Chapter 9 – Responsibilities and Consequences

State Responsibilities

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is responsible for the state accountability system and other statutory requirements related to its implementation. As described in chapters 8 and 9, TEA applies a variety of system safeguards to ensure the integrity of the system. TEA is also charged with taking actions to intervene when conditions warrant.

District Accreditation Status

State statute requires the commissioner of education to determine an accreditation status for districts and charters. Accreditation statuses were first assigned to districts under this statute in 2007. To determine accreditation status and sanctions, TEA takes into account the district’s state and financial accountability ratings. There are other factors that may be considered in the determination of accreditation status. These include, but are not limited to, the integrity of assessment or financial data used to measure performance, the reporting of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data, and serious or persistent deficiencies in programs monitored in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS). Accreditation status can also be lowered as a result of data integrity issues or special accreditation investigations. The four possible accreditation statuses are: Accredited, Accredited-Warning, Accredited-Probation, and Not Accredited-Revoked.

Rules that define the procedures for determining a district’s accreditation status, as well as the prior accreditation statuses for all districts and charters in Texas are available at http://tea.texas.gov/accredstatus/.

Determination of Multiple-Year Improvement Required Status

In determining consecutive years of Improvement Required ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions, only years that a campus is assigned an accountability rating shown below will be considered.

- 2012: No State Accountability Ratings Issued;

While no ratings were issued in 2012, an Improvement Required rating assigned in 2013 and Academically Unacceptable/AEA: Academically Unacceptable ratings assigned in 2011 are considered as consecutive years. In addition, the consecutive years of Improvement Required/Academically Unacceptable ratings may be separated by one or more years of temporary closure or Not Rated ratings. This policy applies to districts and charters as well as campuses when Not Rated and Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues labels are assigned.

PEG Program Campus List

TEA is responsible for producing the list of campuses identified under the Public Education Grant (PEG) criteria. The list of 2017–18 PEG campuses will be released publicly in December 2016. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to PEG Frequently Asked Questions, available at http://tea.texas.gov/perfreport/peg_faq.html.aspx.
Local Responsibilities

Districts have responsibilities associated with the state accountability system. Primarily these involve following statutory requirements, collecting and submitting accurate data, properly managing campus identification numbers, evaluating and assigning community and student engagement ratings, and implementing an optional local accountability system.

Statutory Compliance

A number of state statutes direct local districts and/or campuses to perform certain tasks or duties in response to the annual issuance of the state accountability ratings. Key statutes are discussed below.

- Public Discussion of Ratings [TEC §11.253 (g)] – Each campus site-based decision-making committee must hold at least one public meeting annually after the receipt of the annual campus accountability rating for the purpose of discussing the performance of the campus and the campus performance objectives. The confidentiality of the performance results must be ensured before public release. The accountability data tables available on the TEA public website have been masked to protect confidentiality of individual student results.

- Notice in Student Grade Report and on District Website (TEC §39.361 and TEC §39.362) – Districts are required to publish accountability ratings on their websites and include the rating in the student grade reports. These statutes require districts
  - to include, along with the first written notice of a student’s performance that a school district gives during a school year, a statement of whether the campus has been awarded a distinction designation or has been rated Improvement Required and an explanation; and
  - by the 10th day of the new school year to have posted on the district website the most current information available in the campus report card and the information contained in the most recent performance report for the district.

For more information on these requirements, please refer to Requirement for Posting of Performance - Frequently Asked Questions: Notice in Student Grade Report, available on the TEA website at https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/3297_faq.html.

- Public Education Grant (PEG) Program (TEC §§29.201 - 29.205) – In 1995, the Texas Legislature created the PEG program which permits parents with children attending campuses that are on the PEG list to request that their children be transferred to another campus within the same district or to another district. If a transfer is granted to another district, funding is provided to the receiving district. A list of campuses identified under the PEG criteria is released to districts annually. By February 1 following the release of the list, districts must notify each parent of a student assigned to attend a campus on the PEG list. For more information on the PEG program, please refer to PEG Frequently Asked Questions, available at http://tea.texas.gov/perfreport/peg_faq.html.aspx.

- Actions Required Due to Low Ratings or Low Accreditation Status – Districts with an Improvement Required rating (district or campus) or Accredited Probation/Accredited Warned accreditation status will be required to follow directives from the commissioner designed to remedy the identified concerns. Requirements will vary depending on the circumstances for each individual district. Commissioner of education rules that define the implementation details of these statutes are available on the website for the TEA Program Monitoring and Interventions (PMI) Division in the Accountability Monitoring link.
Campus Identification Numbers
In a given year, districts may need to change, delete, or add one or more campus identification numbers, the unique 9-digit county-district-campus (CDC) number, due to closing old schools, opening new schools, or changing the grades or populations served by an existing school. Unintended consequences can occur when districts "recycle" CDC numbers.

As performance results of prior years is a component of the accountability system in small-numbers analysis and possible statutorily-required improvement calculations in future years, merging prior-year files with current-year files is driven by campus identification numbers. Comparisons may be inappropriate when a campus configuration has changed. The following example illustrates this situation.

Example: A campus served grades 7 and 8 in 2015, but in 2016, serves as a 6th grade center. The district did not request a new CDC number for the new configuration. Instead, the same CDC number used in 2015 was maintained (recycled). Therefore, in 2016, grade 6 performance on the assessments may be combined for small-numbers analyses purposes with performance index results which included grade 7 and 8 performance.

Whether to change a campus number is a serious decision for local school districts. Districts should exercise caution when either requesting new numbers or continuing to use existing numbers when the student population or the grades served change significantly. Districts are strongly encouraged to request new CDC numbers when school organizational configurations change dramatically.

TEA policy requires school districts and charters to request campus number changes of existing campuses for the current school year by October 1 to ensure time for processing before the PEIMS fall snapshot date in late October. Changes for a subsequent school year will not be processed before November 1. This policy does not apply to new active campuses opening mid-year or campuses under construction.

School districts and charters must consult with the TEA PMI Division to change the campus number of a campus rated Improvement Required. The consolidation, deletion, division, or addition of a campus identification number does not absolve the district of the state accountability rating history associated with campuses newly consolidated, divided or closed, nor preclude the requirement of participation in intervention activities for campuses that received a rating of Improvement Required in August. Should the campus identification number change for a campus with an Improvement Required rating, the PMI Division will work with the district to determine specific intervention requirements.

Although the ratings history may be linked across campus numbers for purposes of determining consecutive years of Improvement Required ratings, data will not be linked across campus numbers. This includes PEIMS data, assessment data, and graduation/dropout data that are used to develop the accountability indicators. Campuses with new campus numbers cannot take advantage of any improvement calculations, if applicable, of the accountability system in which the performance index outcomes may be compared under a new number. Therefore, changing a campus number under these
circumstances may be to the disadvantage of an Improvement Required campus. This should be considered by districts and charters when requesting campus number changes for Improvement Required campuses. In the rare circumstance where a campus or charter district receives a new campus or district number, the ratings history is linked while the data are not linked across the district numbers.

An analysis to screen for the inappropriate use of campus numbers is part of the TEA data integrity activities described in Chapter 2 – Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets. TEA can assist in establishing new or retiring old campus numbers.

If a school district enters into a legal agreement with TEA that requires new district or campus numbers, the ratings history will be linked to the previous district or campus number. In this case, both the district and campus will be rated the first year under the new number. Data for districts and campuses in these circumstances will not be linked. This includes the PEIMS data, assessment data, and graduation/dropout data that are used to develop the accountability indicators. Districts or campuses under a legal agreement with TEA cannot take advantage of any improvement calculations or small-numbers analysis the first year under a new district or campus number.

**Community and Student Engagement**

Districts are required to annually evaluate and assign ratings of Exemplary, Recognized, Acceptable, or Unacceptable to itself and each of its campuses for performance in community and student engagement. Districts must designate local committee(s) to determine the criteria that districts use both to evaluate performance and assign ratings for community and student engagement and to evaluate and indicate compliance with statutory reporting and policy requirements. Therefore, districts should locally maintain the documents that were developed to determine the performance rating and compliance status for the district and each campus.

By August 7, districts must report each rating to TEA and the public. TEA will report the performance ratings and compliance status for community and student engagement indicators reported by school districts on the agency website no later than October 1.

For more information, please refer to Requirement for Posting of Performance - Frequently Asked Questions: Community and Student Engagement Posting Requirements, available on the TEA website at https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport//3297_faq.html.

**Complementary Local Accountability Systems**

Although the statewide accountability system has been designed to address the guiding principles articulated in Chapter 1 – Introduction, it is not a comprehensive system of performance evaluation. Communities across Texas have varied needs and goals for the school districts educating their students. Local systems of accountability can best address those priorities.

Districts are encouraged to develop their own complementary local accountability systems to plan for continued student performance improvement. Such systems are entirely voluntary and for local use only. Performance on locally-defined indicators does not affect the ratings determined through the statewide system.
Examples of locally-defined indicators include but are not limited to
• level of parent participation,
• progress on locally-administered assessments,
• progress on goals identified by campus improvement plans,
• progress compared to other campuses in the district,
• progress on professional development goals, and
• school safety measures.

As a different approach, districts may choose to expand the state-designated accountability ratings. For example, they may wish to further differentiate among campuses rated *Met Standard*.

A third approach might be to examine the accountability indicators that comprise the performance indices, both currently in use and planned for implementation, that fall short of local expectations. Additional performance measures could be constructed to track efforts to improve performance in those areas.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, local accountability systems should be designed to serve the needs of the local community and to improve performance for all students.
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