minimum score required for meeting a performance standard for each index. The index scores provide a rating of overall performance for a district or campus. A key feature of a performance index framework is that no single indicator can—by itself—result in a low rating because index performance is a culmination of measures. This system is both comprehensive and extendible; it tracks each student across multiple indices to ensure accountability and allows for new student groups and indicators without requiring districts and campuses to meet new targets.

For details on the STAAR and other indicators that comprise each performance index, see *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators*.

Index 1: Student Achievement

Index 1 measures district and campus performance based on student achievement across all subjects for all students. The total index points and index score are the same: *Index Score = Total Index Points*. Total points are determined by the percentage of assessments that meet or exceed the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) Level II Satisfactory Standard, meet or exceed the English language learner (ELL) progress measure, or achieve the equivalency standard on end-of-course (EOC) substitute assessments.

Examples of Index 1 Calculations The four examples below show the calculation of the Index 1 scores for districts and campuses testing different numbers of subjects depending upon the grades served. The percentage of assessments meeting the Level II Satisfactory Standard is calculated as the number of assessments meeting the satisfactory standard in each test divided by the total number of assessments taken across all subjects. The result is rounded to the nearest whole number. The index points awarded are equal to the percentage of assessments meeting the satisfactory standard. For example, an index score of 65 indicates that 65 percent of all assessments taken met or exceeded the Level II Satisfactory Standard.

Example 1.1 Districts and campuses that test in five subjects: Gr. K–12, Gr. 9–12, Gr. 6–8														
STAAR Performance	Reading		Math		Writing		Science		Social Studies		Total	% Met Level II Satisfactory Standard	Index Points
# Level II Satisfactory Standard	551	+	534	+	27	+	143	+	87	=	1,342	44%	44
Total Tests	984	+	988	+	353	+	354	+	356	=	3,035		
Index 1: Score													44

Example 1.2 Districts and campuses that test in four subjects: Gr. 9–12														
STAAR Performance	Reading		Math		Writing		Science		Social Studies		Total	% Met Level II Satisfactory Standard	Index Points
# Level II Satisfactory Standard	551	+	534	+	0	+	143	+	87	=	1,315	49%	49
Total Tests	984	+	988	+	0	+	354	+	356	=	2,682		
Index 1: Score													49

Example 1.3 Campuses that test in four subjects: Gr. K–5													
STAAR Performance	Reading		Math		Writing		Science		Social Studies		Total	% Met Level II Satisfactory Standard	Index Points
# Level II Satisfactory Standard	551	+	534	+	27	+	143	+	0	=	1,255	47%	47
Total Tests	984	+	988	+	353	+	354	+	0	=	2,679		
Index 1: Score													47

Example 1.4 Campuses that test in three subjects: Gr. K–4													
STAAR Performance	Reading		Math		Writing		Science		Social Studies		Total	% Met Level II Satisfactory Standard	Index Points
# Level II Satisfactory Standard	551	+	534	+	27	+	0	+	0	=	1,112	48%	48
Total Tests	984	+	988	+	353	+	0	+	0	=	2,325		
Index 1: Score													48

Index 2: Student Progress

Index 2 measures student progress in reading/English language arts and mathematics by student demographic categories: race/ethnicity, current and monitored ELLs, and special education.

Each assessment result is categorized according to the STAAR and the English language learner (ELL) progress measure as *Did Not Meet*, *Met*, or *Exceeded Progress*. These results are grouped according to demographic categories. Weighted scores are calculated based on students' level of performance: one point for each percentage of assessment results that *Met* or *Exceeded Progress* and one point for each percentage of results that *Exceeded Progress* and are aggregated across subjects. Fractions of a percent are rounded to the nearest whole number.

Cumulative performance (*Met* and *Exceeded Progress* plus *Exceeded Progress*) for all subjects contributes from 0 to 200 points to each student group that meets minimum-size criteria, including *All Students*. The maximum number of possible points depends on campus type, student population, and demographics. Index 2 is calculated by dividing the total points (cumulative performance) by the maximum number of possible points, resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100 for all districts and campuses.

Example of Index 2 Calculations The following example shows how the combined STAAR and ELL progress measures results are computed across all subjects.

Example 2. Index 2 calculation												
Weighted Progress Rate: All Subjects	All	African Amer.	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
Number of Tests:	989	64	828	39					75	819		
# Met or Exceeded Progress	732	51	621	28					49	614		
# Exceeded Progress	198	16	124	4					4	164		
Percent of Tests: % Met or Exceeded Progress	74%	80%	75%	72%					65%	75%		
% Exceeded Progress	20%	25%	15%	10%					5%	20%		
All Subjects Weighted Progress Rate	94	105	90	82					70	95	536	1200
Total											536	1200
Index 2: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											45	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above indicate student groups that do not meet the minimum-size criteria.

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps

Index 3 emphasizes the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students and the two lowest performing racial/ethnic student groups. The specific racial/ethnic groups are identified for each district or campus based on prior year (2015) assessment results.

Tests used include reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies. One point is given for each percentage of tests meeting or exceeding the Level II Satisfactory Standard. One point is given for each percentage of tests meeting the Advanced Standard on the STAAR assessment. The maximum number of possible points depends on the student population and demographics. Index 3 is calculated by dividing total cumulative performance points by the maximum possible points, resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100.

Examples of Index 3 Calculations The following examples illustrate how the weighted performance rate is computed for reading and how the Index 3 outcomes are determined when the results are combined across all subject areas.

Example 3.1 Index 3 calculation for reading weighted performance					
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		
# Level II Satisfactory Standard and above	80	20	25		
# Advanced Standard	40	0	25		
% Level II Satisfactory Standard and above	100%	50%	100%		
% Advanced Standard	50%	0%	100%		
Reading Weighted Performance Rate	150	50	200	400	600

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

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

Index 4 emphasizes the role of elementary and middle schools in preparing students for the rigors of high school. Index 4 also emphasizes the importance of earning a high school diploma that provides students with the foundation necessary for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military.

For non-AEA districts and campuses, Index 4 is based on four components with one exception: when data are missing for any of the three non-STAAR components, Index 4 is based solely on the STAAR component. The reason for this is elementary and middle school campuses do not report data on graduation rate, graduation diploma plans, or postsecondary indicators. Elementary and middle school campuses report only STAAR results. Therefore, the Index 4 evaluation of these campuses is based solely on the STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard component, as explained below.

For districts, high school campuses, and campuses serving grades K–12, the four components of Index 4 are equally weighted.

Index 4 Components	Weight
1. STAAR at Postsecondary Readiness Standard	25%
2. Graduation Rate (or Dropout Rate)	25%
3. Graduation Diploma Plan	25%
4. Postsecondary Component: College and Career Readiness	25%

The **STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard** is determined by the percentage of students who meet postsecondary readiness standards on two or more subject area assessments. Students tested in only one subject area are required to meet the postsecondary readiness standard on that assessment for credit in Index 4.

Example 4.1 STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard												
STAAR Performance	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
% Meeting Postsecondary Readiness Standard	29%	16%		40%	23%		38%	36%			182	600
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard: Score (total points divided by maximum points)												30.3

Note: Blank cells in the examples above indicate student groups that do not meet the minimum-size criteria.

The **Graduation Rate Score** reflects the highest number of points possible from the combined performance across graduation rates for grades 9–12. The four-year graduation rate, for example, requires tracking the status of a cohort of students from the time they enter grade 9 through their expected graduation year. In general, the graduation rate is the percentage of students who graduate out of all those who start in a grade 9 cohort. Students who transfer out of the Texas public school system before graduation are not counted in this calculation. A class consists of all members of a cohort, and a graduate is a student who successfully completes the requirements for graduation within a specified time frame. Students who dropout or receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate are not counted as graduates. Points are based on the longitudinal cohort of students used to calculate a four-year graduation rate or a five-year graduation rate, for all students and all students grouped by race/ethnicity, ELL status, and special education status. If a graduation rate is not available, the annual dropout rate is used.

The total points and the maximum number of points are reported for both the four-year and five-year graduation rate. The graduation rate that results in the higher score is used to calculate the Index 4 score.

Example 4.2 Graduation Rate												
Graduation Rate	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
~~4 yr. Grad Rate~~	~~84.3%~~	~~78.8%~~			~~78.8%~~		~~91.6%~~	~~86.0%~~	~~44.2%~~	~~69.8%~~	~~533.5~~	~~700~~
5-yr. Grad Rate	85.1%	78.8%			80.0%		92.1%	84.0%	48.9%	77.5%	546.4	700
Higher Graduation Rate: Score											546.4	700
Graduation Rate: Score (best of total graduation rate points divided by maximum points)											78.1	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above indicate student groups that do not meet the minimum-size criteria.

The **Graduation Plan Score** is based on a longitudinal cohort of students. For this component, two percentages are calculated:

- The percentage of students graduating under the Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP)
- The percentage of students graduating under either the RHSP/DAP or the Foundation High School Program (FHSP) with an endorsement (FHSP-E) or the distinguished level of achievement (DLA).

The percentage that contributes the most points to the Index 4 score will be used.

If no longitudinal rate is available, the annual graduation rate will be used.

Example 4.3 Graduation Plan												
Graduation Plan	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
Longitudinal RHSP/DAP Rate	72.7%	76.4%			83.6%		83.0%				315.7	400
~~Longitudinal RHSP/DAP/FHSP E/DLA~~	~~70.5%~~	~~75.4%~~			~~81.5%~~		~~82.0%~~				~~309.4~~	~~400~~
Graduation Plan: Score (best of total graduation plan points divided by maximum points)											78.9	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above indicate student groups that do not meet the minimum-size criteria.

The **Postsecondary Component: College and Career Readiness Indicator Score** is calculated as the percent of annual graduates who accomplished at least one of the following:

- Met or exceeded the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) criteria in both English language arts (ELA) and mathematics on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT
- Completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual-credit courses
- Enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses (including the Tech Prep program)

Note that the TSI portion of the postsecondary component now includes results of the TSI assessment and no longer includes results of the TAKS exit-level assessment. Please see Appendix K – *Data Sources* for more information on the source of the data and the methodology for this component.

Example 4.4 Postsecondary Component: College and Career Readiness												
Postsecondary Component	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
College and Career Readiness	82.1%	71.1%			78.2%		89.9%				321.3	400
Postsecondary Component: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											80.3	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above indicate student groups that do not meet the minimum-size criteria.

The four components of Index 4 are weighted equally to calculate the overall Index 4 score.

Example 4.5 Overall Index 4 Score				
Index 4 Component	Component Score	Multiply by	Weight of	Total Points
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Score	30.3	X	25%	7.6
Graduation Rate Score	78.1	X	25%	19.5
Graduation Plan Score	78.9	X	25%	19.7
Postsecondary Component Score	80.3	X	25%	20.1
Index 4: Score				67

Component scores are rounded to one decimal place. Total points for each component are determined by multiplying the component score by 25 percent and rounding to one decimal place. The overall Index 4 score is the sum of the total points rounded to a whole number. The table on the following page illustrates the calculation of the Index 4 score.

Example 4.6 Index 4 Calculation

Overall Index Score

Overall Performance	Component Score	Multiply by	Weight of	Total Points
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Score	30.3	X	25%	7.6
Graduation Rate Score	78.1	X	25%	19.5
Graduation Plan Score	78.9	X	25%	19.7
Postsecondary Component Score	80.3	X	25%	20.1
Index 4: Score				67

Indicator	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	ELL	Special Ed.	Total Points	Max. Points
• STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard												
% Meeting Postsecondary Readiness Standard	29%	16%		40%	23%		38%	36%			182	600
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											30.3	
• Graduation Rate												
~~4 yr. Graduation Rate~~	~~84.3%~~	~~78.8%~~			~~78.8%~~		~~91.6%~~	~~86.0%~~	~~44.2%~~	~~69.8%~~	~~533.5~~	~~700~~
5-yr. Graduation Rate	85.1%	78.8%			80.0%		92.1%	84.0%	48.9%	77.5%	546.4	700
Highest Graduation Rate: Score											546.4	700
Graduation Rate: Score (best of total graduation rate points divided by maximum points)											78.1	
• Graduation Plan												
Longitudinal RHSP/DAP Rate	72.7%	76.4%			83.6%		83.0%				315.7	400
~~Longitudinal RHSP/DAP/FHSP E/DLA~~	~~70.5%~~	~~75.4%%~~			~~81.5%~~		~~82.0%~~				~~309.4~~	~~400~~
Graduation Plan: Score (best of total graduation plan points divided by maximum points)											78.9	
• Postsecondary Component												
College and Career Readiness	82.1%	71.1%			78.2%		89.9%				321.3	400
Postsecondary Component: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											80.3	

Note: Blank cells in the examples above indicate student groups that do not meet the minimum-size criteria.

AEA Campuses and Charter Districts Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

For alternative education campuses (AECs) and charter districts evaluated under AEA provisions, the Index 4 score is based on two components:

- STAAR scores based on the percent of students who meet the Postsecondary Readiness Standard, as defined above
- Four-, five-, and six-year rates for graduates, continuing students, and GED recipients. If a graduation rate is not available, the annual dropout rate is used.

The two components of Index 4 are weighted to calculate the overall Index 4 score.

Index 4 Components for AEA Campuses and Charters	Weight
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard	25%
Graduation, Continuers, and GED Rate or Annual Dropout Rate	75%

AECs can also earn bonus points toward their Index 4 score. Bonus points may be awarded for the percentage of students who graduate under certain graduation plans, the percentage of students considered college-and-career ready, and an excluded students credit. Please see *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators* for a complete description of bonus points.

Example 4.7 Index 4 Composition for AEA charter districts and AECs with a graduation, continuer, and GED rate												
Component	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
• STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard												
% Meeting Postsecondary Readiness Standard	51%	42%	83%	55%	44%	31%	56%	52%			414	800
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											51.8	
• Graduation, Continuers, and GED Rate												
~~4-Year Rate~~	~~64.3%~~	~~58.8%~~			~~58.8%~~		~~71.6%~~	~~66.0%~~	~~34.2%~~	~~59.8%~~	~~413.5~~	~~700~~
~~5-Year Rate~~	~~65.1%~~	~~58.8%~~			~~60.0%~~		~~72.1%~~	~~64.0%~~	~~48.9%~~	~~57.5%~~	~~426.4~~	~~700~~
6-Year Rate	66.2%	58.8%			61.0%		72.1%		52.2%	58.2%	368.5	600
Highest Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rate: Score											368.5	600
Graduation, Continuers, and GED Rate: Score (best of total points divided by maximum points)											61.4	
• Bonus Points												
Graduation Plan	33.3%										33	
College and Career Readiness											0	
Excluded students credit											0	
Total Bonus Points (maximum of 30)											30	

Example 4.8 Overall Index 4 Score for AEA charter districts and campuses with a graduation, continuer, and GED rate				
Overall Performance	Component Score	Multiply by	Weight of	Total Points
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Score	51.8	X	25%	13.0
Graduation, Continuers, GED Rate Score	61.4	X	75%	46.1
Bonus Points	30			30
Index 4: Score				89

Note: Blank cells in the examples above indicate student groups that do not meet the minimum-size criteria.

Rounding: Component scores are rounded to one decimal place. Total points for each component are derived by multiplying the component score by the respective weights and rounding to one decimal place. Bonus points are rounded to a whole number. The overall Index 4 score is the sum of the total points and bonus points rounded to a whole number.

Example 4.9 Index 4 Calculation for AEA charter districts and AECs with Gr. 9–12 but graduation rate not available				
• Overall Index 4 Score				
Overall Performance	Component Score	Multiply by	Weight of	Total Points
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Score	50.6	X	25%	12.7
Annual Dropout Rate Score	32.1	X	75%	24.1
Bonus Points	25			25
Index 4: Score				62

Indicator	All Students	African Amer.	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Special Ed.	ELL	Total Points	Max. Points
• STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard												
% Meets Postsecondary Readiness Standard	51%	42%	83%	51%	44%	30%	53%	51%			405	800
STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard : Score (total points divided by maximum points)											50.6	
• Graduation, Continuers, and GED or Annual Dropout Rate												
Annual Dropout Rate	13.3%	11.3%			12.5%		17.2%					
Dropout Rate Conversion	33.5	43.5			37.5		14.0				128.5	400
Graduation, Continuers, and GED or Annual Dropout Rate: Score (total points divided by maximum points)											32.1	
• Bonus Points												
Graduation Plan	20.6%										21	
College and Career Readiness	3.0%										3	
Excluded students credit	1										1	
Total Bonus Points (maximum of 30)											25	

Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators

The accountability system uses a performance index framework to combine a broad range of indicators into a comprehensive measure of district and campus performance. The previous chapter described index construction and how index scores are calculated. The indicators used to determine performance and calculate index scores are based on STAAR results, Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data, or other assessment results.

This chapter discusses the three broad types of indicators and details how these indicators are used in each performance index.

STAAR-Based Indicators

2016 STAAR Performance Standards Descriptions

The STAAR program uses three levels standards to describe student performance on an assessment. The table below defines levels II and III and indicates for which assessments they are used and how levels II and III standards are referred to in the manual.

Reference in Manual	Performance Standard	State Assessments
Level II Satisfactory Standard (grades 3–8)	2016 Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance Current-year phase-in satisfactory standard	STAAR, STAAR (Spanish), STAAR L*, STAAR A
Level II Satisfactory Standard (EOCs)	Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance The satisfactory standard in place when test taker was first eligible to take an EOC.	STAAR, STAAR L*, STAAR A
Level II Satisfactory Standard	Final Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance	STAAR Alternate 2
Postsecondary Readiness Standard (grades 3–8 and EOCs)	Final Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance The final level II standard in place when phase-in progression of level II standard is complete	STAAR, STAAR (Spanish), STAAR A
Advanced Standard (grades 3–8 and EOCs)	Level III: Advanced Academic Performance	STAAR, STAAR (Spanish), STAAR A
Advanced Standard	Level III: Accomplished Academic Performance	STAAR Alternate 2

*STAAR L is evaluated only through the ELL progress measure.

Accountability Subset Rule

A subset of test results from both districts and campuses is used to calculate each performance index. The calculation includes only test results for students enrolled in the campus or district in the previous fall, as reported on the PEIMS October snapshot. Three test administration periods are considered for accountability purposes:

STAAR results included in the subset of district/campus accountability	If a student was enrolled in the district/campus on this date:
EOC summer 2015 administration	Fall 2014 enrollment snapshot
EOC fall 2015 administration	Fall 2015 enrollment snapshot
EOC spring 2016 administration	
Grades 3–8 spring 2016 administration	

The 2016 accountability subset rules apply to the STAAR performance results evaluated across all four indices.

- Grades 3–8 – districts and campuses are responsible for students reported as enrolled in the fall (referred to as October snapshot) in the spring assessment results.
- End-of-Course (EOC) – districts and campuses are responsible for
  - summer 2015 results for students reported as enrolled in fall 2014 snapshot;
  - fall 2015 results for students reported as enrolled in the fall 2015 snapshot; and
  - spring 2016 results for students reported as enrolled in the fall 2015 snapshot.

STAAR Retest Performance

The opportunity to retest is available to students who have taken grades 5 and 8 STAAR reading, mathematics, or EOC tests in any subject.

- Student Success Initiative (SSI) – For students in grades 5 and 8, performance indices will include test results for reading and mathematics from the first administration and first re-test administration of all STAAR test versions. The second re-test administration in June 2016 is not used.

  For students in grades 5 and 8, the STAAR reading and mathematics test results from the first and second administration (first re-test opportunity) are processed in two steps. First, the best test result from both administrations is found for each subject. If all test results have the same level of performance, then the most recent test result is selected for calculation. Second, the accountability subset rules determine whether the test result is included in the performance index.

- EOC retesters are counted as passers based on the passing standard in place when they were first eligible to take any EOC assessment.

  Districts and campuses are accountable for three EOC administrations: 1) summer results for students enrolled on the prior-year fall snapshot, 2) fall results for students enrolled on the current-year fall snapshot, and 3) spring results for students enrolled on the fall snapshot (current school year). For students who are enrolled and tested on the same campus or district during the 2016 accountability cycle, calculation of the performance indices will include the best EOC results among tests administered in summer 2015, fall 2015, or spring 2016. The following chart illustrates this process.

Fall 2014 Snapshot	Summer 2015	Fall 2015 Snapshot	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Campus A	Campus A	Campus A	Campus A	Campus A
The best test result is selected. Each test meets the accountability subset rule.				

For students who enrolled and tested at a different campus or district during the 2015–16 school year, the student's single best result for each course is selected. If all test results have the same level of performance, the most recent test result is selected in calculating the index. The selected test is applied to the district and campus that administered the test if the student meets the accountability subset rule (discussed above).

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Fall 2014
Snapshot

Campus A</td><td>Summer 2015</td><td rowspan="3">Fall 2015
Snapshot

Campus A</td><td>Fall 2015</td><td>Spring 2016</td></tr>
<tr><td>Campus A</td><td>Campus B</td><td>Campus B</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">The best test result is selected. However, only the Summer 2015 test meets the accountability subset rule.</td></tr>
</table>

PEIMS-Based Indicators

One of the primary sources for data used in the accountability system is the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data collection. The PEIMS data collection has a prescribed process and timeline that offer school districts the opportunity to correct data submission errors or data omissions discovered following the initial data submission. PEIMS data provided by school districts used to create specific indicators for Index 4 are listed below.

PEIMS data used for indicators of campus/district accountability in Index 4	Data for
4-year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	Class of 2015
5-year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	Class of 2014
6-year Longitudinal Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rate (AEA Provisions Only)	Class of 2013
Longitudinal Graduation Plan Rate [Recommended High School Program or Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP) or Foundation High School Plan Rate with Endorsement (FHSP-E) or Distinguished Level of Achievement (FHSP-DLA)]	Class of 2015
Annual Dropout Rate	2014–15 School Year
Annual Graduation Plan Rate [RHSP/DAP or RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FHSP-DLA]	
Career and Technical Education (CTE) Coherent Sequence of Courses	
Advanced/Dual Credit Course Completion	2014–15 and 2013–14 School Years

Other Assessment Indicators

Index 4 includes postsecondary readiness component in the College and Career Readiness indicator. The Texas Success Initiative (TSI), SAT, or ACT test results are used for this indicator.

Other assessment data used for district/campus accountability indicator Index 4: College & Career Readiness	Data Reported for:
TSI assessment	Tests as of October 2015 administration
SAT college admissions test	Tests as of June 2015 administration
ACT college admissions test	Tests as of June 2015 administration

Index 1: Student Achievement

Index 1 is a snapshot of performance across subjects at the Level II Satisfactory Standard.

Index 1 Targets for Districts and Campuses

Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Ratings Criteria and Index Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2016 Index Targets.

Index 1 Student Performance Standards

Index 1 credits students who meet the Level II Satisfactory Standard and students who meet the Final Level II performance standard on the STAAR Alt 2. The Index 1 **Level II Satisfactory Standard** refers to any of the following: STAAR or STAAR A grade 3–8 or EOC assessments meeting the STAAR 2016 Level II standard, assessments for EOC retesters meeting the phase-in satisfactory standard in place the first time they were eligible to take an EOC assessment, meeting the Final Level II standard on STAAR Alt 2, meeting or exceeding expectations on the ELL progress measure, or meeting the equivalency standard on substitute assessments as a measure of overall student achievement.

Index 1: Student Achievement	Assessments Evaluated in 2016 Accountability Cycle			
		Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
	STAAR End-of-Course			
	Assessments			
		STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and STAAR L*: Algebra I English I English II Biology U.S. History		
	Student Performance Standards			
		STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L*: STAAR Level II Satisfactory Standard or above *or* STAAR Alt 2: Final Level II Standard or above *or* ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation *or* Substitute Assessments**: Meets Equivalency Standard		
	Retests			
		Performance standards can be met by: End-of-Course (EOC) tests taken for the first time within the 2016 accountability cycle (summer 2015, fall 2015, or spring 2016); or, EOC tests that were retaken within the 2016 accountability cycle following a first attempt in a prior accountability cycle.		

	STAAR Grades 3–8		
	Assessments		
		n/a	STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and STAAR L*: Grades 3–8 English Grades 3–5 Spanish
	Student Performance Standards		
		n/a	STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L*: Level II Satisfactory Standard or above *or* STAAR Alt 2: Final Level II or above *or* ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation
	Retests		
		For grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, performance standards can be met by tests taken in either the first administration or the May retest.	

* See following table for inclusion of ELL students based on ELL Progress Measure.

** For more information about the equivalency standard, please see http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter101/ch101dd.html.

Assessments for English Language Learners

	Years in U.S. Schools	STAAR and STAAR A Tests		STAAR-L Tests	STAAR Alternate 2 Tests
		ELLs receiving Bilingual Education or ESL Instructional Services	ELL Parental Denials or ELL progress measure plan exceeders		
Index 1: Student Achievement	*First year of enrollment in U.S. schools*	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	STAAR Final Level II Standard
	Second through fourth year of enrollment in U.S. schools	Spanish STAAR Level II Standard English ELL Progress Measure	STAAR Level ll Standard	ELL Progress Measure	STAAR Final Level II Standard
	*Fifth year or more of enrollment in U.S. schools**	STAAR Level ll Standard	STAAR Level ll Standard	Not Included	STAAR Final Level ll Standard

* Asylees/refugees are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

See *Appendix I – Inclusion of ELL Students in 2016 and Beyond* for more information.

Subjects Evaluated

Test results for all subject areas (English language arts [ELA]/reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies) are combined.

Student Groups Evaluated
All students, including ELLs described above, are evaluated as one group.

Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis
- All students are evaluated; results are used if there are 10 or more STAAR tests, combined across all subjects.
- Small numbers analysis is not used.

Methodology
Assessment results are summed across all grade levels and subject areas. The number of assessments meeting the Index 1 Level II Satisfactory Standard is divided by the number of assessments taken as described here:

$$\frac{\text{Number of Reading + Mathematics + Writing + Science + Social Studies Tests Meeting Level II Satisfactory Standard}}{\text{Number of Reading + Mathematics + Writing + Science + Social Studies Tests Taken}}$$

Rounding

The Index 1 Level II Satisfactory Standard calculation is expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.87% is rounded to 60%; 79.49% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

Index Score
Index 1 has one indicator; therefore, the total index points and index score are equivalent: Index Score = Total Points.

Index 2: Student Progress
Index 2 measures student progress and provides an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for improving student performance independent of the student's pass/fail status on STAAR.

Index 2 Targets for Districts and Campuses
Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Ratings Criteria and Index Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2016 Index Targets.

Index 2 Student Progress Standards
Index 2 credits students who meet the student-level criteria for progress in either the STAAR progress measure or the ELL progress measure. Points for progress in each subject are weighted by the students' level of performance which is a combination of the percentage of tests that met or exceeded progress and the percentage of tests that exceeded progress.

STAAR Progress Measure: Progress is measured at the student-level by the difference between the STAAR scale scores a student achieved in the prior and current years. A student's progress is then designated as *Did Not Meet*, *Met*, or *Exceeded*, depending upon the degree of difference in the scores.

Information on how to calculate a STAAR progress measure can be found on the Student Assessment website in the STAAR® Specific Resources section. Please see http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/staar/. A Questions and Answers document on the progress measure is posted at the same location.

ELL Progress Measure: The English Language Learner (ELL) progress measure is reported for ELL students. The ELL progress measure accounts for the time needed to acquire the English language and to fully demonstrate grade-level academic competency in English. Year-to-year performance expectations for the STAAR content-area tests identify ELL student progress as meeting or exceeding an individual year-to-year expectation plan. An ELL student's plan is determined by the number of years the student has been enrolled in U.S. schools and the student's Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) composite proficiency level.

Information on how to calculate an ELL progress measure can be found at the Student Assessment/State Assessments for English Language Learners website in the General Resources section. Please see http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/ell/. A Questions and Answers document on the ELL Progress Measure is posted at the same location.

Spanish to English Transition proxy calculation. For students who take the STAAR reading Spanish version in 2015, transition in 2016 to the STAAR reading English version, and do not have a STAAR progress measure or ELL progress measure, Index 2 is calculated as follows:

- STAAR Level ll Satisfactory Standard (English-version): One point for each percent of tests meeting STAAR Level II Satisfactory Standard or above; and
- Final Level ll (English-version): One point for each percent of tests meeting the Final Level II standard.

Index 2: Student Progress	Assessments Evaluated in 2016 Accountability Cycle			
		Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
	STAAR End-of-Course			
	Assessments			
		STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and STAAR L*: Algebra I English I (ELL Progress Measure only) English II		
	Student Progress Standards			
		STAAR Progress Measures: Meets or Exceeds Progress *or* ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation		
	Retests			
		Progress standards can be met by EOC tests taken for the first time within the 2016 accountability cycle (summer 2015, fall 2015, or spring 2016).		

	STAAR Grades 3–8		
	Assessments		
		n/a	STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and STAAR L*: Grades 3–8 English Grades 3–5 Spanish
	Student Progress Standards		
		n/a	STAAR Progress Measures: Meets or Exceeds Progress *or* ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation *or* Spanish to English Transition Proxy*
	Retests		
		For grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, progress standards can be met by tests taken in either the first administration or the May retest.	

* Either the ELL Progress Measure or the Spanish to English Transition proxy calculation is applied if a STAAR progress measure is not reported. See following table for inclusion of ELL students.

Assessments for English Language Learners

	Years in U.S. Schools	STAAR and STAAR A Tests		STAAR-L Tests	STAAR Alternate 2 Tests
		ELLs receiving Bilingual Education or ESL Instructional Services	ELL Parental Denials or ELL progress measure plan exceeders		
Index 2: Student Progress	*First year of enrollment in U.S. schools*	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	Student Progress Measure
	Second through fourth year of enrollment in U.S. schools	Student Progress Measure	Student Progress Measure	Student Progress Measure	Student Progress Measure
	*Fifth year or more of enrollment in U.S. schools**	Student Progress Measure	Student Progress Measure	Student Progress Measure	Student Progress Measure

* Asylees/refugees are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

See *Appendix I – Inclusion of ELL Students in 2016 and Beyond* for more information.

Subjects Evaluated

Due to changes in writing assessments in grades 4 and 7, no STAAR progress measures will be available for grade 7 writing in 2016. Because of this, Index 2 scores will be based on progress measures outcomes for reading and mathematics only.

Student Groups Evaluated

Ten student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Students served by special education
- ELL students identified as having limited English proficiency during the reported school year or are in their first or second years of monitoring after exiting ELL status
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis

- All students are evaluated.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 test results attributable to the group.
- The minimum size for the ELL student group is determined using the testers' current ELL status only. Rates will be reported for current and monitored ELL testers.
- Small numbers analysis applies only if the *All Students* group consists of fewer than 10 tests.
- A three-year average is calculated for combined subjects using three years of student progress data for the *All Students* group. The Index 2 calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The *All Students* group is evaluated if the three-year total has at least 10 tests.
- The prior year 2014 and 2015 data used for small numbers analysis are the combination of all subject areas for the same Index 2 results previously reported for that school year, including the 2014 progress measure results that were reported only for high schools, K–12 campuses, and charter districts and AECs evaluated under AEA provisions.

Methodology

Points are weighted according to performance.

- Met or Exceeded Progress – one point for each percentage of tests that met or exceeded progress measure expectations
- Exceeded Progress – one point for each percentage of tests that exceeded progress measure expectations

Rounding

The total weighted progress calculation is expressed as a percent: total points divided by maximum points, rounded to a whole number. For example, 479 total points divided by 800 maximum points is 59.87%, which is rounded to 60%; 79.49% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

Index Score

The Index 2 score is the rounded result of total points divided by the maximum points.

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps

Index 3 emphasizes advanced academic achievement of the economically disadvantaged student group and the lowest performing racial/ethnic student groups at each district and campus.

Index 3 Targets for Districts and Campuses

Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Ratings Criteria and Index Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2016 Index Targets.

Index 3 Student Performance Standards

Evaluation of Index 3 is based on students who meet the **STAAR Level II Satisfactory** and **Advanced** performance standards. The STAAR Level II Satisfactory Standard for Index 3 refers to the combination of STAAR Level ll Satisfactory Standard performance and ELL Progress Measure results. *Note that the STAAR Level II Satisfactory Standard performance results used in Index 3 do not include substitute assessments.*

Advanced standards are the highest assessment level, Level III Advanced, where student performance gaps are the greatest, and likely to be a strong indicator of student preparedness for the next grade or course with little to no academic intervention required. Advanced standards are also tied to statutory and accountability goals stating Texas will be among the top 10 states in postsecondary readiness by 2020, with no significant achievement gaps by race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status.

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps	Assessments Evaluated in 2016 Accountability Cycle			
		Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
	STAAR End-of-Course			
	Assessments			
		STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR Alt 2: Algebra I English I English II Biology U.S. History		
	Student Performance Standards			
		STAAR and STAAR A: Level II Satisfactory Standard or above and Level III Advanced *or* STAAR Alt 2: Final Level II Standard or above and Level III Advanced *or* ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation and STAAR Final Level II or above		
	Retests			
		Performance standards can be met by EOC tests taken for the first time within the 2016 accountability cycle (summer 2015, fall 2015, or spring 2016) or EOC tests that were retaken within the 2016 accountability cycle following a first attempt in a prior accountability cycle.		

	STAAR Grades 3–8		
	Assessments		
		n/a	STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR Alt 2: Grades 3–8 English Grades 3–5 Spanish
	Student Performance Standards		
		n/a	STAAR and STAAR A: Level II Satisfactory Standard or above and Level III Advanced Standard *or* STAAR Alt 2: Final Level II Standard or above and Level III Advanced Standard *or* ELL Progress Measures*: Meets or Exceeds Expectation and STAAR Final Level II or above
	Retests		
		For grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, performance standards can be met by tests taken in either the first administration or the May retest.	

* See following table for inclusion of ELL students based on ELL Progress Measure.

Assessments for English Language Learners

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps	Years in U.S. Schools	STAAR and STAAR A Tests		STAAR-L Tests	STAAR Alternate 2 Tests
		ELLs receiving Bilingual Education or ESL Instructional Services	ELL Parental Denials or ELL progress measure plan exceeders		
	First year of enrollment in U.S. schools	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	STAAR Final Level II Standard and Level III
	Second through fourth year of enrollment in U.S. schools	Spanish STAAR Level II Standard and Level III English ELL Progress Measure and STAAR Final Level II Standard	STAAR Level ll Standard and Level III	Not Included	STAAR Final Level II Standard and Level III
	*Fifth year or more of enrollment in U.S. schools**	STAAR Level ll Standard and Level III	STAAR Level ll Standard and Level III	Not Included	STAAR Final Level II Standard and Level III

* Asylees/refugees are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

See *Appendix I – Inclusion of ELL Students in 2016 and Beyond* for more information.

Student Groups Evaluated

- Economically Disadvantaged
- Two Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic groups determined by comparing performance of racial/ethnic groups on the Index 1 student achievement indicator from the prior year (2014–15). (Racial/ethnic groups are not included in Index 1, but the disaggregated student group rates are reported on the Index 1 data table. In the event that two or more of the lowest performing groups [meeting minimum size] have the same performance rate, the lowest performing groups with the largest denominator will be selected.) New schools will be evaluated on economically disadvantaged performance only.
- For 2016, the results from the 2015 ***federal*** system safeguard reports provided to districts in December 2015 will be used to determine the lowest performing racial/ethnic student groups.

Prior Year Minimum Size Criteria

Identifying which of the seven racial/ethnic groups is used to calculate a campus's or district's Index 3 score is a two-step process.

1. Identify the racial/ethnic groups that have 25 or more tests in both ELA/reading and mathematics in the previous year (minimum-size criteria).
2. From the racial/ethnic groups that meet minimum-size criteria, select the lowest-performing group(s) based on the previous year's Index 1 score*.
    - If three or more racial/ethnic groups meet minimum-size criteria, the two lowest-performing groups are used.
    - If only two racial/ethnic groups meet minimum-size criteria, only the lowest-performing group is used.
    - If only one racial/ethnic group meets the minimum-size criteria, that group is not used. In these cases, only the economically disadvantaged group is used to calculate the Index 3 score.

*The Index 1 score is the percentage of tests at the 2015 Phase-in Satisfactory Standard aggregated across all subjects. This calculation includes STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and grades 3–8 mathematics results that were provided to districts in December 2015. The lowest-performing groups have the lowest percentage of tests at the satisfactory standard.

Current-Year Minimum Size Criteria

The current year (2015–16) subject area performance results for the identified racial/ethnic student group(s) are included in the Index 3 evaluation if there are at least 25 test results in the subject area.

Districts and campuses that do not meet minimum size criteria in any subject area for the racial/ethnic student groups are evaluated on the economically disadvantaged student group alone.

Small Numbers Analysis

- Small numbers analysis applies to the Economically Disadvantaged student group by subject: *reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies.* If the number of STAAR results by subject is fewer than 10 in the accountability subset, a three-year average is calculated for the Economically Disadvantaged student group. The Index 3 calculation is based on the aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The prior year 2014 and 2015 data used for small numbers analysis are the same Index 3 results previously reported for that school year.

- Small numbers analysis is not applied to racial/ethnic student groups. If there are fewer than 25 test results in a subject area for the identified lowest performing racial/ethnic student groups, that group's performance on that subject area is excluded from Index 3 calculations.

Accountability Subset
See the accountability subset rules described earlier in this chapter.

Methodology
Index 3 results are based on points reflecting STAAR performance.
- Satisfactory – one point for each percentage of tests meeting the STAAR Satisfactory Standard or the Advanced Standard
- Advanced – one point for each percentage of tests meeting the Advanced Standard

Rounding
The total performance rate calculation is expressed as a percent, total points divided by maximum points, rounded to a whole number. For example, 800 total points divided by 1,500 maximum points is 53.33% is rounded to 53%; 79.49% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

Index Score
The Index 3 score is the rounded result of total points divided by the maximum points.

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness
Index 4 emphasizes the role of elementary and middle schools in preparing students for the rigors of high school and the importance of earning a high school diploma that prepares students for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military. The index includes test performance for high schools and grades 3–8 at the postsecondary readiness standard.

Index 4 Targets for Districts and Campuses
Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Ratings Criteria and Index Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2016 Index Targets.

Index 4 Student Performance Standards
Index 4 credits districts and campuses for students who meet postsecondary readiness standards on two or more STAAR subject area tests. Students tested in only one subject area are required to meet the postsecondary readiness standard on that test for credit in Index 4. The postsecondary readiness standards are based on the combined results of students achieving the Final Level ll performance or above and students meeting the student equivalency standard on substitute assessments.

Evaluation of Index 4 components
Index 4 is based on all four of the following components ***or*** solely on the STAAR postsecondary readiness standard component when any of the three non-STAAR components are unavailable. For districts, high school campuses, and campuses serving grades K–12, the four components of Index 4 are equally weighted.

	Index 4 Components for Non-AEA Districts and Campuses	Weight
1.	STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard	25%
2.	Graduation Rate	25%
3.	Graduation Plan Rate	25%
4.	Postsecondary Component: College and Career Readiness	25%

Elementary and middle school campuses report only STAAR results, therefore, the Index 4 evaluation of these campuses is based solely on this component.

1. STAAR Component: Postsecondary Readiness Standard

The STAAR component is defined as the percentage of students who met the STAAR Final Level II standard on two or more subject-area STAAR tests. This component is reported for all students combined and for each racial/ethnic group. If a student takes only one subject-area STAAR test, the result for that test is included. For example, a student in grade 3 or grade 6 who takes only the STAAR reading test in 2016 will be included in the calculation of the STAAR postsecondary readiness component of Index 4.

For the STAAR component of Index 4, the STAAR EOC results are evaluated for students who tested for the first time during the 2016 accountability cycle (summer 2015, fall 2015, or spring 2016). Only the EOC results for the students' first and subsequent retests during the 2016 accountability cycle are used to evaluate Index 4. Therefore, retest results for students who tested for the first time prior to the 2016 accountability cycle are not included in Index 4.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Student Groups Evaluated

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: Postsecondary Readiness	Assessments Evaluated in 2016 Accountability Cycle			
		Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
	STAAR End-of-Course*			
	Assessments			
		STAAR and STAAR A: Algebra I English I English II Biology U.S. History		
	Student Performance Standards			
		STAAR and STAAR A: Final Level II or above *or* Substitute Assessments: Meets Equivalency Standard**		

	Retests		
		Performance standards can be met by EOC tests taken for the first time or any subsequent retests in the 2016 accountability cycle (summer 2015, fall 2015, or spring 2016).	
	STAAR Grades 3–8*		
	Assessments		
		n/a	STAAR and STAAR A: Grades 3–8 English Grades 3–5 Spanish
	Student Performance Standards		
		n/a	STAAR and STAAR A: Final Level II or above
	Retests		
		For grades 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, performance standards can be met by tests taken in either the first administration or the May retest.	

* See following table for inclusion of ELL students.

** For more information about the equivalency standard, please see http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter101/ch101dd.html.

Assessments for English Language Learners

	Years in U.S. Schools	STAAR and STAAR A Tests		STAAR-L Tests	STAAR Alternate 2 Tests
		ELLs receiving Bilingual Education or ESL Instructional Services	ELL Parental Denials or ELL progress measure plan exceeders		
Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness	*First year of enrollment in U.S. schools*	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included
	Second through fourth year of enrollment in U.S. schools	Spanish STAAR Final Level II (*Spanish test versions on any subject*) English (*Not tested on any Spanish versions*) Not Included	STAAR Final Level II	Not Included	Not Included
	*Fifth year or more of enrollment in U.S. schools**	STAAR Final Level II	STAAR Final Level II	Not Included	Not Included

* Asylees/refugees are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

See *Appendix I – Inclusion of ELL Students in 2016 and Beyond* for more information.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis

- *All Students* – the group comprising of *All Students* is evaluated if there are at least 10 students in the STAAR component.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students in the STAAR component.
- Small numbers analysis applies only if the *All Students* group consists of fewer than 10 students.
- A three-year average is calculated using STAAR postsecondary readiness data for the *All Students* group. The Index 4 STAAR postsecondary readiness standard calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The *All Students* group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 students.
- The two prior years of data used for small numbers analysis are the same Index 4 results previously reported for that school year.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Methodology

The percent of students meeting the Final Level II performance standard in two or more subject areas ***or*** one subject area, if only one subject area test is taken. This component is defined as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Number of students meeting the STAAR postsecondary readiness standard on at least two subject area tests} + \text{Number of students meeting the STAAR postsecondary readiness standard on the subject area test}}{\text{Number of students with test results in two or more subject areas} + \text{Number of students with test results in only one subject area}}$$

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Rounding

The percent *Met* STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard calculation is expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.87% is rounded to 60%; 79.49% is rounded to 79%; and 89.5% is rounded to 90%.

2. Graduation Rate (or Annual Dropout Rate) Component

High school graduation rates include the four-year and five-year graduation rates or annual dropout rate, if no graduation rate is available.

- Class of 2015 four-year graduation rate is calculated for districts and campuses with students in grade 9 and either grade 11 or 12 in both years one and five of the cohort. Alternatively, the rate can be based on districts and campuses with grade 12 in both years one and five of the cohort.
- Class of 2014 five-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for one additional year.
- Annual Dropout Rate for school year 2014–15 for grades 9–12. If a campus has students enrolled in grade 9, 10, 11, or 12 but does not have a four-year or five-year graduation rate, a proxy for the graduation rate is calculated by converting the grade 9–12 annual dropout rate into a positive measure. Please see *Annual Dropout Rate—Conversion* on the following pages.

Graduation Rate—Student Groups Evaluated

Ten student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Students served by special education
- ELL student group: Students who were ever identified as limited English proficient since entering grade 9 in the Texas public school system
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Graduation Rate—Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis

- All students – the group comprising of *All Students* is evaluated there are at least 10 students in the class.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students in the class.
- Small numbers analysis applies to *All Students*, if the number of students in the class of 2015 cohort (4-year) or class of 2014 cohort (5-year) is fewer than 10. The total number of students in the class cohort consists of graduates, continuing students, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and dropouts.
- A three-year-average graduation rate is calculated for all students. The calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The *All Students* group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 students.

Graduation Rate—Methodology

The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort of first-time students in grade 9 through their expected graduation three years later. The five-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for one additional year. A cohort is defined as the group of students who begin grade 9 in Texas public schools for the first time in the same school year plus students who, in the next three school years, enter the Texas public school system in the grade level expected for the cohort. Students who transfer out of the Texas public school system over the four or five years for non-graduate reasons are removed from the class.

The four-year and five-year graduation rate measures the percent of graduates in a class.

$$\frac{\text{Number of Graduates in the Class}}{\text{Number of Students in the Class}}$$

(Graduates + Continuers + GED Recipients + Dropouts)

Graduation Rate—Rounding

Four-year and five-year graduation rates used in Index 4 calculations are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 74.875% rounds to 74.9%, not 75%.

Annual Dropout Rate Component

For districts and campuses that serve students enrolled in grades 9–12, the grade 9–12 annual dropout rate is used if a four- or five-year graduation rate is not available.

Annual Dropout Rate—Student Groups Evaluated

Ten student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Students served by special education
- ELL student group: students identified as limited English proficient during the reported school year
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Annual Dropout Rate—Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis

- All students – the group comprising of *All Students* is evaluated there are at least 10 students enrolled during the school year.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students enrolled during the school year.
- Small numbers analysis applies to the group of *All Students* if the number of students enrolled in grades 9–12 during the 2014–15 school year is less than 10.
- A three-year-average annual dropout rate is calculated for all students. The calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The *All Students* group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 students.

Annual Dropout Rate—Methodology

The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in grades 9–12 designated as having dropped out by the number of students enrolled in grades 9–12 at any time during the 2014–15 school year.

$$\frac{\text{Number of students who dropped out during the school year}}{\text{Number of students enrolled during the school year}}$$

Annual Dropout Rate—Conversion

Because the annual dropout rate is a measure of negative performance—the rate rises as performance declines—it must be transformed into a positive measure in order to be used as a component of the Index 4 score. The following calculation converts the annual dropout rate for a non-AEA district or campus into a positive measure that is a proxy for the graduation rate.

100 – (Grade 9–12 Annual Dropout Rate x **10**) with a floor of zero

The multiplier of 10 allows the non-AEA district or campus to accumulate points towards the Index 4 score only if its annual dropout rate is less than 10%.

Annual Dropout Rate—Rounding

Grade 9–12 Annual Dropout Rates used in Index 4 calculations are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 24 dropouts divided by 2,190 students enrolled in grades 9–12 is 1.095% which rounds to a 1.1% annual dropout rate.

3. Graduation Plan Component

- The graduation plan component is based on the comparison between two four-year longitudinal cohorts. The first represents the percent of students in the class of 2015 who graduated under the RHSP or DAP and the second represents the percent of students in the class of 2015 who graduated under the RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E or FHSP-DLA.
- Alternatively, the annual graduation plan rate for the 2014–15 school year applies to districts or campuses that do not have a four-year longitudinal graduation cohort or do not meet the minimum size requirement. The component is based on the comparison between two annual graduate cohorts. The first represents the percent of students in 2014–15 who graduated under the RHSP or DAP and the second represents the percent of students in 2014–15 who graduated under the RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E or FHSP-DLA. The annual graduation plan rate also applies to new campuses until sufficient data to calculate a longitudinal graduation plan rate is available.

Graduation Plan Rate—Student Groups Evaluated

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

Graduation Plan Rate—Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis

- All Students – the group comprising of *All Students* is evaluated if there are at least 10 graduates.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 graduates.
- Small numbers analysis applies to *All Students* if the total count of graduates is less than 10.
- A three-year average RHSP/DAP rate is calculated for all students. The calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average. The annual RHSP/DAP rate will have a similar three-year uniform average.
- No small numbers analysis is available for the longitudinal or annual RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/ FHSP-DLA rates.
- The *All Students* group is evaluated if the uniform average has at least 10 graduates.

Graduation Plan Rate—Methodology

The RHSP/DAP or RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FHSP-DLA longitudinal rate applies to districts and high schools with adequate enrollment data. The rate requires tracking the status of a cohort of students from the time they enter grade 9 in 2011–12 through their expected graduation with the class of 2015. A class consists of all members of a cohort, minus students who leave the Texas public school system for reasons other than graduation, earning a GED certificate, or dropping out.

The Foundation High School Program (FHSP) will replace the Minimum (MHSP), Recommended (RHSP) and Distinguished Achievement (DAP) High School Programs for students who began grade 9 in 2014–15. Beginning with the class of 2018, all students will be required to select the FHSP. Until then, students may earn an MHSP, RHSP, or DAP diploma. During this transition period, this approach addresses the varying degrees to which FHSP graduation plans have been implemented across districts.

Calculation that Excludes FHSP Students:

$$\frac{\text{Number of RHSP/DAP graduates in the Class}}{\text{Number of graduates in the Class excluding FHSP graduates}}$$

Calculation that Includes FHSP Students:

$$\frac{\text{Number of RHSP/DAP graduates + (FHSP with endorsement and with or without DLA)}}{\text{(MHSP + RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP without endorsement + FHSP with endorsement and with or without DLA)}}$$

Graduation Plan Rate—Rounding

Graduation plan rates are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 540 RHSP/DAP graduates divided by 570 total graduates is 94.737%, which rounds to 94.7%.

4. Postsecondary Component - College and Career Readiness

The aim of the postsecondary component of Index 4 is to measure high school students' preparedness for college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military. The College and Career Readiness indicator measures the percent of annual graduates for the 2014–15 school year who demonstrated postsecondary readiness in any one of three ways:

1) *Postsecondary Component.* A graduate meeting the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness standards in both ELA/reading and mathematics; specifically, the college-ready criteria on the TSI assessment, the SAT test, or the ACT test, in both English language arts and mathematics. The test results included in this measure include TSI assessments through October 2015 and tests through the June 2015 administration of SAT and ACT. See *Appendix K – Data Sources* for a more detailed explanation.

   A student must meet the TSI requirement for both reading and mathematics but does not necessarily need to meet them on the same assessment. Meeting the TSI requirement in writing on the TSI assessment or ACT will not be used for accountability in 2016 but will be reported.

2) *Advanced/Dual-Credit course Completion.* A graduate who completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual-credit courses in either the 2014–15 or 2013–14 school year. See *Appendix K – Data Sources* for a more detailed explanation and list of courses.

3) *Career and Technical Education (CTE) Coherent Sequence of Courses.* A graduate enrolled and reported in a coherent sequence of CTE courses as part of a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits during the 2014–15 school year. For 2016, a graduate reported as enrolled in the secondary education component of a Tech Prep program are included in the College and Career Readiness indicator. See *Appendix K – Data Sources* for a more detailed explanation.

Postsecondary Component—Student Groups Evaluated

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

Postsecondary Component—Minimum Size Criteria

- All Students – the group comprising of *All Students* is evaluated if there are at least 10 graduates.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 graduates.
- Small numbers analysis is not applied to this component.

Postsecondary Component—Methodology

The percent of annual graduates is defined in this component is:

$$\frac{\text{graduates meeting TSI criteria in both ELA/reading and mathematics (TSI, SAT, or ACT)} \;\textbf{or}\; \text{graduates who completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual credit course in the current or prior school year} \;\textbf{or}\; \text{graduates who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses as part of a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits*}}{\text{Number of annual graduates}}$$

* Includes graduates reported as enrolled in the secondary education component of a Tech Prep program.

Postsecondary Component—Rounding

The percent meeting college and career readiness criteria calculation is expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 597 annual graduates meeting the college and career readiness criteria divided by 1,100 annual graduates is 54.27%, which rounds to 54.3%.

Index 4 Score

The Index 4 overall score is the sum of the weighted four component scores: STAAR, graduation rate, graduation plan, and postsecondary component rounded to a whole number.

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness for AEA Campuses and Charter Districts

Alternative procedures applicable to the Index 4 calculation are provided for approved campuses and charter districts serving at-risk students in alternative education programs. For more information on the alternative education accountability (AEA) eligibility criteria, please see *Chapter 6 – Other Accountability System Processes*.

Index 4 Targets for AEA Campuses and Charters

Please refer to *Chapter 2 – Ratings Criteria and Index Targets* for a detailed discussion of 2016 Index Targets.

Index 4 Student Performance Standards

Index 4 credits districts and campuses for students who meet postsecondary readiness standards on assessments in two or more subject areas. Students tested in only one subject area are required to meet the postsecondary readiness standard on that test for credit in Index 4. The postsecondary readiness standards are based on the combined results of students achieving the Final Level ll performance or above and students meeting the student equivalency standard on substitute assessments.

For a charter district or alternative education campus (AEC) evaluated by AEA provisions, Index 4 is based on two components, weighted as follows.

	Index 4 Components for AEA Campuses and Charters	Weight
1.	STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard	25%
2.	Graduation/Annual Dropout Rate Component: Four-, Five-, or Six-year Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rate or Annual Dropout Rate	75%

To reach the absolute targets established for Index 4 in 2016, AEA campuses and charters apply a weighted evaluation of two components necessary for postsecondary readiness.

Bonus points, described later in this section, are earned according to either the longitudinal or annual graduation plan rate, excluded students credit, and the postsecondary indicator. A maximum of 30 bonus points is added to the final index score.

1. STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard

The STAAR component, described above, is calculated in the same manner for AEA campuses and charters.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis

- All Students – the group comprising *All Students* is evaluated if there are at least 10 students in the STAAR component.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students in the STAAR component. Small numbers analysis applies only if the *All Students* group consists of fewer than 10 students.
- A three-year average is calculated using STAAR Postsecondary Readiness data for the *All Students* group. The Index 4 STAAR postsecondary readiness standard calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The *All Students* group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 students.
- The two prior years of data used for small numbers analysis are the same Index 4 results previously reported for that school year.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Methodology

The percent of students meeting the postsecondary readiness standard in two or more subject areas ***or*** one subject area, if only one subject area test is taken.

STAAR Postsecondary Readiness Standard—Rounding

The calculation of students who meet the postsecondary readiness standard is expressed as a percent, rounded to whole numbers. For example, 59.87% rounds to 60%; 79.49% rounds to 79%; and 89.5% rounds to 90%.

2. Graduation/Annual Dropout Rate Component

The graduation rate calculation is modified to credit AEA campuses and charters for graduates, continuing students (continuers), and GED recipients. Four-year, five-year, and six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rates are calculated for AEA campuses and charters. The grade 9–12 annual dropout rate is used if no combined graduation, continuer, and GED rate is available.

- Class of 2015 four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rates are calculated for AEA campuses and charters with students in grade 9 and either grade 11 or 12 in both years one and year five, or with grade 12 in both years one and year five.
- Class of 2014 five-year graduation, continuer, and GED rates follow the same cohort of students for one additional year; therefore, most AEA campuses and charters that have a four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate in one year will have a five-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate for that cohort in the following year. The five-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate lags behind the four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate by one year.
- Class of 2013 six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rates continue to follow the same cohort of students for one additional year; therefore, most AEA campuses and charters that have a five-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate in one year will have a six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate for that cohort in the following year. The six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate lags behind the four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate by two years.
- Annual Dropout Rate for school year 2014–15 for grades 9–12. If an AEA charter or campus has students enrolled in grade 9, 10, 11, or 12 but does not have a four-year, five-year, or six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate, a proxy for the graduation rate is calculated by converting the grade 9–12 annual dropout rate into a positive measure.

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Student Groups Evaluated

Ten student groups are evaluated.

- All students
- Students served by special education
- ELL student group: Students who were ever identified as limited English proficient since entering grade 9 in the Texas public school system
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races.

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Minimum Size Criteria

- All Students – All students are evaluated; small numbers analysis applies if fewer than 10 students in the class.
- Student groups are evaluated if there are at least 25 students in the class.

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Small Numbers Analysis

- Small numbers analysis applies if there are fewer than 10 students in the Class of 2015 (4-year), Class of 2014 (5-year) or Class of 2013 (6-year). The total number of students in the class cohort consists of graduates, continuers, GED recipients, and dropouts.
- A three-year-average graduation, continuer, and GED rate is calculated for all students. The calculation is based on an aggregated three-year uniform average.
- The *All Students* group is evaluated if the three-year average has at least 10 students.

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Methodology

The four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate follows a cohort of first-time students in grade 9 through their expected graduation three years later. The five-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for one additional year. The six-year graduation rate continues to follows the same cohort of students for one additional year. A cohort is defined as the group of students who begin grade 9 in Texas public schools for the first time in the same school year plus students who, in the next three school years, enter the Texas public school system in the grade level expected for the cohort. Students who transfer out of the Texas public school system over the four, five, or six years due to non-graduate, non-dropout reasons are removed from the class. The graduation, continuer, and GED rate measures the percent of graduates, continuers, and GED recipients in a cohort.

$$\frac{\text{Number of Graduates + Continuers + GED Recipients in the Class}}{\text{Number of Students in the Class (Graduates + Continuers + GED Recipients + Dropouts)}}$$

Graduation, Continuer, and GED Rates—Rounding

Four-year, five-year, and six-year graduation rates used in Index 4 calculations are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 74.875% is rounded to 74.9%, not 75%.

Annual Dropout Rates Included

If an AEA charter or campus has students enrolled in grade 9, 10, 11, or 12 but does not have a four-year, five-year, or six-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate, a proxy for the graduation rate is calculated by converting the grade 9–12 annual dropout rate into a positive measure. Please see the explanation of converting annual dropout rates on the next page.

Annual Dropout Rates—Student Groups Evaluated

Ten student groups are evaluated.

- All Students
- Students served by special education
- ELL students identified as students with limited English proficiency during the reported school year
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races

Annual Dropout Rates—Minimum Size Criteria and Small Numbers Analysis

Please refer to the previous section for information on the minimum size criteria and small numbers analysis for this indicator.

Annual Dropout Rates—Methodology

The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in grades 9–12 designated as dropouts by the number of students enrolled in grades 9–12 at any time during the 2014–15 school year.

$$\frac{\text{Number of students who dropped out during the school year}}{\text{Number of students enrolled at any time during the school year}}$$

Annual Dropout Rates—Conversion

Because the annual dropout rate is a measure of negative performance—the rate rises as performance declines—it must be transformed into a positive measure in order to be used as a

component of the Index 4 score. The following calculation converts the annual dropout rate for an AEA charter or campus into a positive measure that is a proxy for the graduation, continuer, and GED rate.

100 – (Grade 9–12 Annual Dropout Rate x **5**) with a floor of zero

By using the multiplier of 5, an AEA charter or campus accumulates points towards the Index 4 score as long as its annual dropout rate is less than 20%. The formula for the proxy for dropout rates for non-AEA districts and campuses uses a multiplier of 10; non-AEA districts and campuses accumulate points towards the Index 4 score only if their annual dropout rates are less than 10%.

Annual Dropout Rates—Rounding

Grade 9–12 annual dropout rates used in Index 4 calculations are expressed as a percent rounded to one decimal place. For example, 24 grade 9–12 students reported as dropouts divided by 2,190 students enrolled in grades 9–12 is 1.096% which is rounded to a 1.1% annual dropout rate.

Bonus Point Indicators for AEA Campuses and Charters

A maximum of 30 bonus points are added to the Index 4 score for the following indicators.

- RHSP/DAP or RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FHSP-DLA rates based on the four-year longitudinal cohort. For AEA districts and campuses that use the Annual Dropout Rate, an annual RHSP/DAP or RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FHSP-DLA rate is calculated for bonus points. The annual rate is also used if no longitudinal graduation plan data meet the minimum size requirement.
- The College and Career Readiness indicator measures the percent of annual graduates who either 1) met the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness standards in both ELA/reading and mathematics; or 2) completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual credit courses; or 3) were reported enrolled in a CTE-Coherent Sequence of courses as part of a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits.
- Excluded students credit will give AEA districts and campuses bonus points for serving recovered dropouts and other students who graduate or earn a GED, but are statutorily excluded from the graduation and dropout rate calculations.

Graduation Plan Rate (longitudinal or annual)

- Student Groups: *All Students* only
- Please refer to the previous section for information on the minimum size criteria, small numbers analysis, and methodology for this indicator.

For AEA districts and campuses that use the Annual Dropout Rate, the RHSP/DAP or RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FHSP-DLA annual rates are calculated as the percent of prior year graduates reported as having satisfied the course requirements for the RHSP, DAP, FHSP-E, or FHSP-DLA.

Postsecondary Component—College and Career Readiness

- Student Groups: *All Students* only
- Please refer to the previous section for information on the minimum size criteria, small numbers analysis, and methodology for this indicator.

Excluded Students Credit

- Student Groups: *All Students* only.
- Minimum Size: None; the AEA excluded students credit is based on the four-year graduation, continuer, and GED rate with exclusions which may be subject to small numbers analysis.
- Methodology: Number of graduates, continuers, and GED recipients in the 4-year graduation cohort without exclusions (federal rate) minus the number of graduates, continuers, and GED recipients in the 4-year graduation cohort with exclusions (state rate).

Graduates, continuers, and GED recipients from 4-year graduation cohort *without* exclusions (federal rate) of most recent cohort (Class of 2015)	–	Graduates, continuers, and GED recipients from 4-year graduation cohort *with* exclusions (state rate) of same cohort (Class of 2015)	With a floor of zero

The number of students derived from this calculation is added as bonus points to the overall Index 4 score.

Index 4 Score for AEA Campuses and Charters

The STAAR postsecondary readiness standard component contributes 25 percent of the points. The graduation/annual dropout rate component contributes 75 percent of the points. A maximum of 30 bonus points are added to the Index 4 score. The Index 4 score for AEA campuses and charters is the sum of the STAAR postsecondary readiness standard component score, graduation/annual dropout rate score, and bonus points rounded to a whole number.

As noted, the graduation plan rate along with the college-ready graduates rate and excluded students credit contribute bonus points, which are added to the STAAR postsecondary readiness standard component and the graduation rate component to determine the overall Index 4 score.

Chapter 5 – Distinction Designations

Campuses that receive an accountability rating of *Met Standard* are eligible to earn distinction designations. Distinction designations are awarded for achievement in several different areas and are based on performance relative to a group of campuses of similar type, size, grade span, and student demographics. The distinction designation indicators are typically separate from those used to assign accountability ratings. Districts that receive a *Met Standard* rating are eligible for a distinction designation in postsecondary readiness.

Distinction Designations

For 2016, distinction designations are awarded in the following areas:

- Academic Achievement in English Language Arts/Reading (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Mathematics (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Science (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Social Studies (campus only)
- Top 25 Percent: Student Progress (campus only)
- Top 25 Percent: Closing Performance Gaps (campus only)
- Postsecondary Readiness (district and campus)

Distinction Designation Labels

The Accountability Summary and Distinction Designation Reports show one of the following labels for each distinction designation:

***Distinction Earned*.** The district or campus is rated *Met Standard* and meets the criteria for the distinction designation.

***No Distinction Earned*.** The district or campus does not meet the distinction designation criteria or is rated *Improvement Required.*

***Not Eligible*.** The district or campus does not have results to evaluate for the distinction designation, is labeled *Not Rated* or *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues,* is evaluated by alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions, or is a campus paired with a feeder campus for accountability evaluation.

Campus Comparison Groups

Each campus is assigned to a unique comparison group comprised of Texas schools that are most similar to it. To determine the CAMPUS COMPARISON GROUP, each campus is identified by school type (See the *School Types* chart in *Chapter 2 – Ratings Criteria and Index Targets* for more information.) then grouped with 40 other campuses from anywhere in Texas that are most similar in grade levels served, size, the percentage of students who are economically disadvantaged, mobility rate, and the percentage of English language learners. Each campus has only one unique campus comparison group. There is no limit to the number of comparison groups to which a school may be a member. It is possible for a school to be a member of no comparison group other than its own or a member of a number of comparison groups.

A campus earns a distinction designation if it is in the top quartile (Q1) of its comparison group for at least 33 percent (for high schools and K–12 campuses) or 50 percent (for elementary and middle schools) of the indicators used to award the distinction.

- For an indicator to be used to evaluate campuses for a distinction designation, at least 20 campuses in the comparison group must have data for that indicator. If fewer than 20 campuses have data for an indicator, it cannot be used to evaluate campuses for the distinction. This often affects schools with non-traditional grade spans.
- Schools will not have access to the performance data of other schools and will not know where they rank in their comparison groups until the public release of all accountability data.

For details on how campus comparison groups are determined, see *Appendix H – Campus Comparison Groups*.

Academic Achievement in English Language Arts/Reading

An Academic Achievement Distinction Designation (AADD) is awarded to campuses for outstanding achievement in English language arts/reading based on outcomes of several performance indicators.

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

Student Groups: Performance of only the *All Students* group is used.

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

- *Attendance Rate.* Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If a campus has fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (*e.g.,* 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be used to evaluate that campus for this distinction.
- *Assessments (STAAR, AP/IB, SAT,* and/or *ACT).* Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. If a campus has fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, any indicator relying on that assessment cannot be used to evaluate that campus for this distinction.
- *Participation*
  - *AP/IB: ELA.* Minimum size is 10 students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
  - *Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion: ELA/Reading.* Minimum size is 10 students in grades 11 and 12 who complete at least one course.
  - *SAT/ACT Participation.* Minimum size is 10 reported annual graduates.

Indicators:

AADD ELA/Reading Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K–12
1) Attendance rate	✓	✓	✓	✓
2) Greater Than Expected Student Growth in ELA/Reading	✓	✓	✓	✓
3) Grade 3 Reading Performance (Level III)			✓	✓
4) Grade 4 Reading Performance (Level III)			✓	✓
5) Grade 4 Writing Performance (Level III)			✓	✓
6) Grade 5 Reading Performance (Level III)			✓	✓
7) Grade 6 Reading Performance (Level III)		✓		✓
8) Grade 7 Reading Performance (Level III)		✓		✓
9) Grade 7 Writing Performance (Level III)		✓		✓

10) Grade 8 Reading Performance (Level III)		✓		✓
11) English I Performance (Level III)	✓			✓
12) English II Performance (Level III)	✓			✓
13) AP/IB Examination Participation: ELA	✓			✓
14) AP/IB Examination Performance: ELA	✓			✓
15) SAT/ACT Participation	✓			✓
16) SAT Performance: Reading and Writing	✓			✓
17) ACT Performance: ELA	✓			✓
18) Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion Rate: ELA/Reading	✓			✓
Total ELA/Reading Indicators	10	6	6	18

Methodology:

Step 1: Determine a campus's performance on each indicator that applies to it and for which it has data.

Step 2: Compare that campus's performance for each indicator within the campus comparison group.

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 (Q1) for 33 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.
- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.

Please see *Appendix K – Data Sources* for a description of the source of data for each indicator.

Other Information:

- *Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion: ELA/Reading.* The advanced/dual-credit course completion rate for ELA/reading includes only students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
- *Assessments.* A complete list of AP and IB assessments used to award 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.

Sample Campus Calculation:

Example: Colonial High School is fictional but typical of Texas high schools with varied performance on the 10 indicators for this distinction. To determine whether it has earned the distinction, its performance is compared to its unique campus comparison group for each of the 10 indicators. It must be in the top quartile (Q1) for at least 33 percent of the indicators for the AADD in ELA/Reading.

		Attend-ance rate	Greater Than Expected Growth	English I Perform-ance	English II Perform-ance	AP/IB ELA Perform-ance	AP/IB ELA Participation	SAT/ACT Participation	Average SAT Perform-ance in Reading and Writing	Average ACT Perform-ance in ELA	Advanced/ Dual Credit Course Completion
Step 1	Determine Colonial HS performance on its 10 indicators	93.3%	2%	8%	9%	72%	48.9%	90%	1079	23.5	18.5%
Step 2	Compare performance to campuses in Colonial HS Comparison Group.						Q1	Q1	Q1		Q1
						Q2				Q2	
				Q3	Q3						
		Q4	Q4								
Step 3	Is performance in the top quartile?	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Result:		Performance on 4 of 10 indicators is in Q1, which is greater than 33 percent of indicators; Colonial High School earns an AADD in ELA/Reading.									

Academic Achievement in Mathematics

An AADD is awarded to campuses for outstanding achievement in mathematics based on outcomes of several performance indicators.

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

Student Groups: Performance of only the *All Students* group is used.

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

- *Attendance Rate.* Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If a campus has fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (*e.g.,* 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be used to evaluate that campus for this distinction.
- *Assessments (STAAR, AP/IB, SAT,* and/or *ACT).* Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. If a campus has fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, any indicator relying on that assessment cannot be used to evaluate that campus for this distinction.
- *Participation*
  - *AP/IB: Mathematics.* Minimum size is 10 students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
  - *Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion: Mathematics.* Minimum size is 10 students in grades 11 and 12 who complete at least one course.
  - *Algebra I by Grade 8 Participation.* Minimum size is 10 students enrolled in grade 8.
  - *SAT/ACT Participation.* Minimum size is 10 reported annual graduates.

Indicators:

AADD Mathematics Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K—12
1) Attendance rate	✓	✓	✓	✓
2) Greater Than Expected Student Growth in Mathematics	✓	✓	✓	✓
3) Grade 3 Mathematics Performance (Level III)			✓	✓
4) Grade 4 Mathematics Performance (Level III)			✓	✓
5) Grade 5 Mathematics Performance (Level III)			✓	✓
6) Grade 6 Mathematics Performance (Level III)		✓	✓	✓
7) Grade 7 Mathematics Performance (Level III)		✓		✓
8) Grade 8 Mathematics Performance (Level III)		✓		✓
9) Algebra I by Grade 8 Participation		✓		✓
10) Algebra I Performance (Level III)	✓	✓		✓
11) AP/IB Examination Participation: Mathematics	✓			✓
12) AP/IB Examination Performance: Mathematics	✓			✓
13) SAT/ACT Participation	✓			✓
14) SAT Performance: Mathematics	✓			✓
15) ACT Performance: Mathematics	✓			✓
16) Advanced/Dual Credit Course Completion Rate: Mathematics	✓			✓
Total Mathematics Indicators	9	7	5	16

Methodology:

Step 1: Determine a campus's performance on each indicator that applies to it and for which it has data.

Step 2: Compare that campus's performance for each indicator within the campus comparison group.

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 (Q1) for 33 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.
- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.

Please see *Appendix K – Data Sources* for a description of the source of data for each indicator.

Other Information:

- *Algebra I by Grade 8 Participation.* The Algebra I by Grade 8 Participation indicator limits the denominator to 8th grade students based on 2015 PEIMS fall enrollment. The numerator is Algebra I assessments taken in either the current or any prior school year as reported on the Consolidated Accountability File (CAF) cumulative history section.

- *Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion: Mathematics.* The advanced/dual-credit course completion rate for mathematics includes only students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
- *Assessments.* A complete list of AP and IB assessments used to award 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 several performance indicators.

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

Student Groups: Performance of only the *All Students* group is used.

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

- *Attendance Rate.* Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If a campus has fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (*e.g.,* 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be used to evaluate that campus for this distinction.
- *Assessments (STAAR, AP/IB,* and/or *ACT).* Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. If a campus has fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, any indicator relying on that assessment cannot be used to evaluate that campus for this distinction.
- *Participation*
  - *AP/IB: Science.* Minimum size is 10 students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
  - *Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion: Science.* Minimum size is 10 students in grades 11 and 12 who complete 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 Credit Course Completion Rate: Science	✓			✓
Total Science Indicators	6	2	2	8

Methodology:

Step 1: Determine a campus's performance on each indicator that applies to it and for which it has data.

Step 2: Compare that campus's performance for each indicator within the campus comparison group.

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 (Q1) for 33 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.
- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.

Please see *Appendix K – Data Sources* for a description of the source of data for each indicator.

Other Information:

- *Advanced/Dual Credit-Course Completion: Science.* The advanced/dual-credit course completion rate for science includes only students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
- *Assessments.* A complete list of AP and IB assessments used to award 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 outcomes of several performance indicators.

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

Student Groups: Performance of only the *All Students* group is used.

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

- *Attendance Rate.* Minimum size is based on total days in membership. If a campus has fewer than 1,800 total days in membership (*e.g.,* 10 students x 180 school days) attendance cannot be used to evaluate that campus for this distinction.
- *Assessments (STAAR, AP/IB).* Minimum size is 10 students for each assessment. If a campus has fewer than 10 test takers for an assessment, any indicator relying on that assessment cannot be used to evaluate that campus for this distinction.
- *Participation*
  - *AP/IB: Social Studies.* Minimum size is 10 students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
  - *Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion: Social Studies.* Minimum size is 10 students in grades 11 and 12 who complete 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 Credit Course Completion Rate: Social Studies	✓			✓
Total Social Studies Indicators	5	2	N/A	6

Methodology:

Step 1: Determine a campus's performance on each indicator that applies to it and for which it has data.

Step 2: Compare that campus's performance for each indicator within the campus comparison group.

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 (Q1) for 33 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.
- Middle schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools must be in the top quartile for 50 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.

Please see *Appendix K – Data Sources* for a description of the source of data for each indicator.

Other Information:

- *Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion: Social Studies.* The advanced/dual-credit course completion rate for social studies includes only students enrolled in grades 11 and 12.
- *Assessments.* A complete list of AP and IB assessments used to award 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 for outstanding student progress is awarded to campuses whose Index 2 score is ranked in the top 25 percent (Q1) of campuses in their campus comparison groups.

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

Methodology: Campuses are arranged in descending order according to their Index 2 scores. If the Index 2 score for a campus is within the top quartile of its comparison group, it earns a distinction for student progress.

For more information on Index 2, see *Chapters 3 – Performance Index Construction* and *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators*.

Top 25 Percent: Closing Performance Gaps

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

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

Methodology: Campuses are arranged in descending order according to their Index 3 scores. If the Index 3 score for a campus is in the top quartile of its comparison group, it earns a distinction for closing student achievement gaps.

For more information on Index 3, see *Chapters 3 – Performance Index Construction* and *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators*.

Postsecondary Readiness

Both districts and campuses that receive a *Met Standard* rating are eligible for a distinction designation for outstanding academic performance in attainment of postsecondary readiness. To earn a distinction for postsecondary readiness, elementary and middle schools' Index 4 score must be ranked among the top 25 percent of their campus comparison groups, high schools and K–12 campuses must have at least 33 percent of their indicators in the top quartile of their campus comparison groups, and districts must have at least 70 percent of all of their campuses' postsecondary indicators in the top quartile.

Who is eligible: Multi-campus districts and campuses that receive a *Met Standard* rating

For single-campus districts and charters that share the same 2016 performance data as the campus, the campus is eligible to earn a postsecondary readiness distinction designation, but 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.

Minimum Size: Indicators 4–9 must have a minimum size of 10. Values used for indicators 1–3 are from Index 4 calculations. See *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators* for a description of the minimum-size criteria used for Index 4.

Indicators for campuses:

Postsecondary-Readiness Indicators	High School	Middle School / Junior High	Elementary	K–12
1) Index 4 - Percent at STAAR Postsecondary Readiness	✓	✓	✓	✓
2) Four-Year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	✓			✓
3) Four-Year Longitudinal Graduation Plan Rate	✓			✓
4) College-Ready Graduates	✓			✓
5) Advanced/Dual Credit 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 Postsecondary Readiness Indicators	9	1	1	9

Note: Values used for indicators 1–3 are from Index 4 calculations. Please see *Appendix K – Data Sources* for descriptions of how other indicators are calculated.

Methodology:

Elementary and Middle Schools: Campuses are arranged in descending order according to their Index 4 scores. If the score for a campus is in the top quartile of its comparison group, it earns a distinction for postsecondary readiness.

High Schools: High schools and combined elementary/secondary schools (K–12) must be in the top quartile (Q1) for 33 percent or more of all the indicators for which they have data.

Districts: A district must have at least 70 percent of its campuses' postsecondary indicators in the top quartile (Q1). See the sample district calculation at the end of this chapter.

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

Sample Campus Calculation:

Example: 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 for each of the nine indicators. It must be in the top quartile (Q1) for at least 33 percent of the indicators for the Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation.

		STAAR Post secondary Readiness Standard 47%*	Graduation Rate 87.7%*	Graduation Plan Rate 85.9%*	College-Ready Graduates 85%	Advanced/ Dual-Credit 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 1	Determine Beta HS performance on its nine indicators.									
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 four of nine indicators is in Q1, which is greater than 33 percent of indicators, Beta High School earns a Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation.								

* This is the same value as is used for determining Index 4.

Other Information:

- *Four-Year Longitudinal Graduation Plan Rate.* The four-year longitudinal graduation plan rate indicator uses the higher of two rates comprised of students who graduate with Recommended High School Plan (RHSP) or Distinguished Achievement Plan (DAP) compared to students who graduate with RHSP or DAP or Foundation High School Plan with an Endorsement (FHSP-E) or Foundation High School Plan with a Distinguished Level of Achievement (FHSP-DLA). The longitudinal graduation plan rate used for the postsecondary distinction designation may be different than the one used in Index 4 for accountability because the comparison is made at the *All Students* level only for distinction designations.
- *CTE-Coherent Sequence Graduates.* The CTE-Coherent Sequence Graduates indicator measures the percent of 2014–15 annual graduates who enrolled in and completed a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits. The CTE-Coherent Sequence designation is derived from the summer 2015 PEIMS submission. For more information, see *Appendix K – Data Sources.*
- *Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion.* The advanced/dual-credit 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 indicators that make up Index 4, see *Chapter 3 – Performance Index Construction* and *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators*.
- *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.*

Sample District Calculation:

Example: 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 percent, which is less than 70 percent. This sample district does not earn a Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation.		

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

In 2015, results of STAAR assessments in mathematics for grades 3–8 and STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 for all subjects and grade levels were excluded from accountability. Because of this, and the inclusion of these assessments in 2016 accountability, a separate required improvement calculation at the index level for districts and campuses that do not meet the accountability target for the index cannot be calculated. Required improvement 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 grade 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. Pairing decisions for 2016 are due May 2–13, 2016.

If a district fails to inform TEA of its pairing preference, pairing decisions will be made by TEA. 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 and should serve students in contiguous grades. For example, a kindergarten (K) through grade 2 campus should be paired with the campus that serves grade 3 in which its students will be enrolled following grade 2.

When a campus being asked to pair is a prekindergarten (PK) or K campus with a “feeder” relationship to a campus that also requires pairing (e.g., a grade 1–2 campus.) both campuses should pair with the same campus that serves grade 3 in which their students will be enrolled following grade 2.

Campuses may be paired with the district itself instead of with another campus. This option is suggested for cases in which the 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 itself.

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

Districts may change pairings from year to year. Any changes should, however, be based on establishing the most appropriate pairing relationship. For example, a change in attendance zones that affects feeder patterns may cause a district to change pairing. A change in a pairing relationship does not change accountability ratings assigned in previous years to either campus.

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 are targeted to dropout prevention and recovery of students in grades 9–12, with enrollment consisting of at least 50 percent of the students 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 2015 AEA provisions are re-registered automatically in 2016. 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 2016 AEA provisions. The 2016 registration process occurred March 28–April 8, 2016.

AEA Campus Registration Criteria

Thirteen criteria must be met for campuses to register for AEA. However, the requirements in criteria 8–13 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 have its own county-district-campus number on PEIMS fall snapshot day (October 30, 2015).
3) 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.
4) The AEC must be dedicated to serving students at risk of dropping out of school as defined in TEC §29.081(d).
5) At least 50 percent of students at the AEC must be enrolled in grades 6–12.
6) The AEC must operate on its own campus budget.
7) The AEC must offer nontraditional settings and methods of instructional delivery designed to meet the needs of the students served on the AEC.
8) The AEC cannot be the only middle school or high school listed for the district in AskTED.
9) The AEC must have an appropriately certified, full-time administrator whose primary duty is the administration of the AEC.
10) 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.
11) 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.
12) 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.

13) 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 2016 that had at least 75 percent in 2015 remains registered in 2016.

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 *2016 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, 2015, 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 late April or early 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.

Chapter 7 – Appealing the Ratings

The commissioner of education is required to provide a process for districts or charters 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 will result 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(s) 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 will negatively impact the overall accountability rating. Online applications provided by TEA and the testing contractors 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. Please see *Chapter 10 – Calendar* for more information.

August 12, 2016	*Ratings Release.* No appeals will be resolved before the ratings release.
August 12–September 30, 2016	*2016 Appeals Window.* Appeals may be submitted *by the superintendent* once ratings are released publicly. 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.
By August 26, 2016	*Data tables released.* Data tables used to calculate accountability ratings are released through TEASE (unmasked) and public website (masked).
By September 16, 2016	*Remaining accountability reports released.* System safeguards, distinction designations, and accountability summaries released through TEASE (unmasked) and public website (masked)
September 30, 2016	*Appeals Deadline.* Appeals must be postmarked or hand-delivered no later than September 30, 2016, in order to be considered.
December 2016	*Decisions Released.* Commissioner’s decisions are mailed in the form of response letters to each school district and charter that filed an appeal by the September 30 deadline. Letters are posted to the TEASE website.
December 2016	*Ratings Update.* The outcome of all appeals are reflected in the ratings update scheduled for December 2016. 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(s). The appeals process is not an appropriate method to correct data that were inaccurately reported by the district. A district that submits inaccurate data 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(s).

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 considered.
- Appeals of 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 2016 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 appeals 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 (noon on April 8, 2016) or the pairing application (2:00 p.m. on May 13, 2016) are denied.
    - *Inclusion or exclusion of specific test results*
        - Specific administration results used to meet grade 5 or 8 Student Success Initiative (SSI)
        - Grade-level mathematics assessment for a middle school student who took the Algebra I EOC
    - *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 graduation plan 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 2016 accountability are identified based on PEIMS enrollment data submitted in fall 2015. 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 2016 ratings status based on information relevant to the 2016 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(s) 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 12, 2016.
- *Other Issues*. If other serious issues are found, copies of correspondence with the testing contractor(s), the regional ESC, or TEA should be provided with the appeal.
- *Online Testing Errors*. Appeals based on STAAR or TELPAS online test submission errors—other than those discussed in the special processing section of chapter 2 of this manual—must include documentation or validation of the administration of the assessment.
- *SB 1867 Provision.* A district or campus rated *Improvement Required* because of the inclusion in the calculation of graduation rates those students who are allowed to be excluded (under SB 1867 [84th Texas Legislature, 2015]) may submit an appeal.

  These students are
  - at least 18 years old as of the PEIMS fall submission of the school year for which ratings are being assigned,
  - have satisfied the credit requirements for high school graduation, and
  - have not completed their individualized education program (IEP) services.

  Appeals should be based on the students who match each of these criteria and whose IEPs include graduation plans that exceed the longitudinal (four- or five-year) cohort period. Sufficient documentation for students developed in their earliest years of inclusion in the class of 2015 cohort should be included. Students served in special education programs with IEPs developed during the last year of their longitudinal cohort will not be favorable for appeal.

  Documentation should include only the information necessary to show the date that the graduation plan was established. Providing a student's entire IEP and other ARD paperwork is not necessary.

- *TSI Data.* A district or campus rated *Improvement Required* because of mismatches in the student-identifying information between the TSI data files (used in the postsecondary readiness component of Index 4) and the TEA 2015 annual graduates file, may submit an appeal. Sufficient documentation of student-identifying information and TSI assessment scores should be included.

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(s). 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 website. 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://seguin.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 12 through 5:00 p.m. CDT on September 30. 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 30, 2016. The appeal shall include the following:
  - A statement that the letter is an appeal of a 2016 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(s)
  - 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                                                          postage
Your address                                                      ------
City, TX Zip

                        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. Mike Morath, 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 30, 2016, 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 30, 2016. Overnight courier tickets or tracking documentation must indicate package pickup on or before September 30.
- 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:**
Dear Commissioner Morath, This is an appeal of the 2016 accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD. 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 *Met Standard*. 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. Attached is the students' identification information as well as the PEIMS data for the students whose tests were affected. The second attachment shows the recalculated reading percent passing for Elm Elementary. 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. Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools *Attachments*	Dear Commissioner Morath, This is an appeal of the 2016 accountability rating issued for Elm Street Elementary School (ID 123456789) in Elm ISD. 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 *Met Standard*. 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 *Met Standard* criteria. We recognize the importance of accurate data coding and have put new procedures in place to prevent this from occurring in the future. Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools *Attachments*
	Dear Commissioner Morath, Maple ISD feels that its rating should be *Met Standard*. The discrepancy occurs because TEA shows that the performance in Index 1 for Writing is 48%. We have sent two compositions back for scoring and are confident they will be changed to passing. If you have questions, do not hesitate to contact us, at 701-555-1234. Sincerely, J. Q. Educator Superintendent of Schools *(no attachments)*

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 website 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 website.
- 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 website at the same time the letters are mailed. Superintendents are also notified via email 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 December 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 district or campus 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(s) 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

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

On September 30, 2013, the U.S. Secretary of Education approved the request of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to waive specific provisions of ESEA/NCLB. 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. Texas has since received two, one-year extensions; the current waiver is effective through the 2015–16 school year.

On December 10, 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) reauthorized the ESEA and provides states with new flexibility to develop a state accountability system to meet federal accountability requirements. However, the new accountability provisions of ESSA are not in effect for the 2015–16 school year.

State Accountability System Safeguards

System safeguards have been established to meet state accountability-related intervention requirements. Performance results are disaggregated to show the performance of each student group on each of the indicators. 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.

On August 15, 2016, the state accountability ratings will be released on the TEA website. Distinction designations and system safeguard reports will be released on the website on or before September 16, 2016. The system safeguard reports provide disaggregated results for four components (performance rates, participation rates, graduation rates, and limits on the use of the alternative assessment) for eleven student groups: all students, African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, two or more races, economically disadvantaged, students served by special education, and English language learners (ELLs). The ELL student group includes both students currently identified as limited English proficient (LEP) and 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. All student groups have the same target for each of the four components.

The table below shows the 2016 performance targets for both AEAs and non-AEAs that will be used for state system safeguards and federal accountability evaluations.

Accountability System Safeguard Measures and Targets (Non-AEAs and AEAs)											
	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	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%
Performance Rate Targets - Federal											
Reading	87%	87%	87%	87%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	87%	87%	87%
Mathematics	87%	87%	87%	87%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	87%	87%	87%
Participation Rate Targets - Federal											
Reading	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Mathematics	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Graduation Rate Targets - Federal **											
4-year	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%
5-year	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
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 are applied to state system safeguards and include an improvement target.

State Performance Targets

Performance rates calculated for system safeguards for state accountability are the disaggregated results used to calculate the Index 1 score for reading, mathematics, writing, science, and social studies. The performance target for 2016 is 60 percent of tests meeting or exceeding the satisfactory standard. It corresponds to the target of 60 on *Index 1: Student Achievement*. While AEAs have a target of 35 for Index 1, the system safeguard target for AEAs is 60. System safeguard targets are the same for AEAs and non-AEAs.

Federal Performance Targets

Performance rates calculated for system safeguards for federal accountability are the disaggregated results used to calculate the Index 1 score for reading and mathematics only. The performance target for 2016 is 87 percent of tests meeting or exceeding the satisfactory standard. The targets are required for only seven student groups: all students, African American, Hispanic, White, economically disadvantaged, students served by special education, and ELLs.

Federal Participation Targets

The target of 95 percent of students taking a state-administered assessment in reading and mathematics is unchanged from the federal accountability target in prior years. Participation measures are based on STAAR and TELPAS assessment results. For more information on how participation is calculated, please see *Appendix K – Data Sources.*

Federal Graduation Rate Goals and Targets

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

The long-term statewide goal for the four-year graduation rate is 90.0 percent. Districts and high schools that do not meet this goal must meet either meet an annual target toward the four-year graduation rate or an annual target for the five-year graduation rate.

Four-Year Graduation Rate Annual Target: For 2016, the annual target is 88 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 percent decrease in the difference between prior year graduation rate and the 90 percent goal.

Five-Year Graduation Rate Annual Target: For 2016, the annual target is 90 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in five years.

Limits on Use of Alternative Assessments

The system safeguard reports indicate whether a school district has exceeded the federal limit on use of alternative assessments. Federal limitations require that the number of scores that meet the STAAR Alternate 2 satisfactory standard not exceed one percent of the district's total participation. The measures—reported only at the district level—are shown separately for reading and mathematics.

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 accountability safeguard target for any one target 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

Where applicable, the data used to calculate state system safeguard results are also used to meet federal accountability requirements, such as district evaluations for Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs), the USDE Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) State Performance Plan (SPP), and the State Annual Performance Report (APR). These federal requirements are limited to the English language arts/reading and mathematics performance and participation indicators for the required ELL and special education programs at the 2015–16 federal performance target of 87 percent.

The minimum-size criteria used for federal accountability requirements, however, differs from the minimum-size criteria used for state accountability. The table below compares the criteria for state and federal accountability.

2016 System Safeguard Minimum Size Criteria			
		State System Safeguards	**Federal Accountability Requirements***
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

* Where applicable, these minimum-size criteria are applied to meet the assessment and accountability requirements of the 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/Texas_Schools/Waivers/NCLB-ESEA_Waiver_Information/.

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/.

Chapter 9 – Responsibilities and Consequences

State Responsibilities

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is responsible for the state accountability system and other statutory requirements related to its implementation. As described in chapters 8 and 9, TEA applies a variety of system safeguards to ensure the integrity of the system. TEA is also charged with taking actions to intervene when conditions warrant.

District Accreditation Status

State statute requires the commissioner of education to determine an accreditation status for districts and charters. Accreditation statuses were first assigned to districts under this statute in 2007. To determine accreditation status and sanctions, TEA takes into account the district's state and financial accountability ratings. There are other factors that may be considered in the determination of accreditation status. These include, but are not limited to, the integrity of assessment or financial data used to measure performance, the reporting of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data, and serious or persistent deficiencies in programs monitored in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS). Accreditation status can also be lowered as a result of data integrity issues or special accreditation investigations. The four possible accreditation statuses are: *Accredited*, *Accredited-Warned*, *Accredited-Probation*, and *Not Accredited-Revoked*.

Rules that define the procedures for determining a district's accreditation status, as well as the prior accreditation statuses for all districts and charters in Texas are available at http://tea.texas.gov/accredstatus/.

Determination of Multiple-Year *Improvement Required* Status

In determining consecutive years of *Improvement Required* ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions, only years that a campus is assigned an accountability rating shown below will be considered.

- 2013–2016: *Met Standard, Met Alternative Standard, Improvement Required;*
- 2012: *No State Accountability Ratings Issued;*
- 2004–2011: *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, *Academically Unacceptable*, *AEA: Academically Acceptable*, *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*.

While no ratings were issued in 2012, an *Improvement Required* rating assigned in 2013 and *Academically Unacceptable/AEA: Academically Unacceptable* ratings assigned in 2011 are considered as consecutive years. In addition, the consecutive years of *Improvement Required/Academically Unacceptable* ratings may be separated by one or more years of temporary closure or *Not Rated* ratings. This policy applies to districts and charters as well as campuses when *Not Rated* and *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* labels are assigned.

PEG Program Campus List

TEA is responsible for producing the list of campuses identified under the Public Education Grant (PEG) criteria. The list of 2017–18 PEG campuses will be released publicly in December 2016. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to *PEG Frequently Asked Questions,* available at http://tea.texas.gov/perfreport/peg_faq.html.aspx.

Local Responsibilities

Districts have responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. Primarily these involve following statutory requirements, collecting and submitting accurate data, properly managing campus identification numbers, evaluating and assigning community and student engagement ratings, and implementing an optional local accountability system.

Statutory Compliance

A number of state statutes direct local districts and/or campuses to perform certain tasks or duties in response to the annual issuance of the state accountability ratings. Key statutes are discussed below.

- Public Discussion of Ratings [TEC §11.253 (g)] – Each campus site-based decision-making committee must hold at least one public meeting annually after the receipt of the annual campus accountability rating for the purpose of discussing the performance of the campus and the campus performance objectives. The confidentiality of the performance results must be ensured before public release. The accountability data tables available on the TEA public website have been masked to protect confidentiality of individual student results.
- Notice in Student Grade Report and on District Website (TEC §39.361 and TEC §39.362) – Districts are required to publish accountability ratings on their websites and include the rating in the student grade reports. These statutes require districts
  - to include, along with the first written notice of a student's performance that a school district gives during a school year, a statement of whether the campus has been awarded a distinction designation or has been rated *Improvement Required* and an explanation; and
  - by the 10th day of the new school year to have posted on the district website the most current information available in the campus report card and the information contained in the most recent performance report for the district.

  For more information on these requirements, please refer to *Requirement for Posting of Performance - Frequently Asked Questions: Notice in Student Grade Report*, available on the TEA website at https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport//3297_faq.html.
- Public Education Grant (PEG) Program (TEC §§29.201 - 29.205) – In 1995, the Texas Legislature created the PEG program which permits parents with children attending campuses that are on the PEG list to request that their children be transferred to another campus within the same district or to another district. If a transfer is granted to another district, funding is provided to the receiving district. A list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria is released to districts annually. By February 1 following the release of the list, districts must notify each parent of a student assigned to attend a campus on the PEG list. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to PEG Frequently Asked Questions, available at http://tea.texas.gov/perfreport/peg_faq.html.aspx.
- Actions Required Due to Low Ratings or Low Accreditation Status – Districts with an *Improvement Required* rating (district or campus) or *Accredited Probation/Accredited Warned* accreditation status will be required to follow directives from the commissioner designed to remedy the identified concerns. Requirements will vary depending on the circumstances for each individual district. Commissioner of education rules that define the implementation details of these statutes are available on the website for the TEA Program Monitoring and Interventions (PMI) Division in the Accountability Monitoring link

at http://tea.texas.gov/pmi/ and on the TEA Accreditation Status website at http://tea.texas.gov/accredstatus/.

Campus Identification Numbers

In a given year, districts may need to change, delete, or add one or more campus identification numbers, the unique 9-digit county-district-campus (CDC) number, due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grades or populations served by an existing school. Unintended consequences can occur when districts "recycle" CDC numbers.

As performance results of prior years is a component of the accountability system in small-numbers analysis and possible statutorily-required improvement calculations in future years, merging prior-year files with current-year files is driven by campus identification numbers. Comparisons may be inappropriate when a campus configuration has changed. The following example illustrates this situation.

Example: A campus served grades 7 and 8 in 2015, but in 2016, serves as a 6th grade center. The district did not request a new CDC number for the new configuration. Instead, the same CDC number used in 2015 was maintained (recycled). Therefore, in 2016, grade 6 performance on the assessments may be combined for small-numbers analyses purposes with performance index results which included grade 7 and 8 performance.

Whether to change a campus number is a serious decision for local school districts. Districts should exercise caution when either requesting new numbers or continuing to use existing numbers when the student population or the grades served change significantly. Districts are strongly encouraged to request new CDC numbers when school organizational configurations change dramatically.

TEA policy requires school districts and charters to request campus number changes of existing campuses for the current school year by October 1 to ensure time for processing before the PEIMS fall snapshot date in late October. Changes for a subsequent school year will not be processed before November 1. This policy does not apply to new active campuses opening mid-year or campuses under construction.

School districts and charters must consult with the TEA PMI Division to change the campus number of a campus rated *Improvement Required.* The consolidation, deletion, division, or addition of a campus identification number does not absolve the district of the state accountability rating history associated with campuses newly consolidated, divided or closed, nor preclude the requirement of participation in intervention activities for campuses that received a rating of *Improvement Required* in August. Should the campus identification number change for a campus with an *Improvement Required* rating, the PMI Division will work with the district to determine specific intervention requirements.

Although the ratings history may be linked across campus numbers for purposes of determining consecutive years of *Improvement Required* ratings, data will not be linked across campus numbers. This includes PEIMS data, assessment data, and graduation/dropout data that are used to develop the accountability indicators. Campuses with new campus numbers cannot take advantage of any improvement calculations, if applicable, of the accountability system in which the performance index outcomes may be compared under a new number. Therefore, changing a campus number under these

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 campus or district number, the ratings history is 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

Districts are required to annually evaluate and assign ratings of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Acceptable*, or *Unacceptable* to itself and each of its campuses 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 https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/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

- level of parent participation,
- progress on locally-administered assessments,
- progress on goals identified by campus improvement plans,
- progress compared to other campuses in the district,
- progress on professional development goals, and
- school safety measures.

As a different approach, districts may choose to expand the state-designated accountability ratings. For example, they may wish to further differentiate among campuses rated *Met Standard.*

A third approach might be to examine the accountability indicators that comprise the performance indices, both currently in use and planned for implementation, that fall short of local expectations. Additional performance measures could be constructed to track efforts to improve performance in those areas.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, local accountability systems should be designed to serve the needs of the local community and to improve performance for all students.

This page is intentionally blank.