

ATTACHMENT 8

**TEXAS Consolidated State Application
Accountability Workbook**

TEXAS

Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

February 28, 2013



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

This page intentionally left blank.

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems

Status	State Accountability System Element
Principle 1: All Schools	
F	1.1 Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .
F	1.2 Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .
F	1.3 Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .
F	1.4 Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
F	1.5 Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
F	1.6 Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
Principle 2: All Students	
F	2.1 The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>
F	2.2 The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> .
F	2.3 The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations	
F	3.1 Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .
F	3.2 Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> .
F	3.2a Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .
F	3.2b Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .
F	3.2c Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .
Principle 4: Annual Decisions	
F	4.1 The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

F	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> .
F	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> .
F	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> .
F	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> .
F	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
F	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

F	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> .
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> .
F	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

F	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

F	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> .
F	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> .
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> .

Principle 10: Participation Rate

F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> .

STATUS Legend:

- F – Final policy
- P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval
- W– Working to formulate policy

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The state accountability system includes all public schools and school districts in the state.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The state accountability system designed around the STAAR assessment program has two components. One component is a performance index framework consisting of four performance indexes that are constructed to align with state goals related to academic achievement for all students, student progress, closing performance gaps, and postsecondary readiness. Each of the four indexes are designed to focus on specific measures of student performance in order to provide a comprehensive overview of school performance based on multiple indicators of student success. The second component consists of disaggregated performance rates designed to ensure focused school interventions, while meeting federal accountability requirements and serving as a system of safeguards for the performance indexes.

Performance Index

Index 1 - Student Achievement: This index provides an overall summary of the school's performance at the Phase-in Level II performance standard on the STAAR across all grade levels and subject areas tested.

Index 2 - Student Progress: This index credits schools for demonstrating progress on the student growth measure developed for the STAAR assessments.

Index 3 - Closing the Performance Gaps: This index focuses on academic performance at the Final Level III Advanced performance standard of the economically disadvantaged student group and the two lowest performing race/ethnicity groups on the campus or district.

Index 4 - Postsecondary Readiness: This index includes measures of secondary completion, such as graduation rates and percent graduating with advanced diploma plans. Beginning in 2014, Final Level II performance on STAAR is included in Index 4.

Disaggregated System Safeguards

Underlying the performance index framework are disaggregated performance results. The disaggregated performance results will serve as a safeguard to ensure that poor performance in one area or one student group is not masked in the performance index. Together the performance index and safeguards system meet all state and federal accountability requirements.

The following template shows the disaggregated performance measures and safeguard targets. Performance rates are calculated from the assessment results used to calculate performance rates in the performance index. A single target will be used for the disaggregated performance rates that correspond to the 2013 target for student achievement in the performance index. (The 2013 targets for the performance index will be set by the commissioner in March 2013.) Federal targets have been set for

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

participation rates, graduation rates, and limits on use of proficient results from assessments based on alternate achievement standards and assessments based on modified achievement standards. Additional information about these indicators and targets is found in Critical Element 10.1 – 10.2, Critical Element 7.1, and Critical Element 5.2, respectively.

	All	African American	American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Pacific Islander	White	Two or More	Econ. Disadv.	ELL	Special Educ.
Performance Rates											
Reading	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mathematics	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Writing	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Soc. Studies	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Participation Rates											
Reading	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Mathematics	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Federal Grad. Rates											
4-year	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%
5-year	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%
District Limits on Use of Alternative Assessment Results											
Reading											
Modified	2%	<i>Not Applicable</i>									
Alternate	1%	<i>Not Applicable</i>									
Mathematics											
Modified	2%	<i>Not Applicable</i>									
Alternate	1%	<i>Not Applicable</i>									

* Targets for 2013 will be set by the commissioner in March 2013. The system safeguard performance rates and target will correspond to the performance rates and target for student achievement in the performance index.

Results will be reported for any cell that meets accountability minimum size criteria. Failure to meet the safeguard target for any reported cell must be addressed in the Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS). 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. The TAIS determines the level of intervention and support the campus or district receives based on performance history as well as current year state accountability rating and performance on the safeguard performance measures. Critical Element 1.6 provides additional information about the TAIS.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

A one-page overview of the performance index framework is found on the agency website at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/20121130tac/overview2013.pdf>.

A technical description of indicator definitions and index construction for each of the four performance indexes is found on the agency website at: http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/20121130tac/tac_overview.ppt.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) has multiple academic achievement standards.

Level III: Advanced Academic Performance

Performance in this category indicates that students are well prepared for the next grade or course. They demonstrate the ability to think critically and apply the assessed knowledge and skills in varied contexts, both familiar and unfamiliar. Students in this category have a high likelihood of success in the next grade or course with little or no academic intervention. For Algebra II and English III, this level of performance also indicates students are well prepared for postsecondary success.

Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance

Performance in this category indicates that students are sufficiently prepared for the next grade or course. They generally demonstrate the ability to think critically and apply the assessed knowledge and skills in familiar contexts. Students in this category have a reasonable likelihood of success in the next grade or course but may need short-term, targeted academic intervention. For Algebra II and English III, this level of performance also indicates students are sufficiently prepared for postsecondary success.

The Level II performance standards will be phased in. In 2013 all students will be held to the Phase-in 1 Level II performance standard. The Level II phase-in is a four-year, two-step process. Students assessed on the Grade 3-8 tests are held to the Phase-in 1 Level II standard in 2012 and 2013 and the Phase-in 2 Level II standard in 2014 and 2015. If students take their first STAAR EOC assessment in 2012 or 2013, they will be held to the Phase-in 1 Level II performance standard for their graduation requirement. If students take their first STAAR EOC assessment in 2014 or 2015, they will be held to the Phase-in 2 Level II performance standard for their graduation requirement.

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

EOC Minimum Score

For the STAAR EOC assessments, minimum scores (set at one standard error of measurement (SEM) below the Level II standard in place for the student that year) are used to determine whether a student's score on a particular EOC assessment may count towards his or her cumulative score in that content area required for graduation.

Level I: Unsatisfactory Academic Performance

Performance in this category indicates that students are inadequately prepared for the next grade or course. They do not demonstrate a sufficient understanding of the assessed knowledge and skills. Students in this category are unlikely to succeed in the next grade or course without significant, ongoing academic intervention.

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)

The TAKS is the graduation requirement for students through the class of 2014 who entered high school before the STAAR EOC was introduced. In 2013 the last TAKS graduating class will be administered the exit-level test in Grade 11. TAKS results at the Met Standard (proficient) performance standard will be included in the accountability indicators.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

Table of phase-in and final recommended Level II and Level III standards is found on the agency website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=2147506337&libID=2147506330>.

State law and administrative rules governing the assessment and accountability system, along with additional administrative materials, are found on the agency web site located at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/> (TEA);

http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3534&menu_id=793 (Student Assessment); and <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account> (Accountability).

Specific information related to students receiving special education services is found at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2147491399>.

The link to the Texas Education Code (TEC), Chapter 39, governing assessment and accountability is <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/?link=ED>.

Supporting evidence also includes information on the assessment of LEP or ELL students found at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3300&menu_id=793; information related to TELPAS Reading found at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/ell/telpas/> information related to STAAR Modified found at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/special-ed/staarm/> and information related to STAAR Alternate found at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/special-ed/staaralt/>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?</p>	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	<p>Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>State statute [Texas Education Code §39.054(a)] requires that accountability designations for all districts and campuses be released no later than August 8 each year. Both components of the state accountability system, the state rating outcomes and the disaggregated system safeguard results, will be released no later than August 8 each year.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The state will produce annual reports that incorporate all the state and federal required reporting elements.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?²</p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	<p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Interventions The Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) was implemented following release of the 2012 state accountability ratings and 2012 federal adequate yearly progress designations. TAIS distinguishes levels of assistance for Title I and non-Title I campuses and districts by incorporating the state and federal accountability labels into an aligned system of support. Support Schools are assigned to one of two intervention stages, LEA guided interventions and Education Service Center (ESC) guided interventions. Focus Schools receive targeted and guided state and ESC interventions. Priority Schools receive intensive, targeted, and guided state and ESC interventions.</p> <p>Following release of the 2013 state accountability ratings, the TAIS levels of assistance will be updated by incorporating the new designations under the performance index framework. State statute requires multiple years of state rating outcomes, therefore for purposes of determining level of interventions, 2013 accountability ratings will be considered consecutive years of ratings with 2011 state accountability ratings and 2012 adequate yearly progress determinations.</p> <p>Districts and campuses are also subject to supports and interventions for failure to meet disaggregated system safeguard targets. The TAIS determines the level of intervention and support the campus or district receives based on performance history as well as current year state accountability rating and performance on the safeguard performance measures.</p> <p>Rewards For campuses that receive Title I, Part A funds, the state has established two categories of Distinguished Schools based on the criteria established in statute: Distinguish Progress Schools and Distinguished Performance Schools. These schools will be recognized for their outstanding achievement.</p> <p>Distinction Designations Campuses and districts are eligible for higher level distinction designation ratings for recognized and exemplary performance beginning in 2014. Campuses will also be eligible for distinction designations for top twenty-five percent in student progress and top twenty-five percent in closing performance gaps. Academic Achievement distinction designations for reading and mathematics will be awarded in 2013.</p>		

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Additional distinction designations in additional areas will be developed, beginning with 21st Century Workforce Development.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

Information pertaining to the Texas Accountability Intervention System, including sanctions and interventions, is located at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=2147508296>.

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?</p>	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	<p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The assessment results for 2013 included in the accountability indicators include STAAR grade-level assessments administered to students in Grades 3-8, STAAR EOC assessment results for all EOC assessments administered to students enrolled in Grades 9 and 10, and TAKS results for students enrolled in Grade 11. The campuses and districts included in the accountability system include all campuses and districts administered by the Texas Education Agency regardless of program or type of public school.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p>	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Full academic year is defined as follows:</p> <p>District: For Grade 3-8 grade level assessments and EOC assessments administered in the fall or spring of the school year, full academic year is defined as students enrolled in the district on the fall enrollment snapshot date. For EOC assessments administered in the summer, the full academic year is defined as students enrolled in the district on the preceding fall enrollment snapshot date.</p> <p>Campus: For Grade 3-8 grade level assessments and EOC assessments administered in the fall or spring of the school year, full academic year is defined as students enrolled on the campus on the fall enrollment snapshot date. For EOC assessments administered in the summer, the full academic year is defined as students enrolled on the campus on the preceding fall enrollment snapshot date.</p> <p>The fall enrollment snapshot date is defined in the annual Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) Data Standards. Fall enrollment records submitted by each district represent students enrolled in the district on the snapshot date. The snapshot date is typically the last Friday in October.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The fall enrollment record submitted by the district for each student enrolled on the fall snapshot date includes the district unique identification number and the unique identification number of the campus on which the student is enrolled or on which the student receives the majority of her or his instruction. The test answer documents also include the district unique identification number and the campus unique identification number.</p> <p>Performance of students with the same district identification number on the fall enrollment record and the test answer document are included in the evaluation of the district, even if campus identification numbers show that the student was enrolled on one campus in the district in the fall and tested on a different campus.</p> <p>Performance of students with the same campus identification number on the fall enrollment record and the test answer document are included in the evaluation of the campus.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The goal specified in state statute is that Texas will be among the top ten states in postsecondary readiness by 2020 by improving student achievement at all levels in the core subjects of the state curriculum; ensuring the progress of all students toward achieving advanced academic performance; closing advanced academic performance achievement gaps among groups; and closing gaps among groups in the percentage of students graduating under the recommended high school program and advanced high school program. The accountability system is designed address this goal.</p>		

³ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State’s requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State’s academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>All campuses and districts must meet the performance index targets and disaggregated system safeguard targets described under Critical Element 1.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Campuses and districts receive an overall accountability rating based on the performance index component of the accountability system. – Campuses and districts are also subject to Texas Accountability Intervention System requirements based on performance on the disaggregated system safeguards indicators. 		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools).</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The 2012 assessment results will not be used to establish a starting point because in 2012 only one cohort of high school students (class of 2015) is assessed on STAAR EOC. Most students in the class of 2015 will take the first course in the sequence for each subject. Consequently the 2012 results are not representative of the STAAR program when fully implemented. The 2013 STAAR results will be used as the baseline for establishing accountability performance targets for 2014 and beyond. The 2013 assessment results will include two cohorts of high school students (class of 2015 and class of 2016) on STAAR EOC graduation plans. STAAR EOC results will include results for both the first and second course in the sequence for each subject.

Baseline Data
for Targets

	EOC Courses*	2012	2013	2014
Grade 9	English I Reading English I Writing Algebra I Biology World Geography	Class of 2015 STAAR EOC	Class of 2016 STAAR EOC	Class of 2017 STAAR EOC
Grade 10	English II Reading English II Writing Geometry Chemistry World History	Class of 2014 TAKS	Class of 2015 STAAR EOC	Class of 2016 STAAR EOC
Grade 11	English III Reading English III Writing Algebra II Physics U.S. History	Class of 2013 TAKS	Class of 2014 TAKS	Class of 2015 STAAR EOC

*There is not a state-mandated course sequence; however, this represents the typical course sequence that most students follow.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The commissioner of education will set the 2013 accountability targets in March 2013. The 2013 accountability ratings will mark a transition from the former system of dual state and federal ratings under the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) to an integrated accountability system under the STAAR assessment program that meets both state and federal accountability requirements. Due to the move from end of grade to end of course (EOC) assessments as the high school graduation requirement, development of new student growth measures for STAAR, and the transition from accountability based on proficiency standards to postsecondary readiness performance standards, the performance index framework cannot be fully implemented until 2014. For that reason, the 2013 accountability targets will be independent of future targets rather than the baseline target for future years and will be set based on 2012 performance percentiles.</p> <p>A starting point and targets for 2014 and beyond will tied to the state goal that Texas will be among the top ten states in postsecondary readiness by 2020. The starting point and targets will be set following the 2013 ratings release as described under Critical Elements 3.2a and 3.2c.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. • Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Accountability targets for 2014, 2015, and 2016 accountability systems will be set in fall 2013. Following is the timeline for setting accountability targets (intermediate goals).</p> <p>June 2013 – STAAR results from 2012-2013 testing released.</p> <p>July/August 2013 – STAAR English language learner progress measure finalized.</p> <p>September 2013 – models of 2014 accountability performance indexes and disaggregated system safeguards constructed.</p> <p>October 2013 – Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) and Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) convene to develop recommendations to commissioner for accountability ratings criteria for 2014 and beyond and targets for 2014, 2015, and 2016 accountability systems.</p> <p>November 2013 – commissioner announces accountability ratings criteria for 2014 and beyond and final 2014 targets, preliminary 2015 targets, and preview 2016 targets.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
The state will make an annual determination of whether each public school campus and district met accountability targets on the performance index and disaggregated system safeguards.		

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The accountability system includes disaggregated student group performance for all required student groups: All Students, seven race/ethnicity student groups, economically disadvantaged students, special education students, and English language learners (ELL). The following table shows the student groups that are included in the accountability system, with number and percentage of students from 2011-2012 enrollment.

Student Group	2011-2012	
	Number	Percent
African American	637,934	12.8
American Indian	22,224	0.4
Asian	176,755	3.6
Hispanic	2,530,789	50.8
Pacific Islander (formerly with Asian)	6,227	0.1
White	1,520,320	30.5
Two or More Races (new category)	83,871	1.7
Economically Disadvantaged	3,008,464	60.4
Special Education	430,350	8.6
English Language Learner	837,536	16.8
Total Enrollment	4,978,120	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.</p>	<p>State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Performance Index Student group performance is incorporated into the performance index: Index 1: Student Achievement – All Students Index 2: Student Progress – All Students, Race/Ethnicity (seven groups), Special Education, English Language Learners (ELL) Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps – Economically Disadvantaged, Race/Ethnicity (two lowest performing groups) Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness – All Students, Race/Ethnicity (seven groups); also Special Education and ELL for graduation rates, graduation and GED rates, and annual dropout rates</p> <p>Disaggregated System Safeguards All of the System Safeguard indicators are disaggregated for all required student groups as shown in the table under Critical Element 1.2.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Students with disabilities are included in the STAAR assessment program. As required by Texas Education Code (TEC) §39.023, students receiving special education services are assessed annually. The following provides a summary of the 2012-2013 assessments offered at grade level and as end of course assessments for students receiving special education services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• General assessment Most special education students are administered the general assessments. The STAAR replaced the TAKS assessment program beginning in spring 2012. Under the STAAR program, at grades 3–8, students are tested in mathematics and reading. Students are also tested in writing at grades 4 and 7, science at grades 5 and 8, and social studies at grade 8. STAAR EOC assessments are available for Algebra I, geometry, Algebra II, biology, chemistry, physics, English I, English II, English III, world geography, world history, and U.S. history.</p> <p>• Alternate assessment based on modified grade-level achievement standards The STAAR Modified assessments for grades 3–8 and for EOC reflect the same content as the general assessments. The STAAR Modified assessments reflect the same increased rigor and focus of the general assessments. STAAR Modified assessments will be developed for nine of the twelve EOC assessments: Algebra I, geometry, biology, English I, English II, English III, world geography, world history, and U.S. history. STAAR Modified assessments will not be developed for Algebra II, chemistry, or physics, as these courses are not required on the Minimum High School Program, the graduation program for students who received modified instruction and are eligible to take STAAR Modified assessments.</p> <p>• Alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards The STAAR Alternate assessments are similar in design to the TAKS–Alt assessments and are available at the same grades and subjects as STAAR Modified. Students perform assessment tasks linked to the grade-level TEKS. However, STAAR Alternate incorporates a vertical alignment in the program’s assessment tasks that will allow scores to be compared across different grades for the same subject and language version. The high school assessments changed from grade-level assessments to course-based assessments. STAAR Alternate assessments reflect the same increased rigor and focus of the general and modified assessments. STAAR Alternate high school assessments have been developed for Algebra I, geometry, biology, English I, English II, English III, world geography, world history, and U.S.</p> 		

history.

- **STAAR-Alternate and STAAR-Modified results**

The federal limits on use of proficient results from alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities and alternate assessments based on modified grade-level achievement standards (one percent limit for STAAR-Alternate and two percent limit for STAAR Modified) will be calculated separately for Reading and Mathematics. The number of scores that meet the Phase-in Level II performance standard on STAAR-Alternate may not exceed one percent of the district's total participation (denominator of the participation rate described in Principle 10). The number of scores that meet the Phase-in Level II performance standard on STAAR-Alternate and STAAR Modified combined may not exceed three percent of the district's total participation. Texas allows school districts to apply for a waiver, or exception, to the one percent limit for students with significant cognitive disabilities assessed on the STAAR-Alternate. Exceptions are granted for school districts only to the extent that the statewide limit of one percent is maintained.

All districts that exceed the STAAR-Alternate one percent limit and/or the STAAR-Alternate and STAAR Modified three percent limit, and campuses in those districts that administer STAAR-Alternate and STAAR Modified assessments, are subject to interventions as part of the disaggregated accountability system safeguards. The system safeguard interventions apply for all districts that exceed the federal limits, regardless of whether or not their performance rates meet the system safeguard targets. The interventions require districts and campuses to develop focused plans for improvement. If the use of STAAR-Alternate and STAAR Modified is not addressed and the district exceeds the federal limits in the next accountability cycle, the level of assistance and intervention increases. It is not necessary to change assessment results that exceed the federal limits from proficient to non-proficient because all districts that exceed the one percent and two percent limits, and campuses in those districts that administer STAAR-Alternate and STAAR Modified, are subject to interventions. The process of changing assessment results seldom led to interventions and the interventions addressed overall performance in the subject rather than use of alternative assessments.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

English language learners (ELL) are included in the STAAR assessment program and in all assessment and non-assessment indicators. In addition, ELL student group performance is evaluated for assessment and non-assessment indicators in both components of the accountability system, the performance index and the disaggregated system safeguards.

The STAAR assessment program and Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) are designed to provide valid measures academic achievement and English proficiency of ELL students who enter the Texas public schools system knowing English to varying degrees and with a wide range of educational and sociocultural backgrounds

- **STAAR English**
 Most ELL students are assessed on the English assessments. Under the STAAR program, at grades 3–8, students are tested in mathematics and reading. Students are also tested in writing at grades 4 and 7, science at grades 5 and 8, and social studies at grade 8. STAAR EOC assessments are available for Algebra I, geometry, Algebra II, biology, chemistry, physics, English I, English II, English III, world geography, world history, and U.S. history. In 2013 the TAKS assessment is administered to students in Grade 11 for whom TAKS is the graduation requirement.
- **STAAR Spanish**
 At Grades 3-5 the STAAR assessments are administered in Spanish as well as English. This includes reading and mathematics for Grades 3-5, Grade 4 writing, and Grade 5 science.
- **Linguistically Accommodated Tests**
 STAAR L is a linguistically accommodated English version of the STAAR grades 3–8 and EOC mathematics, science, and social studies assessments. STAAR L is provided for ELL students who meet participation requirements for a substantial degree of linguistic accommodation in these subject areas. STAAR L will be administered as an online testing program beginning in spring 2013. The Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) is responsible for making linguistic accommodation decisions for ELL students.
- **ELL Progress Measure**
 Also under development is a measure of expected academic performance for ELLs that sets challenging but achievable goals to meet grade-level academic content standards for ELL students in accordance with a timeline based on their years in U.S. schools.

- **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System**

The Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) is designed to assess the progress that ELL students make in learning the English language.

- **Accountability Indicators**

ELL students are included in participation rates, graduation rates, and dropout rates.

The new assessments allow the accountability system to increase campus and district accountability for performance of ELL students rather than penalize campuses and districts that have large ELL populations. Performance results for ELL students are included in the assessment performance indicators based on years in U.S. schools.

- First year of enrollment in U.S. schools: assessment results not included in accountability performance indicators. (Students must be assessed and are included in participation rates.)
- Second through fourth year of enrollment in U.S. schools: English assessment results are included in the disaggregated system safeguards performance rates and in Index 1 (except immigrants entering in Grade 9 or above), Index 2, and Index 3 accountability indicators using the ELL progress measure. Spanish assessment results are included in the Index 1, Index 2, and Index 3 indicators and in the disaggregated system safeguards performance rates.

2013 only: English assessment results for students in their second and third year of enrollment in U.S. schools, and recent immigrants entering Texas public schools in Grade 9 or above, are not included in the accountability performance indicators because the ELL progress measure will not be available in 2013.

- Fifth year or more of enrollment in U.S. schools: English and Spanish assessment results are included in all indicators in all indexes and in the disaggregated system safeguard performance rates.

The performance results for a small number of asylees/refugees in their first through fifth year of enrollment in U.S. schools are not included in assessment performance indicators.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/ell/>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p>	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The same minimum size criteria are used in the performance index and disaggregated system safeguards components of the accountability system.</p> <p>All Students – no minimum size criteria; if denominator is less than 10, data are aggregated across two or three years</p> <p>Student Groups – denominator greater than or equal to 25</p>		

⁵ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The state accountability system does not reveal personally identifiable information. State law, administrative rule, and policies and procedures require and enforce strict adherence to the protection of student confidentiality and privacy rights, as guaranteed under the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence:</p> <p>Student confidentiality is protected in state statute and rules. State law and administrative rules governing the assessment and accountability systems, along with additional administrative materials, are found on the agency web site located at http://www.tea.state.tx.us (TEA); http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3534&menu_id=793 (Student Assessment); and http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account (Accountability).</p> <p>The link to the Texas Education Code (TEC), Chapter 39, governing assessment and accountability is http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/?link=ED.</p> <p>Supporting evidence also includes administrative materials for the assessment program such as the District and Campus Coordinator Manuals available on the Student Assessment website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3.aspx?id=3679&menu_id=793.</p>		

⁶ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Academic assessment results are the basis of all of the indicators in three of the four indexes and of half of the indicators in the fourth index that make up the performance index component of the accountability system. The disaggregated system safeguards component of the accountability system includes assessment participation and performance rates and graduation rates that meet federal accountability requirements.</p>		

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p>	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, - Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and - Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁸ to make AYP.</p>	<p>State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Texas is required by state statute to use the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition and No Child Left Behind (NCLB) graduation rate calculation. The four-year graduation rates follow a cohort of first-time ninth graders through their expected graduation three years later. The five-year rates follow the same cohort of students for one additional year. Texas also calculates six-year rates follow the same cohort of students for two additional years.</p> <p>State statute (Texas Education Code §39.053(g-1)) requires that certain students be excluded from the graduation rates and dropout rates used in the state accountability rating system. The rates with state exclusions are included in Index 4 in compliance with state statute. These include four-year graduation rates and five-year graduation rates; annual dropout rates; and four-year, five-year, and six-year graduation and GED rates for alternative education campuses.</p> <p>A second set of graduation rates without the state exclusions is calculated to meet federal accountability requirements. The rates without state exclusions are reported and are evaluated outside the performance index framework as part of the disaggregated system safeguards. Districts and campuses must meet federal accountability targets on the federal graduation rates for All Students and each of the ten student groups evaluated in the state accountability system.</p> <p>Goal: The long term statewide goal for the four-year graduation rate is 90.0 percent. High schools and school districts that do not meet the 90.0 percent graduation rate goal must meet either an annual target or a growth target for the four-year graduation rate, or an annual target for the five-year graduation rate.</p>		

⁸ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>Four-Year Graduation Rate Annual Target: For 2013 accountability determinations, 78.0 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years.</p> <p>Four-Year Graduation Rate Growth Target: The growth target is a 10.0 percent decrease in difference between prior year graduation rate and the 90.0 percent goal or at least 1.0 percentage point increase in graduation rate.</p> <p>Five-Year Graduation Rate Target: For 2013 accountability determinations, 83.0 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in five years.</p> <p>All districts and campuses that fail to meet graduation rate targets are subject to interventions. The interventions require districts and campuses to develop focused plans for improvement. If graduation rates do not improve and the district or campus fails to meet federal accountability targets in the next accountability cycle, the level of assistance and intervention increases.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The additional indicators for elementary schools and middle/junior high schools are performance results in Writing, Science, and Social Studies. The assessment indicators in the state accountability system include results for Writing, Science, and Social Studies as well as Reading and Mathematics. Writing and Science assessments are administered in both elementary and middle/junior high school. Social Studies assessments are administered in middle/junior high school. Performance on Writing, Science, and Social Studies assessments are included in the performance index indicators and disaggregated system safeguards.</p>		

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?</p>	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>State law and administrative rule require assessments to be valid and reliable. All state assessments follow a rigorous test development process to ensure that nationally recognized educational testing standards are met. Section 39.023(i) of the Texas Education Code requires: "Each assessment instrument adopted under those rules must be reliable and valid and must meet any applicable federal requirements for measurement of student progress." Section 101.3(b) of 19 Texas Administrative Code also requires: "Tests shall be reliable and valid measures of the essential knowledge and skills and shall be administered in a standardized manner."</p> <p>The primary testing contractor for the Texas assessment program is required by contract to comply with educational testing standards. The applicable language of the contract reads as follows: The highest technical quality must be maintained in the production and administration of tests and in the reporting of test results. To this end, the contractor must be cognizant of applicable sections of the standards for educational tests set by the American Psychological Association (APA), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME).</p> <p>The agency also is advised by a national Technical Advisory Committee, composed of prominent educational testing experts from across the county, to ensure full compliance with educational testing standards.</p> <p>School leaver data used to calculate graduation rates are submitted to the Texas Education Agency under the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) Data Standards and Student Attendance Accounting Handbook. Leaver data are subject to the Performance-Based Monitoring System Leaver Records Validation System.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: Information pertaining to the Texas Student Data System is found at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/tsds/.</p> <p>The link to the Student Attendance Accounting Handbook is http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=7739.</p> <p>Information pertaining to PBMAS Leaver Data Validation process is viewable here http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2147495639&menu_id=2147483703&menu_id2=2147483713.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The disaggregated system safeguards component of the accountability system includes separate performance rates for reading and mathematics for each student group as shown under Critical Element 1.2. Reading and mathematics performance are also incorporated into the assessment indicators used in the performance index component of the accountability system.</p>		

¹⁰ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Accountability determinations are made based on academic indicators that have met the state standard for data reliability as described in Critical Element 7.3. Accountability determinations are made through a process that is applied uniformly to all campuses and districts in the State.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Accountability determinations will be made based on the criteria described in Critical Element 1.2, which will be uniformly applied to all campuses and districts in the State. Bases for appeals are limited to mistakes in the data used to make accountability determinations or in the inferences made on the basis of that data. The appeals process is governed by state statute and all appeals are reviewed an external panel.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence:</p> <p>TEC §§ 39.151, The link to the Texas Education Code (TEC), Chapter 39, governing the appeal process for accountability ratings is http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.39.htm#39.151.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p>	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The accountability system is designed to accommodate changes to the student assessment program. A number of upcoming changes were known as the accountability system was developed.

- By statute, measures of Final Level II performance on the STAAR assessments are incorporated into the accountability system in 2014.
- An English language learner progress measure to evaluate performance and growth of ELL students their first four years in U.S. schools will be incorporated into the accountability system in 2014.
- The Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) graduation requirement will be phased out and the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) end-of-course graduation requirement phased in beginning with the class of 2015, so that the mix of high school assessments in the accountability system will change each year through 2015.
- Student performance standards for STAAR assessments are phased in over four years to ensure that campuses have adequately prepared students for the more rigorous requirements of the STAAR assessment program.
- STAAR performance standards will be reviewed at least every three years as required by state statute and adjusted if necessary. The first review will be in 2014 and would affect performance standards for the 2014-2015 assessments.

An annual review of the state accountability system is conducted each year following release of ratings. A technical advisory committee of educators and a policy advisory committee that includes representatives of the business community and state policymakers convene annually to review

¹¹ Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

accountability issues and any proposed changes to the system, including changes required due to changes in state statute. The appeals process described under Critical Element 9.2 can also lead to proposed changes to the accountability system.

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The assessment data used for the accountability assessment indicators are used to calculate the participation rates. Test answer documents make up the denominator of the participation rate. Test answer documents are submitted for all students in Grades 3-8 enrolled on the day of testing. For students in Grades 9-12 a test answer document is submitted for each course for which an EOC is administered. In 2013 a test answer document is submitted for each student enrolled in Grade 11 in the last class to graduate under the TAKS exit-level testing. Participation rates are calculated by subject for Reading and Mathematics for All Students and each of the ten student groups described in Critical Element 5.1.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Participation rates are evaluated outside the performance index framework as part of the disaggregated system safeguards component of the accountability system. Districts and campuses must meet the 95 percent participation rate target for all students and each of the ten student groups.</p>		

Appendix A

Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.