

State Accountability Update

TETN Videoconference #43255 | August 24, 2017

Texas Education Agency
Academics
Performance Reporting

Updated 2017 Accountability Calendar

2

Date	Activity
August 7	2017 accountability data tables, student lists, and Index 1–4 data downloads released to districts
August 14	2017 preliminary accountability ratings, preliminary PEG list, data tables, system safeguards, distinction designations, accountability summaries, and corresponding data downloads released to the districts. Appeals window opened.
August 15	2017 preliminary accountability ratings, preliminary PEG list, data tables, system safeguards, distinction designations, accountability summaries, and corresponding data downloads released to the public
September 15	Appeals window closes at 5:00 p.m. CDT
September 29	2017 Consolidated School Rating Report (state-assigned academic and financial ratings and locally assigned community and student engagement ratings) released to the public

Updated 2017 Accountability Calendar

3

New Date	Activity
November	2017 ratings appeal responses released to districts
November	2017 final accountability ratings released to districts and the public after resolution of appeals
November	Final List of campuses identified under PEG criteria for 2018–19 school year released to the public
November	2016–17 Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPR) released to the public

2017 Statewide Results



Statewide Results for 2017

5

Districts

- Of the 1,203 districts in Texas, 1,146 (95.3%) earned a rating of *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard*, compared to 1,131 (93.7%) in 2016, and 1,151 (94.4%) in 2015.
- 44 (3.7%) were rated *Improvement Required*, compared to 66 (5.5%) districts in 2016 and 57 (4.7%) in 2015.
- 13 (1.1%) were labeled *Not Rated*, compared to 10 (0.8%) districts in 2016 and 11 (0.9%) in 2015.

Statewide Results for 2017

6

Campuses

- Of the 8,757 campuses in Texas, 7,830 (89.4%) earned a rating of *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard*, compared to 7,667 (88.4%) in 2016 and 7,472 (86.4%) in 2015.
- 371 (4.2%) campuses were rated *Improvement Required*, compared to 467 (5.4%) in 2016 and 610 (7.1%) in 2015.

Statewide Results for 2017

7

Alternative Education Campuses (AECs)

- Of the 389 AECs evaluated under AEA provisions, 249 (64.0%) earned a rating of *Met Alternative Standard*, compared to 246 (63.1%) in 2016 and 269 (68.3%) in 2015.
- 19 (4.9%) AECs were rated *Improvement Required*, compared to 25 (6.4%) in 2016 and 10 (2.5%) in 2015.
- 121 (31.1%) AECs were labeled *Not Rated*, 10 of which are AECs of choice, 19 are dropout recovery schools, and 92 are residential treatment facilities. In 2016, 118 (30.4%) AECs were labeled *Not Rated*. In 2015, 115 (29.2%) were labeled *Not Rated*.

Public Notification Requirements for Districts

8

Texas Education Code (TEC), § 39.361 and § 39.362 require districts to do the following:

- Publish whether each campus has been awarded a distinction designation or is currently rated *Improvement Required* and explain the significance of the information.
- By the 10th day of the new school year, post on its website the current accreditation status and accountability ratings, Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPR), and School Report Cards (SRC).
- Define and explain each accreditation status under TEC § 39.051.

More information is available at https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/3297_faq.html.

2017 Appeals Timeline

9

Date	Activity
August 14– September 15	<i>2017 Appeals Window.</i> Districts register their intent to appeal using the TEASE Accountability website and mail or hand-deliver their appeal letter with supporting documentation. See the “How to Appeal” section in <i>Chapter 7 – Appealing the Ratings</i> .
Friday, September 15	<i>Appeals Deadline.</i> Appeals must be postmarked or hand-delivered no later than September 15, 2017, in order to be considered.
November 2017	<i>Decisions Released.</i> Commissioner’s decisions are mailed in the form of response letters to each school district and charter that filed an appeal by the September 15 deadline. Letters are posted to the TEASE website.
November 2017	<i>Ratings Update.</i> TEASE and public websites will be updated to reflect the outcome of all appeals.

2017 Appeals Process

10

- Districts may appeal for any reason; however, the basis for an appeal should be a data or calculation error attributable to the testing contractor(s), a regional education service center (ESC), or TEA.
- The compensatory nature of the index framework and other features—such as using multiple indicators to calculate an overall index score—minimize the possibility that district coding errors in PEIMS or the STAAR assessment program negatively impact the overall accountability rating.
- Use of online applications provided by the agency and testing contractor ensure that districts are aware of data correction opportunities. District responsibility for data quality is the cornerstone of a fair and uniform rating determination.

2017 Special Circumstance Appeals

11

- *Rescoring.* If a district requested that its results be rescored, the district must provide a copy of the dated request sent to the testing contractor(s) and the outcome of the rescored tests with the appeal.

If the rescored results impact the rating, these appeals are necessary because rescored results may not be processed in time to be included in the assessment data used to determine the accountability ratings released by August 15, 2017.

- *Other Issues.* If other serious issues are found, copies of correspondence with the testing contractor(s), the ESC, or TEA should be provided with the appeal.

2017 Special Circumstance Appeals

12

- *TSI Data.* A district or campus rated *Improvement Required* due to mismatches in the student-identifying information between the TSI data files (used in the postsecondary readiness component of Index 4) and the TEA 2016 annual graduates file, may submit an appeal. Sufficient documentation of student-identifying information and TSI assessment scores should be included.
- *Not Rated Appeals.* Districts and campuses assigned *Not Rated* labels are responsible for appealing this rating by the appeal deadline if the basis for this rating was a special circumstance or error by the testing contractor(s). If TEA determines that the *Not Rated* label was indeed due to special circumstances, it may assign a revised rating.

Distinction Designations

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

2017 Appeals Process

14

Relationship to the Accountability System Safeguards, PBMAS, and TAIS

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

2017 System Safeguards and Interventions

15

- Information for districts and campuses with areas of need identified through the 2017 state accountability system was released in an August 16th *To The Administrator Addressed* letter.
- Detailed information about state accountability intervention requirements and resources are available on the School Improvement website at <http://tea.texas.gov/schoolimprovement/> and the [Texas Center for District and School Support](#) website.

2017 Performance Reports



Accountability Ratings Index Data Overview Report

17

- The Accountability Ratings Index Data Overview Report was posted on August 15 on the campus search page of the 2017 Accountability Ratings webpage.
- This report provides the index scores for each campus and its forty campus comparison group.
- Users can sort any index to see how a campus performed in relation to the other campuses in its comparison group.

Distinction Designation Data Overview Report

18

- The Distinction Designation Data Overview Report was posted on August 15 on the campus search page of the 2017 Accountability Ratings web page.
- This report provides detailed comparison group data for every indicator evaluated for each distinction designation.
- Users can sort any distinction designation indicator and determine how a particular campus performed in relation to the other campuses in its comparison group.

Texas Consolidated School Ratings Report (TCSR)

19

- On September 29, TEA will release the TCSR, which includes the 2017 state-assigned academic and financial ratings and the locally assigned community and student engagement ratings.
- The reports will include the community and student engagement ratings reported in PEIMS Submission 3.
- Districts cannot alter the ratings submitted in PEIMS. Any discrepancies between the ratings posted on a district website and the September 29 report released by TEA may be noted by a district on its local website.

Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) and School Report Card (SRC)

20

- The TAPR will be released on the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) and the TEA public website by November.
- The SRC, which reports a subset of data from the TAPR, will be released on the TEA public website in December.
- TAPR and SRC updates will be discussed during the November 9, 2017, TETN session (#43256).

Texas School Accountability Dashboard

21

- The Texas School Accountability Dashboard will be updated to reflect the 2016–17 accountability results and ratings in January.
- TEA will provide an update on the dashboard during the November 9, 2017, TETN session (#43256).

2018 Accountability Development



Accountability Advisory Committees

23

Fall 2017

Accountability advisory groups convene to develop recommendations for accountability ratings criteria and targets for 2018 in the new A–F system. Advisory group subcommittees will discuss changes to accountability components in monthly teleconferences.

Early spring 2018

The commissioner announces the structure of the A–F system including accountability ratings criteria and targets for 2018 and, if possible, preliminary 2019 targets.

Distinction Designations

24

- Significant changes are not anticipated for distinction designations.
- Indicators evaluated in 2017 for each distinction designation will likely continue to be evaluated in 2018, based on recommendations from accountability advisory groups.
- New indicators may be added to certain distinction designations in 2018, based on recommendations from accountability advisory groups.
- Methodology for determining postsecondary readiness distinction designation for districts will likely remain unchanged.

House Bill 22 Implementation



Key Features of House Bill 22

26

- A–F letter grades are described as follows:
 - A = exemplary performance
 - B = recognized performance
 - C = acceptable performance
 - D = performance that needs improvement
 - F = unacceptable performance

- A–F letter grades will be given for three domains:
 - Student Achievement
 - School Progress
 - Closing the Gaps

Key Features of House Bill 22

27

- Overall A–F letter grade will be calculated as follows:
 - Considers best of Student Achievement or School Progress, unless the district or campus receives an F in either domain, in which case the district or campus may not be assigned a rating higher than a B for the composite for the two domains
 - The Closing the Gaps domain makes up at least 30 percent of the overall rating
- Districts and campuses will be evaluated on all three domains.
- Districts will receive an A–F rating beginning in 2018.
- Campuses will receive a *Met Standard* or *Improvement Required* rating in 2018.
- Even though campuses are evaluated on the three domains, they will not receive A–F grades in 2018.
- Campuses will receive an A–F rating beginning in 2019.
- Community and Student Engagement ratings repealed

Key Features of House Bill 22

28

- Extracurricular/Cocurricular Indicator
 - Study to determine the feasibility of incorporating indicators that account for extracurricular and cocurricular student activity
 - Report to the legislature on the feasibility of incorporating these indicators by December 1, 2022, unless the commissioner adopts a similar indicator before then
- Statewide Input
 - School boards
 - Administrators
 - Teachers
 - Parents
 - Any other interested stakeholders

January 1, 2019, A–F “What if” Report

29

- Overall and domain ratings each campus would have received for 2017–18
- Correlation between letter grades and student characteristics:
 - Students qualifying for the free or reduced-price meals
 - Students of limited English proficiency
 - Race/ethnicity
 - Socioeconomic status

Student Achievement Domain

30

Elementary and Middle Schools

- STAAR Approaches Grade Level standard
- STAAR Meets Grade Level standard
- STAAR Masters Grade Level standard

Final Student Achievement Domain methodology will be determined after consultation with stakeholder groups that will be convened in fall 2017/spring 2018.

Student Achievement Domain

31

Districts, High Schools, and K–12 Campuses

- STAAR Approaches Grade Level standard
- STAAR Meets Grade Level standard
- STAAR Masters Grade Level standard
- TSI criteria in reading and mathematics
- AP or similar assessment
- Dual credit
- Military enlistment
- Industry certification
- Postsecondary certification programs
- College preparation ELA or mathematics course
- Composite of indicators that show college readiness
- High school graduation rates
- OnRamps dual enrollment course
- Associate's degree

School Progress Domain

32

- STAAR growth measure
- Performance of districts and campuses compared to similar districts or campuses

Final School Progress Domain methodology will be determined after consultation with stakeholder groups that will be convened in fall 2017/spring 2018.

Closing the Gaps Domain

33

- Disaggregated data to demonstrate the differentials among various student groups:
 - ❑ Students formerly receiving special education services
 - ❑ Students continuously enrolled
 - ❑ Students who are mobile
 - ❑ Students from different racial and ethnic groups
 - ❑ Students from different socioeconomic backgrounds

Final Closing the Gaps Domain methodology will be determined after consultation with stakeholder groups that will be convened in fall 2017/spring 2018.

Local Accountability System

34

HB 22 establishes a local accountability system which allows districts and charter schools to develop a plan to locally evaluate their campuses. Once the plan receives approval from the agency, districts and charter schools may use locally developed domains and indicators in addition to the three domains to evaluate and assign A–F campus ratings.

Local Accountability System

35

- Districts must include the three domain performance ratings assigned by TEA (at least 50% of the overall rating).
- Locally developed domain or accountability measures must contain differentiated levels of performance, provide for the assignment of A–F grades, and be reliable and valid.
- Calculations for locally developed overall performance ratings, domains, and accountability measures must be capable of being audited.
- Districts must produce a campus score card that may be displayed on TEA's website.
- Districts must develop and make publicly available an explanation of the methodology used to assign ratings.

Local Accountability System

36

- Participating districts must submit a local accountability plan to TEA.
- The plan may be approved if
 - the agency determines the plan meets the minimum requirements,
 - an audit conducted by the agency verifies calculations included in the plan, and
 - a review panel approves the plan.
- The commissioner has authority to develop the process to approve requests by school districts or open-enrollment charter schools to assign campus performance ratings.
- An overall campus rating may only be assigned under a locally developed accountability system to campuses that were not assigned an overall rating of D or F by TEA.

From Here to August 2018

37

- Training of Trainers
 - Wednesday, August 30: 1:00–3:00
 - *Thursday, September 14: 1:00–3:00 (Tentative)*
 - Wednesday, September 27: 1:00–3:00
 - Wednesday, October 25: 1:00–3:00
- Continuing advisory group meetings—throughout 2017
- Commissioner visits to ESCs—throughout 2017
- Commissioner meets with superintendents—throughout 2017
- Administrative rule adoption (including a public comment period)—spring 2018

Engaging Stakeholders

38

Local Accountability System Pilot	Indicator Development and Domain Construction			
Volunteer Districts	ATAC	APAC	Regional ESCs	Community Leaders**
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application and Invitations: September 2017 • Monthly meetings in Austin starting October 2017 • Monthly meetings in Austin continuing until Spring 2019 • Application deadline for 2019–20 school year: Spring 2019 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six subcommittees meet monthly from August 2017 through November 2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student Achievement Domain ▪ School Progress Domain ▪ Closing the Gaps Domain ▪ Local Accountability ▪ Reporting Systems* ▪ Distinctions/Badges • September 2017: ATAC Meeting • November 2017: ATAC Meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four subcommittees meet monthly from September 2017 through November 2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student Achievement Domain ▪ School Progress Domain ▪ Closing the Gaps Domain ▪ Local Accountability ▪ Reporting Systems* • October 2017: APAC Meeting • December 2017: APAC Meeting 	<p>Three Training-of-trainers (ToT) Sessions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 2017: HB22 Overview/Student Achievement Domain • October 2017: School Progress Domain • November 2017: Closing the Gaps Domain 	<p>Three monthly meetings from September 2017 through November 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Achievement Domain • School Progress Domain • Closing the Gaps Domain • Reporting Systems

* The Reporting Systems subcommittee is a joint ATAC/APAC Meeting

**School Board Members, Chambers of Commerce, and Parents

Performance Reporting Resources and Contacts

39

- **2017 Accountability Manual**
<http://tea.texas.gov/2017accountabilitymanual.aspx>
- **Performance Reporting Resources**
<http://tea.texas.gov/perfreport/resources/index.html>
- **Performance Reporting Home Page**
<http://tea.texas.gov/accountability/>
- **Performance Reporting E-mail**
performance.reporting@tea.texas.gov
- **Performance Reporting Telephone**
(512) 463-9704