

Chapter 12

State Accountability Ratings: 2013 and Beyond

Overview of Statutory Requirements

Statute adopted during the 81st Legislative Session in 2009 in House Bill (HB) 3 , made significant changes to parts of Chapter 39, Public School System Accountability, in the Texas Education Code (TEC). These changes will shift the focus of the state accountability system from meeting satisfactory standards on the state assessments to meeting both satisfactory and college-ready standards on new STAAR assessments that are linked to postsecondary readiness. This section of the report addresses the new statutory requirements for rating districts and campuses beginning in 2013.

On or before August 8th of each year, the commissioner of education shall assign a rating to districts and campuses based on acceptable or unacceptable performance. However, if a district or campus received an unacceptable rating in the previous year, they will be notified by June 15th of an unacceptable rating for the current year.

Statute specifies the following indicators be used in determining accountability ratings:

- Student performance on the STAAR grades 3–8 and End-of-Course (EOC) assessments. This is measured against both student passing standards and college-readiness standards. Student progress is also factored in to allow more students to be included as meeting these standards.
- Dropout Rates (including district completion rates) for grades 9 through 12.
- High School Graduation Rates.

Additional features are available to improve the rating outcome. Some are required and one is optional. Statute specifies they be used for the assessment and dropout or district completion indicators. The high school graduation indicator is excluded from the additional features. These features are

- Required improvement over the prior year (required), or
- Average performance of the last three years (required), or
- Performance on 85 percent of the measures meets the standard (optional).

The following tables outline the indicators and features used in the 2011 rating system (Table 12-1), and the statutory requirements for the indicators and features for 2013 and beyond (Table 12-2).

Table 12-1: 2011 - Indicators and Features

Indicators of Student Achievement	1) Did Performance Meet Accountability Standard on up to 35 Measures ?	Additional Features		
		2) If not, did performance meet Required Improvement?	3) If not, does it meet standard by using Texas Projection Measure?*	4) If not, does it meet standard by using Exceptions Provision?
Met Satisfactory Standard for TAKS (3–11) Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science	For 5 Subjects and 5 Student Groups (25 Measures)	For 5 Subjects and 5 Student Groups	For 5 Subjects and 5 Student Groups	For 5 Subjects and 5 Student Groups
Met Commended Performance Standard for TAKS (3–11) ** Reading/ELA Mathematics	For 2 Subjects and 2 Student Groups (All Students and Economically Disadvantaged)	N/A	For 2 Subjects and 2 Student Groups (All Students and Economically Disadvantaged)	N/A
Met English Language Learner (ELL) Progress Criteria for TAKS (3–11) or TELPAS ** Reading/ELA English Version	For 1 Subject and 1 Student Group (Current and Monitored LEP Students)	For 1 Subject and 1 Student Group (Current and Monitored LEP Students)	To Be Determined	For 1 Subject and 1 Student Group (Current and Monitored LEP Students)
Annual Dropout Rates (gr. 7–8)	For 5 Student Groups (5 Measures)	For 5 Student Groups	N/A	N/A
Longitudinal Four-year Completion Rate (gr. 9–12)	For 5 Student Groups (5 Measures)	For 5 Student Groups	N/A	N/A

* As outlined in the July 8, 2010, correspondence from the commissioner, options for use of the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) in 2011 will be reviewed during the 2011 accountability development process in spring 2011.

** The Met Commended Performance and ELL Progress indicator standards must be met to achieve the *Recognized* and *Exemplary* ratings in 2011. These measures alone will not cause the district/campus to be rated *Academically Unacceptable*.

Table 12-2: 2013 and Beyond – Statutory Requirements for Indicators and Features

Indicators of Student Achievement		1) Did Performance Meet Accountability Standard on 45 Measures?	Additional Features		
			2) If not, did performance meet Required Improvement? §39.053(e)	3) If not, does 3-year average performance meet standard? §39.054(c)(2)	4) If not, does performance meet the standard on at least 85% of measures? §39.054(d)
§39.053 (c)(1)(A)(i)	<i>Met Satisfactory Standard for STAAR (3–8 and EOC) Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science</i>	For 5 Subjects and 5 Student Groups (25 Measures): Students who Met Standard <i>plus</i> Students who Met Student Progress for Satisfactory Standard <i>[Required by HB3 Effective 2013]</i>	For 5 Subjects and 5 Student Groups: Students who Met Standard <i>plus</i> Students who Met Student Progress for Satisfactory Standard <i>[Required by HB3 Effective 2013]</i>	For 5 Subjects and 5 Student Groups: Students who Met Standard <i>plus</i> Students who Met Student Progress for Satisfactory Standard <i>[Required by HB3 Effective TBD]</i>	For 5 Subjects and 5 Student Groups: Students who Met Standard <i>plus</i> Students who Met Student Progress for Satisfactory Standard <i>[Optional in HB3]</i>
§39.053 (c)(1)(A)(ii)	<i>Met Student Progress for Satisfactory Standard for STAAR (3–8 and EOC) Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science</i>				
§39.053 (c)(1)(B)(i)	<i>Met College Readiness Standard STAAR (3–8 and EOC) Reading/ELA Mathematics</i>	For 2 Subjects and 5 Student Groups (10 Measures): Students who Met College Readiness Standard <i>plus</i> Students who Met Student Progress for College Readiness Standard <i>[Required by HB3 Effective 2014]</i>	For 2 Subjects and 5 Student Groups: Students who Met College Readiness Standard <i>plus</i> Students who Met Student Progress for College Readiness Standard <i>[Required by HB3 Effective 2014]</i>	For 2 Subjects and 5 Student Groups: Students who Met College Readiness Standard <i>plus</i> Students who Met Student Progress for College Readiness Standard <i>[Required by HB3 Effective TBD]</i>	For 2 Subjects and 5 Student Groups: Students who Met College Readiness Standard <i>plus</i> Students who Met Student Progress for College Readiness Standard <i>[Optional in HB3]</i>
§39.053 (c)(1)(B)(ii)	<i>Met Student Progress for College Readiness Standard for STAAR (3–8 and EOC) Reading/ELA Mathematics</i>				
§39.053 (c)(2)	Dropout and District Completion Rates	For 5 Student Groups (5 Measures)	<i>Required by HB3 Effective 2013</i>	<i>Required by HB3 Effective 2013</i>	<i>Optional in HB3</i>
§39.053 (c)(3)	HS Graduation Rates	For 5 Student Groups (5 Measures)	Not Required by HB 3		

Decisions To Be Made

During the development of the new accountability system, the commissioner of education will rely extensively on the detailed review, study, and advice of educators, parents, and business and community leaders in establishing accountability criteria and setting standards. The following topics summarize a portion of the issues that will be explored with the advisory groups during the development process. Using the recommendations provided by advisory groups and public input, TEC §39.054(a) specifies that the commissioner ultimately shall determine how to assign ratings.

Satisfactory Standard and Annual Improvement. TEC §39.053(c)(1)(A) requires that the performance rating be based on the percentage of students who passed the assessment in addition to students who meet student progress requirements for the satisfactory standard. The commissioner will determine the required satisfactory standard beginning with the performance ratings assigned in 2013.

College-Ready Standard and Annual Improvement. TEC §39.053(c)(1)(B) requires that the performance rating also be based on the percentage of students who meet the college readiness standard in addition to students who meet student progress requirements for the college readiness standard. The commissioner will determine the required college ready standard beginning with the performance ratings assigned in 2014.

Dropout, Completion, and/or Graduation Rate. TEC §39.053(c)(2) specifies the use of dropout rates for grades 9–12 and district completion rate, then follows with a requirement in (c)(3) for high school graduation rates. This part of statute is the same as existed in prior statute. The commissioner shall consider indicators used formerly as well as new data to determine how to implement this requirement.

Additional Features: Required Improvement. TEC §39.053(c) requires that the performance on the assessments and dropouts (but not high school graduation rate) “be compared to... required improvement.” This language is similar to the required improvement language in prior statute. The commissioner shall determine how to apply required improvement to the indicators and whether to also apply it to the high school graduation indicator.

Additional Features: Three-Year Average Performance. In cases where the acceptable performance on the assessments and dropouts is not met, TEC §39.054(c) requires that the commissioner average the performance on the current year and the preceding two years to see if that meets the acceptable standard. The commissioner shall determine how to apply a three-year average to the indicators, and whether to also apply it to the high school graduation indicator. The commissioner will also determine how to phase in use of the feature since three years of comparable results will not be available for all of the indicators in the first year that ratings are assigned.

Additional Features: Meeting Standard on 85 Percent of Measures. TEC §39.054(d) allows the commissioner to accept satisfactory performance on 85 percent of the assessments and dropout measures. The commissioner shall determine how to apply the 85 percent provision to the

indicators, and whether to also apply it to the high school graduation indicator. TEC §39.054(d-1) allows the commissioner to consider alternative performance criteria for districts and campuses with student groups that are substantially similar in composition to all students on the same district or campus.

Additional Features: Order of Use. The sequential priority assigned to the three additional features is not specified in statute and will be determined during the accountability development process.

Use of Other Assessments to Meet Cumulative Score Requirements. If a student's satisfactory performance on advanced placement, international baccalaureate, or SAT subject area test or other test equal in rigor to a STAAR EOC test is used to meet the cumulative score requirements for graduation, the commissioner will determine whether these results will be factored in the assessment results used for state accountability.

Student Groups: Race/Ethnicity. The new accountability rating system will be based on the new federal race/ethnicity definitions that were collected in PEIMS for the first time in the 2009–2010 school year. Accountability advisory groups will recommend possible changes to the accountability race/ethnicity student groups to be evaluated for 2013 and beyond. Some alternatives include:

- Report all seven categories and use any or all of the seven for which minimum size criteria are met.
- Report all seven categories and use the three largest groups that meet minimum size criteria for any campus or district. (Districts and campuses would be evaluated on different race / ethnicity student groups, up to three total.)
- Evaluate the current student groups (African American, Hispanic / Latino, and White) if minimum size criteria are met and collapse all other categories—Asian, Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander, Native Indian/Alaska Native, and Two or More Races—into an “Other” category and evaluate as a fourth group if minimum size criteria are met.

Student Groups: Minimum Size Criteria. In order to ensure the validity of the measures evaluated, student groups must meet a minimum size criterion that will be determined during the accountability development process.

Alignment between State and Federal Accountability Requirements. As discussed in section two of this report, the accountability development process will explore options that will maximize the alignment between the state and federal accountability requirements.

Assignment of Rating Labels

According to statutory changes in HB 3, the assignment of accountability ratings can proceed in one of two ways, either as A) four rating categories, or as B) only two ratings —“Acceptable” and “Unacceptable”— with additional distinction ratings, e.g., “Acceptable with Recognized Distinction.”

An option of assigning four ratings is illustrated in Table 12-3, and a second option that assigns two ratings is shown in Table 12-4. Both tables include a comparison to the rating labels assigned in 2011 and a comparison of the possible ratings to be assigned in 2013 and 2014, since 2014 is the first year that college readiness standards are required to be evaluated.

Table 12-3: Option A—Four Rating Categories (Campuses and Districts)

2011	2012	2013		2014 and Beyond		
Academically Unacceptable	No Ratings Assigned	Did Not Meet Standards	"Unacceptable"	Did Not Meet Standards	"Unacceptable"	
Academically Acceptable		Met Satisfactory/Student Progress Standards on STAAR and Met Dropout, Completion, Graduation Standards*	"Acceptable"	Met Satisfactory/Student Progress Standards on STAAR and Met Dropout, Completion, Graduation Standards *	Met College Readiness/Student Progress Standard on STAAR*	"Acceptable"
Recognized		N/A	Met Higher College Readiness/Student Progress Standard on STAAR**		"Recognized"	
Exemplary		N/A	Met Highest College Readiness/Student Progress Standard on STAAR**	"Exemplary"		

* To attain "Acceptable" rating, campuses and districts also use Additional Features (i.e. required improvement, three-year averaging, and 85 percent provision).

** Statute allows for other factors to be used to determine sufficient student attainment of postsecondary readiness.

Table 12-4: Option B – Two Rating Categories (Campuses and Districts)

2011	2012	2013		2014 and beyond	
Academically Unacceptable	No Ratings Assigned	Did Not Meet Standards	"Unacceptable"	Did Not Meet Standards	"Unacceptable"
Academically Acceptable		Met Satisfactory/ Student Progress Standards on STAAR, and Met Dropout, Completion, Graduation Standards*	"Acceptable"	Met Satisfactory/ Student Progress and Met College Readiness/ Student Progress Standards on STAAR, and Met Dropout, Completion, Graduation Standards*	"Acceptable"***
Recognized					
Exemplary					

* To attain "Acceptable" rating, campuses and districts also use Additional Features (i.e. required improvement, three-year averaging, and 85 percent provision).

** Beginning in 2014, districts and campuses that achieved an "Acceptable" rating would be eligible for an additional distinction rating based on meeting a higher college readiness standard, e.g. "Acceptable with Recognized Distinction" or the highest college readiness standard, e.g. "Acceptable with Exemplary Distinction."

Decisions To Be Made

Two Ratings vs. Four Ratings. The commissioner shall determine whether to assign four ratings or only two primary ratings with the possibility of one of two additional rating distinctions.

Rating Labels. TEC §39.053 and §39.054 refer to "acceptable/unacceptable" and "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" performance. The commissioner shall determine the labels for these two rating categories.

Initial Rating Release in 2013. TEC §39.054 requires campus and district performance ratings to be issued by August 8 each year and campuses and districts with repeated unacceptable ratings to be notified by June 15 each year. The June 15 notification requirement may not be possible in the initial rating cycle in 2013, since final standards and criteria may not be able to be adopted in commissioner rule by June 15, 2013.

Early Indicator Reports. During the development of the new accountability system, advisory groups will determine whether early indicator reports can be made available to districts and campuses

based on the 2011–2012 STAAR results. These reports would allow districts to identify areas of performance that may need strengthening prior to release of ratings under the new system.

Assignment of Rating Standards

TEC §39.053(f) requires that the commissioner annually define the state standard for the current school year for student achievement indicators and also project the state standards for each indicator for the following two school years. It is anticipated that advisory groups will recommend standards to the commissioner annually. The commissioner will announce his decisions as early as possible and standards will be adopted as commissioner rule.

As outlined in Table 12-5, the 2013 accountability standards for the acceptable performance rating will not be finalized until 2013—the standards will be set in spring 2013 after the advisory group has reviewed the STAAR grade 3–8 results with the assigned student passing standards. At that time, the 2014 and 2015 accountability standards for the acceptable performance rating will be projected. If it is necessary to make adjustments to the projected standards for 2014, the commissioner will release final decisions on the 2014 accountability standards for the acceptable performance rating based on the recommendations of advisory groups in spring 2014. Since two years of results will be available in 2014, the commissioner can also set the final 2015 standards for the acceptable performance rating and project the standards for 2016. This will provide districts with more than one year advance notice of the 2015 standards.

TEC §39.053(f) also directs the commissioner to raise the state standard for the percent college-ready indicator so that Texas ranks in the top ten among states nationally by 2019–2020 on two measures—the percent college-ready and the percent graduating under the recommended or advanced high school program, with no gaps by race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status.

Table 12-5: HB3—Determination of Rating Standards for Acceptable/Unacceptable Performance

A single standard will be established for a combined indicator of meeting satisfactory or meeting student progress requirements.

Indicators of Student Achievement		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
§39.053 (c)(1)(A)(i)	<i>Met Satisfactory Standard for STAAR (3–8 and EOC) Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science</i>	2013 standards are set and applied in 2013	2014 standards are set and applied in 2014	2015 standards are applied	2016 standards are applied	2017 standards are applied	2018 standards are applied	2019 standards are applied	2020 standards are applied
§39.053 (c)(1)(A)(ii)	<i>Met Student Progress for Satisfactory Standard for STAAR (3–8 and EOC) Reading/ELA Writing Mathematics Social Studies Science</i>		2014 and 2015 standards are projected	2015 standards are set and applied in 2015	2016 standards are projected	2017 standards are set and applied in 2016	2018 standards are set and applied in 2017	2019 standards are set and applied in 2018	2020 standards are set and applied in 2019
§39.053 (c)(1)(B)(i)	<i>Met College Readiness Standard for STAAR (3–8 and EOC) Reading/ELA Mathematics</i>	2014 and 2015 standards are projected	Standards and projections will be set on same schedule as STAAR Satisfactory Standards						
§39.053 (c)(1)(B)(ii)	<i>Met Student Progress for College Readiness Standard for STAAR (3–8 and EOC) Reading/ELA Mathematics</i>		Standards continue to increment to achieve the following goals by 2019–2020*: 1) Texas ranks in top ten among states in college-readiness measures; and, 2) There are no significant achievement gaps among student groups.						
§39.053 (c)(2)	Dropout and District Completion Rates	Standards and projections will be set on same schedule as STAAR Satisfactory Standards							
§39.053 (c)(3)	HS Graduation Rates	Standards and projections will be set on same schedule as STAAR Satisfactory Standards							

* This requirement, specified in §39.053 (f), only applies to the Met College Readiness Standard, not the Met Student Progress for College Readiness Standard.

Decisions To Be Made

Defining Criteria for Top Ten Status. Statute does not define the criteria to be used to compare performance nationally on college-ready measures. The commissioner will determine criteria to determine valid comparisons in these measures among all fifty states.

Defining Criteria for No Significant Achievement Gaps. Statute does not define the criteria to determine if there are no significant achievement gaps among the student groups. The commissioner will determine criteria used to determine if there are no significant achievement gaps by 2020.

Incremental Standards only Apply to Acceptable/Unacceptable Status. Statute requires that the increased standards are applied to the college-ready measure used to determine the acceptable/unacceptable performance ratings. Statute does not apply the increasing college-ready standards to the distinction designation ratings of Recognized and Exemplary.

Incremental Standards only Apply to the Met College Readiness Standard. Statute specifies that the increased standards only apply to the Met College Readiness Standard, not Met Student Progress for College Readiness Standard. Advisory groups will explore options for setting the appropriate standard to achieve the top ten states goal based on performance on the college readiness indicator that does not include the results of student progress toward the college readiness standard.

Additional Assessments based on College Readiness. Since college readiness standards will be initially set on reading/English language arts and mathematics, additional subject areas will be incorporated in future years if college readiness standards are applied to these assessments.

Assessments Used for State Accountability

TEC §39.053(c) requires the use of assessments under §39.023(a), (c), and (l) in determining acceptable and unacceptable performance. However, TEC §39.202(1) requires the use of assessments under §39.023(a), (b), (c), and (l) in determining ratings of recognized and exemplary. This creates a discrepancy in the inclusion of performance on alternate assessments, as mandated in §39.023(b). See Table 12-6 for a comparison of the use of these assessments.

Table 12-6: Assessments Required by HB 3 for Ratings

	Rating of <i>Acceptable/Unacceptable</i> §39.053 and 39.054	Distinction Rating of <i>Recognized or Exemplary</i> §39.202
STAAR (grades 3–8) TEC §39.023(a) and (l) - Reading (3,4,5,6,7,8) - Mathematics (3,4,5,6,7,8) - Writing (4,7) - Science (5,8) - Social Studies (8)	Required	Required
STAAR (End of Course) TEC §39.023(c) - Mathematics (Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry) - Science (Biology, Chemistry, Physics) - ELA (English I, II, and III) - Social Studies (World Geography, World History, U. S. History)	Required	Required
STAAR (grades 3–8 and EOC) TEC §39.023(b) Modified Assessments - All Subjects	Not Required	Required
STAAR (grades 3–8 and EOC) TEC §39.023(b) Alternate Assessments - All Subjects	Not Required	Required
STAAR Linguistically Accommodated Testing (LAT) - All Subjects	Not Required	Not Required
TELPAS TEC §39.027(e)	Not Required	Not Required

Decisions To Be Made

Modified and Alternate Assessments. In 2011, the TAKS–M and TAKS–Alt assessments were included in the base indicator used for the state accountability ratings. The commissioner shall determine how the modified and alternate assessments for STAAR will be used to determine all ratings.

Assessments for English Language Learners. In 2011, the ELL Progress Measure was incorporated in the state accountability system to evaluate progress towards reading proficiency in English for current and monitored LEP students. The commissioner shall determine how the STAAR and TELPAS assessment results for ELLs will be used to determine ratings in the new accountability system.

Other Accountability Requirements

Campuses With Additional Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) Requirements. HB 3 continues to require identification of campuses meeting current year standards for acceptable performance that do not meet accountability standards for the subsequent year. As described in Section VII of this report, these campuses are subject to additional campus improvement plan (CIP) requirements. After final appeal decisions are made for the 2011 ratings in October 2011, the list of campuses with additional CIP requirements will be released for the 2011–2012 school year. Since there are no ratings assigned in the 2011–2012 school year and the ratings criteria will not be finalized until spring 2013, it will not be possible to identify these campuses for the 2012–2013 school year. After the initial performance ratings of the new accountability system are finalized in fall 2013, the list of campuses with additional CIP requirements will be released for the 2013–2014 school year.

Public Education Grant (PEG) Campuses. TEC, Chapter 29, Subchapter G, §§29.201–29.205, requires that TEA identify campuses at which 50 percent or more of the students did not pass the state assessments in any two of the preceding three years or did not meet standards for acceptable performance in any of the three preceding years. Statute also requires that notification of eligibility be provided no later than February 1 to each parent of a student in the district assigned to attend a school identified on the PEG list for the upcoming school year.

The following table outlines the PEG identification criteria for the 2011–2012 through the 2016–2017 school years. Since the PEG criteria lag up to three years behind the current year, it will be possible to identify campuses that meet the statutory criteria during each of these years.

2011–2012 Identification Criteria	TAKS passing rate <= 50% in <u>two of the three</u> preceding years (2008, 2009, 2010) OR rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> in 2008, 2009, or 2010.
2012–2013 Identification Criteria	TAKS passing rate <= 50% in <u>two of the three</u> preceding years (2009, 2010, 2011) OR rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> in 2009, 2010, or 2011.
2013–2014 Identification Criteria	TAKS/STAAR passing rate <= 50% in <u>two of the three</u> preceding years (TAKS: 2010, 2011, STAAR: 2012) OR rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> in 2010 or 2011.
2014–2015 Identification Criteria	TAKS/STAAR passing rate <= 50% in <u>two of the three</u> preceding years (TAKS: 2011, STAAR: 2012, 2013) OR rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> in 2011 or 2013.
2015–2016 Identification Criteria	STAAR passing rate <= 50% in <u>two of the three</u> preceding years (STAAR: 2012, 2013, 2014) OR rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> in 2013 or 2014.
2016–2017 Identification Criteria	STAAR passing rate <= 50% in <u>two of the three</u> preceding years (STAAR: 2013, 2014, 2015) OR rated <i>Academically Unacceptable</i> in 2013, 2014, or 2015.

Decisions To Be Made

PEG Methodology. Since the PEG identification criteria are prescribed in statute and are applied to the prior three school years, a number of issues will be addressed during the accountability development process. For example, it is anticipated that a large number of campuses will be identified

for PEG in the initial years of the STAAR program when the 50 percent passing criteria are applied to the STAAR results. Other issues include development of a methodology that combines TAKS and STAAR results during the transition years.

Stakeholder Advice

In developing the previous state accountability systems, the commissioner and the TEA have depended on the annual advice and guidance of advisory committees. These have been comprised of education leaders, business leaders, parents, community members, educator organizations, and legislative staff. Further, public input has been sought on the recommendations from the advisory groups.

Advisory groups will also be used during the development of the new accountability system and will meet at least five times from 2011 to 2013 to assist staff and provide recommendations to the commissioner in developing the new system. These advisory groups will continue to meet annually after 2013.

Rulemaking Process

Texas Education Code provides the commissioner of education with rulemaking authority. The following references, which deal specifically with accountability, will be addressed in the *2013 Accountability Manual*, key parts of which will be adopted by rule by summer 2013:

- §39.053(i) The commissioner by rule shall adopt accountability measures to be used in assessing the progress of students who have failed to perform satisfactorily as determined by the commissioner under Section 39.0241(a) or under the college readiness standard as determined under Section 39.0241 in the preceding school year on an assessment instrument required under Section 39.023(a), (c), or (l).
- §39.054 (a) The commissioner shall adopt rules to evaluate school district and campus performance and, not later than August 8 of each year, assign each district and campus a performance rating that reflects acceptable performance or unacceptable performance. If a district or campus received a performance rating of unacceptable performance for the preceding school year, the commissioner shall notify the district of a subsequent such designation on or before June 15.
- §39.151(a) The commissioner by rule shall provide a process for a school district or open-enrollment charter school to challenge an agency decision made under this chapter relating to an academic or financial accountability rating that affects the district or school.
- §39.151(b) The rules under Subsection (a) must provide for the commissioner to appoint a committee to make recommendations to the commissioner on a challenge made to an agency decision relating to an academic performance rating or determination or financial

accountability rating. The commissioner may not appoint an agency employee as a member of the committee.

Timeline for Development of Accountability System

TEA has already begun the process of developing a new state accountability system for Texas, based on the legislative mandates in HB 3. This section of the report presents a timeline of the work on state accountability for Texas public schools. Other events related to distinction designations and performance reporting are addressed in separate timelines.

2011	This year will focus primarily on the final year of the current accountability system. Staff will continue work on the new system for 2013. Activities related to the development of the system for 2013 and beyond are noted to the right as "HB 3."	2011 or HB 3
January – February	TEA staff continues analysis of available data in preparation for advisory meetings to finalize the 2011 accountability system.	2011
Early March	Educator Focus Group on Accountability meets to review and make recommendations for 2011 accountability. Focus group will also review transition plan requirements for 2012 and beyond.	Both
March	Work begins on identifying and selecting members for the HB 3 advisory committee.	HB 3
Late March	The Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee (CAAC) meets to review and comment on the recommendations for the 2011 accountability system.	2011
Early April	The Commissioner of Education releases final decisions for the 2011 accountability system.	2011
Mid-May	Rulemaking process begins to have key chapters of the <i>2011 Accountability Manual</i> adopted as part of Texas Administrative Code.	2011
June	Class of 2010 completion data and 2009–2010 dropout data are available to districts.	2011
July 29	Ratings are released for last time under current system.	2011
August	Appeal window closes, each appeal is researched.	2011
September	Appeals panel meets to consider all appeals.	2011
September	Staff analyzes available data and compiles materials for first HB 3 Advisory Group meeting.	HB 3
Mid-October	The commissioner considers all appeals and makes final decisions. Final ratings for 2011 are released.	2011
Late October	Initial HB 3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members receive a HB 3 orientation and review guidance for framework of new system. • Review options for HB 3 early indicator reports. 	HB 3
November	List of Campuses with Additional CIP Requirements released	2011
Late November	Standards set for STAAR EOC assessments. Work begins on Early Indicator Reports.	HB 3

2012	2012 will be devoted to development of the new accountability system.
January	TEA staff analyzes EOC performance data.
February	Second HB3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First opportunity to provide data analyses of EOC data; • Review options for accountability and finalize framework; • Review options for graduation/completion/dropout rate indicators.
May/June	Third HB3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of additional features; • Finalize recommendations on indicators; • Review further analyses of 2011 EOC results.
June	Class of 2011 completion rates available, with HB3 exclusions on one year of cohort.
September	Modeling can start with partial results: EOC from 2012 is available with standards; STAAR 3–8 is also available from 2012, but with no standards applied.
October	Fourth HB3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review distinction designation indicators; • Analyze various accountability standards based on modeling of 2012 EOC and grades 3–8 results (prior to standard setting).
December	Standards for STAAR 3–8 are available. Modeling and analysis begins.

2013	Year of new ratings release.
February	Fifth HB3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize recommendations on 2013 accountability standards based on modeling of 2012 EOC and grades 3–8 results (with standards); • Finalize recommendations on 2013 system features • Finalize recommendations on projected standards for 2014 and 2015
March	Commissioner releases final decisions for 2013 Ratings
March	Rulemaking process begins to have standards and procedures for the 2013 accountability system adopted as part of Texas Administrative Code.
April/May	Key chapters of <i>2013 Accountability Manual</i> released.
Early June	Confidential completion and dropout data released to districts.
June 15	If possible, notification reports will be issued to districts for campuses rated as AU in 2011 that are anticipated to be rated as “unacceptable” in 2013.
August 8	Release of district and campus performance ratings based on percent proficient indicator. Distinction designations are assigned to campuses.
Early September	Appeals window closes
Late September	Appeals Panel meets to consider appeals
Early October	Commissioner determines final ratings; ratings updated.
Late October	List of Campuses with Additional CIP Requirements released

2014	2014 will have additions to the accountability system.
February/March	Annual meeting of HB3 advisory committee meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review 2013 system; • Finalize recommendations on 2014 accountability standards; • Review and finalize 2014 system features; • Finalize recommendations on 2015 accountability standards; • Finalize recommendations on projected standards for 2016.
March/April	Commissioner releases final decisions for 2014 Ratings
April/May	Key chapters of <i>2014 Accountability Manual</i> released.
Early June	Confidential completion and dropout data released to districts.
June 15	Notification reports issued to districts for campuses rated as "unacceptable" in 2013 that are anticipated to be rated as "unacceptable" in 2014.
August 8	Release of district and campus performance ratings based on percent proficient and percent college-ready indicators. Distinction designations are assigned to districts and campuses.
Early September	Appeals window closes
Late September	Appeals Panel meets to consider appeals
Early October	Commissioner determines final ratings; ratings updated.
Late October	List of Campuses with Additional CIP Requirements released

