

# Final Recommendations for 2016 Accountability

This document presents the final recommendations of ATAC and APAC for 2016 accountability.

## I. 2016 System Rigor

The overall design of the accountability system will remain the same, evaluating performance according to four indices:

- Index 1: Student Achievement
- Index 2: Student Progress
- Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps
- Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

### Changes Affecting All Four Performance Indices

- **Increase in the student performance standards for STAAR grades 3–8 and end-of-course (EOC) general assessments** By commissioner’s rule, the scheduled increase in 2015–16 to the Phase-in 2 Level II passing standard is replaced with a standard progression approach which will begin in 2015–16 and continue until 2021–22, the year final Level II standards are scheduled to be in place.
- **Inclusion of grades 3–8 mathematics STAAR assessments** The 2016 accountability system will include the performance results for grades 3–8 mathematics in all indices, including progress measure results for grades 3–8 mathematics, where applicable. The student performance standard for grades 3–8 mathematics will be the 2015–16 standard.
- **Inclusion of STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 assessments.** The 2016 accountability system will include the STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 performance results in Index 1 and will include the STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 progress measure results in Index 2, where applicable.

- **ATAC Recommendation: Include STAAR A results in all indices and STAAR Alternate 2 results in Index 1, Index 2, and Index 3.**

**Rationale:** Inclusion of STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 results in all applicable indices encourages districts to administer the appropriate assessments to students with disabilities regardless of the impact on state accountability ratings. Concerns with student performance on these assessments can be addressed in the recommendations for 2016 performance index targets.

- **APAC Recommendation: Include STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 results in Index 1 and Index 2 only.**

**Rationale:** While inclusion would discourage campuses from shifting low-performing students to STAAR A, many students who take STAAR A are the same students who receive modified instruction and previously took the STAAR-Modified test. STAAR A is not a modified assessment, so more time is needed to prepare these students to meet the higher performance standards on STAAR A.

- **TEA Staff Recommendation: ATAC Recommendation**

# Final Recommendations for 2016 Accountability

## 2. Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets

**Ratings Criteria** Performance targets will be set for each index. In order to receive a *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating, all campuses and districts must meet the performance index target on the following indices if they have performance data for evaluation:

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

**Rationale:** This recommendation reflects the original intent when the index framework was developed. Given that the progress measures will be reported for the first time on the STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 assessments in 2016, it is difficult to anticipate how these new progress measures will affect the Index 2 outcomes. This also addresses the concern with the limited availability of progress measures on the EOC assessments for high schools and K–12 campuses and districts.

**2016 Performance Index Targets** ATAC and APAC members recommended the performance index targets for 2016 shown on the table on the following pages. Targets in parentheses indicate staff recommendations, where they differ from ATAC/APAC recommendations.

# Final Recommendations for 2016 Accountability

## Index Targets and Recommendations for Non-AEA Districts and Campuses

	2015 Index Targets					ATAC/APAC Recommendation 2016 Index Targets				
	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3	Index 4		Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
				All Components	STAAR Component Only				All Components	STAAR Component Only
Districts	60	20	28	57	13	55 (60)	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile **	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile ***	60	12 (13)
Campuses										
Elementary	60	30	28	n/a	12	55 (60)	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile **	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile ***	n/a	12
Middle		28	27	n/a	13		5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile **	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile ***	n/a	12 (13)
High School/ K-12		15	31	57	21		5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile **	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile ***	60	12 (21)

\* 2015 Index 2 targets for non-AEA campuses were set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2015 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts corresponded to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2015 campus performance across all campus types.

\*\* 2016 Index 2 targets for non-AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts will correspond to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance across all campus types.

\*\*\* 2016 Index 3 targets for non-AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts will correspond to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance across all campus types.

# Final Recommendations for 2016 Accountability

## Index Targets and Recommendations for AEA Charter Districts and Campuses

	2015 Index Targets					ATAC/APAC Recommendation 2016 Index Targets				
	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3	Index 4		Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
				Both Components	Graduation /Dropout Rate Only				Both Components	Graduation Dropout Rate Only
AEA Charter Districts	35	7	11	33	45	30 (35)	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile **	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile ***	33	45
AEA Campuses										

\* 2015 Index 2 targets for both AEA charter districts and AEA campuses were set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2015 campus performance.

\*\* 2016 Index 2 targets for both AEA charter districts and AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2016 campus performance.

\*\*\* 2016 Index 3 targets for both AEA charter districts and AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2016 campus performance.

### **Rationale:**

**Index 1** – For 2016, set the target at 55, in recognition of the increase in the STAAR satisfactory standard and the inclusion of STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2.

**Index 2** – For 2016, set targets at the fifth percentile by campus type based on 2016 performance. Due to changes in writing exams in grades 4 and 7, no STAAR progress measures will be available for grade 7 writing for 2016. Because of this, ATAC and APAC recommend Index 2 scores be based on progress outcomes for reading and mathematics only.

**Index 3** – For 2016, ATAC recommends including STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 in Index 3 and setting the target at the fifth percentile by campus type based on 2016 performance.

For 2016, APAC recommends excluding STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 from Index 3. APAC agreed with the targets recommended by APAC.

**Index 4** – For 2016, ATAC recommends including STAAR A in Index 4 and increasing the target for districts and high school/K–12 campuses rated on all four components to a target of 60. ATAC also recommended setting one target for all campuses and districts that have only the STAAR component at a target of 12. AEA districts and campuses with both the STAAR and graduation component would have a target of 33, while those with the graduation component only would have a target of 45.

For 2016, APAC recommends excluding STAAR A from Index 4. APAC agreed with targets the recommended by ATAC.

## Final Recommendations for 2016 Accountability

**TEA Staff Recommendation on Targets:** For non-AEA districts and campuses, staff recommends keeping the 2016 Index 1 target the same as the 2015 target (60) to preserve the increased rigor of the accountability system introduced by the inclusion of STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and grades 3–8 mathematics and the increase in the STAAR performance standard.

Staff agrees with the ATAC/APAC recommendation to set the Index 2 and Index 3 targets at the fifth percentile and increase the target for all components of Index 4 to 60. Staff recommends keeping the 2016 Index 4 targets for the STAAR component only the same as the 2015 targets to preserve the increased rigor of the accountability system introduced by the inclusion of STAAR A and grades 3–8 mathematics. For AEA charter districts and campuses, staff recommends keeping the 2016 Index 1 target the same as the 2015 target (35) to preserve the increased rigor of the accountability system introduced by the inclusion of STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and grades 3–8 mathematics and the increase in the STAAR performance standard.

**Rating Labels.** The 2016 rating labels remain the same rating labels issued in 2015 accountability

- *Met Standard* – met the required performance index targets and other accountability rating criteria
- *Improvement Required* – did not meet the required performance index targets or other accountability rating criteria
- *Met Alternative Standard* – assigned to charter operators and alternative education campuses evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions
- *Not Rated* – under certain circumstances, districts or campuses may not receive a rating.

### 3. Performance Indices

The original design of each performance index remains the same as the prior year.

**Index 1: Student Achievement.** Provides a snapshot of performance across subjects, on both general and alternative assessments, at the satisfactory performance standard.

#### **Inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs)**

- *ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are included at the Level II standard, regardless of their number of years in U.S. schools.*
- *ELLs whose years in U.S. schools exceeds their ELL plan year are included at the STAAR satisfactory standard.*
- *ELLs with parental denial for instructional services who are in their second or more year in U.S. schools are included at the STAAR satisfactory standard.*
- *ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have an ELL progress measure are excluded.*

## Final Recommendations for 2016 Accountability

**Index 2: Student Progress.** Measures of student progress provide an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for improving student performance independent of overall student achievement.

### **Inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs)**

- *ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are included, regardless of their number of years in U.S. schools.*
- *ELLs whose years in U.S. schools exceeds their ELL plan year are included.*
- *ELLs with parental denial for instructional services who are in their second or more year in U.S. schools are included.*
- *ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have an ELL progress measure are excluded.*

**Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps.** Emphasizes the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students and the two lowest-performing racial/ethnic student groups.

The ATAC/APAC consensus for 2016 accountability was no changes to the Index 3 calculation.

### **Inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs)**

- *ATAC: ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are included at the Level II and Level III standard, regardless of their number of years in U.S. schools. (TEA staff recommendation)*
- *APAC: ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are excluded from Index 3.*
- *ELLs whose years in U.S. schools exceeds their ELL plan year are included at the satisfactory standard and Level III standard.*
- *ELLs with parental denial for instructional services who are in their second or more year in U.S. schools are included at the satisfactory standard and Level III standard.*
- *ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have an ELL progress measure are excluded.*

**Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness.** 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 provides students with the foundation necessary for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military. Alternative procedures are provided for Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) campuses and charter districts serving at-risk students in alternative education programs.

### **Inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs)**

- *ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are excluded.*
- *ELLs whose years in U.S. schools exceeds their ELL plan year are included at the final Level II standard.*
- *ELLs with parental denial for instructional services who are in their second or more year in U.S. schools are included at the final Level II standard.*
- *ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have an ELL progress measure are excluded.*

# Final Recommendations for 2016 Accountability

## Graduation Plan

### ▪ **ATAC/APAC Recommendation: Graduation Plan Component and Foundation High School Plan (FHSP) Transition**

For 2016 accountability, ATAC and APAC recommend calculating the two diploma plan rates shown on the next page and using the one that gives the district or campus the most points for the graduation plan component of Index 4.

**Rationale:** 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**

$$(RHSP + DAP)$$

---

$$(MHSP + RHSP + DAP)$$

### **Calculation that Includes FHSP Students**

$$(RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP-E + FHSP-DLA)$$

---

$$(MHSP + RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP + FHSP-E + FHSP-DLA)$$

Notes:

FHSP: Foundation High School Program (FHSP) without endorsement

FHSP-E: FHSP with endorsement, and no distinguished level of achievement

FHSP-DLA: FHSP with endorsement and Distinguished Level of Achievement

# Final Recommendations for 2016 Accountability

## Texas Success Initiative

- **ATAC/APAC Recommendation: TSI portion of postsecondary component.**  
Include the results of the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) assessment in the postsecondary component and give credit for every student who
  - meets the TSI requirement in reading on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT
  - and**
  - meets the TSI requirement in mathematics on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT

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.

With the inclusion of the TSI results, the postsecondary component evaluated in 2016 accountability for the 2014–15 graduates is as shown below:

graduates meeting TSI criteria in both ELA/reading and mathematics (TSI, SAT, or ACT)	<b>or</b>	graduates who completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual enrollment course in the current or prior school year	<b>or</b>	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*
Number of annual graduates				

**Rationale:** The 2013–14 annual graduates were the last graduating class with TAKS results that could have been used in the college-readiness indicator of the postsecondary component. Beginning with the graduates from the 2014–15 school year, the postsecondary component will incorporate the results from the TSI assessment and continue to credit students who meet the TSI criteria on either the SAT or ACT assessments.