

State and Federal Accountability Update

TETN | June 14, 2012

Texas Education Agency | Office of Assessment and Accountability
Division of Performance Reporting
Shannon Housson and Ester Regalado

2012 Federal Accountability

2012 AYP: Standards & Targets

3

- Reading/English Language Arts (STAAR and TAKS)
 - 87% in Reading/English language arts
 - Participation: 95% Rate
- Mathematics (STAAR and TAKS)
 - Performance: 83% Proficiency Rate
 - Participation: 95% Rate
- Other Indicator
 - Secondary Schools:
75% Graduation Rate (for every student group)
 - Elementary/Middle/Junior High Schools:
90% Attendance Rate (All Students only)

2012 AYP: Proficiency Rate

4

- **AYP Proficiency Rate:**

**Students who Met the Passing Standard
(subject to the 1% and 2% caps)**

Total Number of Students Tested

- Performance Rate is compared to the 2012 AYP Targets of:
 - 87% in Reading/English Language Arts and
 - 83% in Mathematics

2012 AYP: Performance Standards

5

Enrolled Grades	Assessment	Performance Standard Planned for AYP Calculations
Grades 3-8	STAAR (English & Spanish) reading and mathematics*	Bridged to TAKS <i>Met Standard</i>
	STAAR Modified reading and mathematics	Bridged to TAKS-Modified <i>Met Standard</i>
	STAAR Alternate reading and mathematics	Bridged to TAKS-Alt <i>Met Standard</i>
	STAAR EOC English I reading and Algebra I*	Bridged to TAKS <i>Met Standard</i> for grade 9 reading and mathematics
	STAAR Modified EOC English I reading and Algebra I	<i>No Standard Available</i> – performance results not included in AYP. Students counted as participants only.
	STAAR EOC English II reading, Geometry and Algebra II*	STAAR <i>Phase-in Standard</i> **
	STAAR Modified EOC English II reading and Geometry	Not operational / results not included in AYP

* Includes linguistically accommodated assessments, where applicable.

** A small number of students in middle school grades enrolled in high school courses are required to meet the STAAR phase-in standard to satisfy their End-of-Course testing requirements for graduation.

2012 AYP: Performance Standards

6

Enrolled Grades	Assessment	Performance Standard Planned for AYP Calculations
Grade 10	TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) ELA and mathematics*	TAKS <i>Met Standard</i>
	TAKS-Modified ELA and mathematics*	TAKS-Modified <i>Met Standard</i>
	STAAR Alternate EOC English I and Algebra I	Bridged to TAKS-Alt <i>Met Standard</i> for grade 9 reading and mathematics
	STAAR Alternate EOC English II and Geometry	Bridged to TAKS-Alt <i>Met Standard</i> for grade 10 reading and mathematics

* Includes linguistically accommodated assessments, where applicable

2012 AYP: Performance Standards

7

- **AYP Performance Improvement/Safe Harbor**
 - Meet the performance requirement:

2012 AYP Proficiency Rate:	MINUS	2011 AYP Proficiency Rate:	=	CHANGE
Students who Met the Passing Standard (subject to the 1% and 2% caps)		Students who Met the Passing Standard (subject to the 1% and 2% caps)		Must meet the 10 percent decrease from the prior year in percentage of students counted as not proficient.
Total Number of Students Tested		Total Number of Students Tested		

- AND must meet the Other Indicator requirement

2012 AYP: Performance Standards

8

- Performance: 10% decrease in percent not passing plus
 - met the absolute standard for the Other Indicator, or
 - achieve the required improvement on the Other Indicator
- Participation: Two-year average rate of 95%
- Other Indicator:
 - Elementary/Middle/Junior High Schools:
Increase in Attendance Rate from previous year.
 - Secondary Schools: Graduation Rate

2012 AYP: Graduation Rate

9

Beginning with 2012 AYP, student groups will be evaluated. The minimum size requirement is the same as in past years: 50 / 10.0% / 200.

The graduation rate calculations include five alternatives for districts and campuses to meet the required goal and targets pending USDE approval:

- 4-year longitudinal Annual Graduation Rate Goal of 90.0%.
- 5-year longitudinal Annual Graduation Rate Target of 80.0%.

2012 AYP: Graduation Rate Alternatives

10

- 4-year Annual Graduation Rate Target of 75.0%
- 4-year Graduation Rate Alternatives:
 - **Safe Harbor Target**
A 10.0 percent decrease in difference between the prior year 4-year Graduation Rate and the 90.0 percent statewide goal
 - **Improvement Target**
A 1.0 percent increase from the prior year 4-year Graduation Rate

2012 AYP Timeline

2012 AYP Timeline

12

Tuesday May 22, 2012	Campus Priority List for the 2% Federal Cap available online (TEASE)
June	Expected USDE approval of requested amendments to the 2012 Texas AYP Workbook. Texas has tentative approval of 2012 calculation.
June	2012 AYP Guide released
Tuesday, July 10, 2012	Deadline for Campus Priority List for the 2% Federal Cap
July 31, 2012	TEASE release of Preliminary 2012 AYP Data Tables <i>without</i> AYP/SIP labels for all districts and campuses

2012 AYP Timeline

13

Wednesday August 8, 2012	Public release of Preliminary 2012 AYP/SIP statuses for all districts and campuses
Sept. 7, 2012	Appeals and Federal Cap Exceptions Deadline
December	Final 2012 AYP Status released Preview of NCLB School Report Card data (Part I only)
January, 2013	Public release of the 2011-12 NCLB Report Card

2012 Reporting

14

- Class of 2011 graduation/completion/dropout data and 2010-2011 annual dropout data will be released to districts on TEASE on Thursday, June 28. *(Summary data will include rates with and without statutory exclusions.)*
- AEIS Reports (without STAAR results) will be released in November 2012.
- School Report Cards will not be released in 2012.

2013 Accountability Development

2013 Accountability Development

16

- In 2009, the Texas Legislature passed HB3, mandating the creation of an entirely new accountability system for 2013.
- TEA produced a plan for implementing these changes in the *Transition Plan for House Bill 3*, published in December 2010.
- In 2012, TEA began working with advisory committees of educators and others to develop a new accountability system.

2013 Accountability Development

17

Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC)

- In October 2011, the commissioner asked superintendents and ESC directors to submit nominations for educators to serve on the ATAC.
- 156 nominations were received, 27 members were selected for the ATAC. The ATAC membership is online at:
<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/atac.html>
- Since March, work groups of ATAC members have met to discuss, research, and propose solutions to key issues.
- The ATAC and its work groups will continue to meet into 2013.

2013 Accountability Development

18

Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC)

- In October 2011, the commissioner requested nominations from educator organizations, business organizations, and educational service centers for the APAC.
- Twenty-nine members were selected for the APAC, representing various educational and business organizations and legislative offices. The APAC membership is online at:
<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/apac.pdf>

2013: Advisory Committees

19

APAC and ATAC Meeting Outcomes

- A summary of meeting outcomes for the joint APAC/ATAC meeting from March 2012 is posted online at:
<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/materials.html>
- A summary of meeting outcomes for the May 2012 ATAC meeting will be posted at the same link during the week of June 18.

2013: Goals and Guiding Principles

20

- At the initial meeting in March 2012, APAC and ATAC members defined the Goals and Guiding Principles for the new accountability system.
- The committees endorsed five primary goals that will ensure that Texas will be among the top ten states in postsecondary readiness by 2020, as delineated in Chapter 39.053(f) of the Texas Education Code.
- The committees also adopted a set of Guiding Principles that will be used to inform the accountability development process.

2013 Accountability Goals

21

- 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 level gaps among groups.
- Closing gaps among groups in the percentage of students graduating under the recommended high school program and advanced high school program.
- Rewarding excellence based on other indicators in addition to state assessment results.

2013 Accountability Guiding Principles

22

■ **Student Performance**

- The system is first and foremost designed to improve student performance.
- The system focuses on preparing students from the elementary grades and above for success after high school.

■ **System Safeguards**

- The system uses safeguards to minimize unintended consequences.

2013 Accountability Guiding Principles

23

■ **Recognition of Diversity**

- The system is fair and addresses the diversity of student populations and educational settings.

■ **Public Participation and Accessibility**

- The system's development and implementation are informed by advice from Texas educators and the public.
- The system is understandable and provides performance results that are relevant, meaningful, and easily accessible.

2013 Accountability Guiding Principles

24

■ **Coordination**

- The system is part of an overall coordinated strategy for state and federal ratings, reporting, monitoring, and interventions.

■ **Statutory Compliance**

- The system is designed to comply with statutory requirements.

2013 Accountability Guiding Principles

25

■ **Local Responsibility**

- Districts are responsible for submitting accurate data upon which ratings are based.
- The system relies on local school districts to develop and implement local accountability systems that complement the state system.

■ **Distinction Designations**

- Recognized and exemplary distinction ratings are based on higher levels of student performance rather than more students performing at the satisfactory level.

Options for New Accountability Framework

26

- **Separate Indicators (all or nothing)**
 - System used in past accountability systems.
 - Requires districts and schools to meet the standard for every indicator to achieve a certain rating.
 - In 2011, districts and schools had to meet a standard for up to 35 separate indicators.
 - With HB3 the possible indicators increases to 100.
- **Performance Index**
 - Districts and campuses are required to meet an index, or accountability target.
 - Each indicator contributes points to the index score.
 - A Performance Index system is used in many states.

Options for New Accountability Framework

27

■ Performance Index (continued)

- Contains multiple measures each contributing points to an “index” score.
- Performance on all measures is included, but stronger performance in some areas can compensate for weaker performance in other areas.
- Resulting rating reflects overall performance rather than the weakest areas.
- Any number of indicators and student groups can be added to the system without creating additional targets for campuses and districts to meet.

Proposal for Accountability Framework

28

- Four performance indexes are directly aligned with the accountability system Goals and Guiding Principles:
 - Performance Index 1 focuses on student achievement for All Students and participation by race/ethnicity.
 - Performance Index 2 focuses on student progress by race/ethnicity.
 - Performance Index 3 focuses on closing performance gaps between high- and low-performing students.
 - Performance Index 4 focuses on measures of postsecondary readiness and includes a measure for elementary/middle schools in developing the rigor necessary for high school students to successfully meet graduation standards.

Proposal for Accountability Framework

29

- The committee members developed the proposed framework to meet the requirements of House Bill (HB) 3. They also developed their proposal based on their belief that the new accountability system should:
 - Improve student performance for every child;
 - Direct resources for improvement;
 - Be comprehensive in nature;
 - Focus on narrowing the performance gap between historically disadvantaged and advantaged students; and
 - Measure indicators that move a school/district toward higher performance.

Proposal for Accountability Framework

30

- The indicators that will comprise the four indexes have not been determined. Indicators will be reviewed and discussed by ATAC workgroups to address the following topics:
 - End-of-course (EOC);
 - Progress Measures;
 - English language learners (ELLs);
 - Alternative education settings; and
 - Recognized and Exemplary Distinction Designations.

Input on Proposed Framework

31

- Educators are invited to comment on proposals made by the advisory groups.
- The proposed Performance Index framework is posted online for educator review and comment at the 2013 Accountability Development page:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/index.html>

- Click on the Proposals link, scroll to the bottom of the page, and click on the Comments link.
- This page will be posted online on June 14, 2012.

2013: Calendar

32

- The Comprehensive Meeting Calendar posted at the link below outlines the timeline for the various topics to be considered by the APAC and ATAC groups.

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/materials.html>

2013: HB 3 Transition Summary

33

Transition Plan Charts and Tables

- Details about the transition plans for the new accountability system for 2013, 2014, and 2015 are available from the March 2012 meeting materials.

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/materials.html>

- A summary of the HB 3 legislative requirements are also available in the Reference Materials at the 2013 Accountability Development page.

[http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/reference/lege interpretation.pdf](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/reference/lege_interpretation.pdf)

2013 and 2014 Accountability - Summary

34

		2013	2014
<i>Acceptable/ Unacceptable*</i> (Campuses & Districts)	STAAR Level II Performance	✓	✓
	STAAR Level III Performance	✗	TBD
	STAAR Growth Measures	✗	TBD
	Improvement Feature	TBD	✓
	Release Date Deadline	8/8	8/8
Distinction Designations for <i>Recognized & Exemplary</i> (Campuses & Districts)	STAAR Level III Performance	Not Awarded	✓
	STAAR Growth Measures		TBD
	Release Date Deadline		8/8

* Labels to be determined.

2013 and 2014 Accountability - Summary

35

		2013	2014
Distinction Designations for Top 25% in: <i>Student Growth</i> <i>Closing Gaps</i> (Campuses Only)	STAAR Level III Performance	Not Awarded	✓
	STAAR Growth Measures		TBD
	Release Date Deadline		8/8
Distinction Designations for Academic Achievement (1 of 5 committees) (Campuses Only)	STAAR Level III Performance (Grades 3-8) Reading/ELA & Mathematics Only	✓	✓
	STAAR Growth Measures	✗	TBD
	Other College-Readiness HS Indicators Reading/ELA & Mathematics Only	✓	✓
	Release Date Deadline	8/8	8/8

Academic Achievement Distinction Designations

Academic Achievement Distinction Designations Committee (AADDC)

37

- As mandated by statute, nominations for the distinction designations were provided by the governor, lieutenant governor, and speaker of the house of representatives.
- The AADDC first met on April 16 and will reconvene on June 25.
- The AADDC is charged with the development of the criteria for the campus-level academic achievement distinction designations to recognize outstanding academic achievement in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Their recommendations will include indicators, standards, additional features, and options for distinction labels.
- Academic achievement distinction designations will be awarded on August 8, 2013.

Academic Achievement Distinction Designations Committee (AADDC)

38

- At the April meeting, the AADDC reviewed agency research on the academic education literature of possible indicators of high achievement in ELA and mathematics.
- The AADDC also reviewed other state accountability systems and national award systems that identify and reward academic excellence.
- The committee also proposed additional indicators that will be reviewed at the next meeting in June.

Academic Achievement Distinction Designations Committee (AADDC)

39

Academic Achievement Distinction Designations

- A summary of the April AADDC meeting outcomes is posted online at:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/materials.html>

TETN Accountability Update Session

40

Next TETN Session and Tentative Agenda Topics

- Friday, September 21, 2012 (10 a.m. to noon)
 - Review of 2012 AYP Release
 - Review of 2012 AEIS Reports
 - Update on 2013 State Accountability Development
 - Update on Academic Achievement Distinction Designations

Resources

41

- **2013 Development Site**
<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/index.html>
- **Frequently Asked Questions About Adequate Yearly Progress**
<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/faq/faq.html>
- **Performance Reporting Home Page**
<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport>
- **Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Home Page**
<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ayp>
- **Performance Reporting Email**
performance.reporting@tea.state.tx.us
- **Division of Performance Reporting Telephone**
(512) 463-9704