The Implementation of House Bill 22

COLLABORATING TO BUILD A BETTER ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM
House Bill 22, 85th Texas Legislature

“The commissioner shall evaluate school district and campus performance and assign each district and campus an overall performance rating of”

A   B   C   D   or   F
“The commissioner shall solicit input statewide from persons . . . , including school district boards of trustees, administrators and teachers employed by school districts, parents of students enrolled in school districts, and other interested stakeholders.”
Three Domains: Combining to Calculate Overall Score

- Best of Achievement or Progress
  - Student Achievement
  - School Progress

- Minimum 30%
  - Closing The Gaps

Minimum 30%
Design Approach: Philosophical Commitments

“The commissioner shall ensure that the method used to evaluate performance is implemented in a manner that provides the mathematical possibility that all districts and campuses receive an A rating.”

1. No forced distribution

2. Law switched from annually to periodically

We WANT stability in the model; we do not want the bar to keep changing. We want to commit to something so the bar will remain static for five years, so the rules don’t change.
**A-F Accountability: New Labels/Grades**

**A** = Exemplary Performance

**B** = Recognized Performance

**C** = Acceptable Performance

**D** = In Need of Improvement

**F** = Unacceptable Performance
Student Achievement: Performance

- Student Achievement
- School Progress
- Closing The Gaps
### Student Achievement: Calculating Score

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board**
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tests</strong></td>
<td>3,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Approaches Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>2,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Meets Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Masters Grade Level</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Approaches Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meets Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Masters Grade Level</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of 3

\[
\frac{92.7 + 60.6 + 27.3}{3} = 60.2
\]

Student Achievement Score = A

---

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.

---

**Calculating Score**

- **Total Tests**: 3,212
- **# Approaches Grade Level or Above**: 2,977
- **# Meets Grade Level or Above**: 1,945
- **# Masters Grade Level**: 878
- **% Approaches Grade Level or Above**: 92.7%
- **% Meets Grade Level or Above**: 60.6%
- **% Masters Grade Level**: 27.3%

Average of 3

\[
\frac{92.7 + 60.6 + 27.3}{3} = 60.2
\]

Student Achievement Score = A

---

**60x30TX**

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.
Student Achievement: Calculating Score

- College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
- Graduation Rates
**Student Achievement: CCMR Indicators for HS**

**College Ready**
- Meet criteria on AP/IB exams
- Meet TSI criteria (SAT/ACT/TSIA) in reading and mathematics
- Complete a college prep course offered by a partnership between a district and higher education institution as required from HB5
- Complete a course for dual credit
- Complete an OnRamps course
- Earn an associate’s degree
- Meet standards on a composite of indicators indicating college readiness

**Career Ready**
- Earn industry certification
- Be admitted to post-secondary industry certification program

**Military Ready**
- Enlist in the United States Armed Forces
School Progress: Growth

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
School Progress: Two Aspects to Progress

Part A: Student Growth

Part B: Relative Performance
**Student Growth**: Measuring Advancement

- **Exceeds**: +1 Point Awarded
  - Meeting or exceeding expected growth

- **Expected**: +.5 Points Awarded
  - Maintaining proficiency but failing to meet expected growth

- **Maintains**: +0 Points Awarded
  - For falling to a lower level

**3rd Grade Example**: Masters → Approaches → Does Not Meet

**4th Grade Example**: Masters → Meets → Maintains

- **Does Not Meet**: Limited
  - For falling to a lower level
### Student Growth: Percentage of Students Gaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does Not Meet</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td>Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td>Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td>Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Year**

- **Does Not Meet**: Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt, Did not meet = 0 pts
- **Approaches**: Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt, Did not meet = .5 pts
- **Meets**: Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt, Did not meet = 0 pts
- **Masters**: Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt, Did not meet = 0 pts

**Previous Year**

- **Does Not Meet**: Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt, Did not meet = 0 pts
- **Approaches**: Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt, Did not meet = .5 pts
- **Meets**: Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt, Did not meet = 0 pts
- **Masters**: Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt, Did not meet = 0 pts
## Student Growth: Percentage of Students Gaining

### Current Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does Not Meet Grade Level</th>
<th>Approaches Grade Level</th>
<th>Meets Grade Level</th>
<th>Masters Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet = 0 pts</td>
<td>Did not meet = 0.5 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches Grade Level</th>
<th>Meets Grade Level</th>
<th>Masters Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet = 0 pts</td>
<td>Did not meet = 0.5 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Grade Level</th>
<th>Masters Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Masters Grade Level | |
|---------------------||
| 0 pts | 1 pt |
### Student Growth: Percentage of Students Gaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does Not Meet</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does Not Meet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>= 0 pts</td>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>.5 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approaches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>= 0 pts</td>
<td>Did not meet</td>
<td>.5 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meets</strong></td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masters</strong></td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Student Growth: Percentage of Students Gaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Grade Level</th>
<th>Approaches Grade Level</th>
<th>Meets Grade Level</th>
<th>Masters Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does Not Meet</strong></td>
<td>Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt Did not meet = 0 pts</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt Did not meet = .5 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approaches</strong> Grade Level</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt Did not meet = 0 pts</td>
<td>Met/Exceeded Growth Measure = 1 pt Did not meet = .5 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meets</strong> Grade Level</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masters</strong> Grade Level</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

A campus with fewer economically disadvantaged students on average has higher levels of student achievement.

A campus with more economically disadvantaged students tends to have lower levels of student achievement.
Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

Higher Levels of Student Achievement

Student Achievement Domain Score for All Students

% Economically Disadvantaged Students

Higher Rates of Economically Disadvantaged

Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

Higher Levels of Student Achievement

Student Achievement Domain Score for All Students

% Economically Disadvantaged Students

Higher Rates of Economically Disadvantaged

Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

Higher Levels of Student Achievement

Student Achievement Domain Score for All Students

% Economically Disadvantaged Students

Higher Rates of Economically Disadvantaged
Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educational Equity

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
Closing the Gaps: Aligning Accountability Systems
Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educational Equity

- Race/Ethnicity
- Special Education
- Continuously Enrolled and Mobile
- English Learners (ELs)
- Economically Disadvantaged

All Students
# Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educational Equity

## Student Groups
- All Students
- African American
- Hispanic
- White
- American Indian
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Two or More Races
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Current and Former Special Education
- Current and Monitored English Learners
- Continuously Enrolled/Non-Continuously Enrolled

## Indicators
- Academic Achievement in Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science and Social Studies
- Growth in Reading and Mathematics (Elementary and Middle Schools)
- Graduation Rates
- English Learner Language Proficiency Status
- College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance
- At or Above Meets Grade Level Performance in Reading and Mathematics
Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educational Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Achievement Target</th>
<th>% of Subgroups that meet target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Accountability Plan

- Student Achievement
- School Progress
- Closing The Gaps

Local Accountability

*Example

Extra-Curricular Activities

*Example

Local Assessments

[Image of Local Accountability Plan with icons and text]

[Image of TEA logo]
Local Accountability Plan: Purpose and Requirements

**Purpose**
To allow districts (at their option) to rate campuses using locally developed domains and accountability measures.

**Requirements for Districts**
- Local plans must include the TEA-assigned three domain performance ratings (at least 50% of the overall rating).
- Locally developed domain and measures must provide for the assignment of A–F grades and be reliable and valid.

**More Requirements for Districts**
- Auditable calculations
- Campus score card that can be displayed on TEA’s website
- Publicly available explanation of the methodology used to assign ratings
- Plans submitted to TEA for approval
**Local Accountability Plan: Getting the Plan Approved**

**Authority**

The commissioner has authority to develop the process to approve requests to assign campus performance ratings.

**Requirements for Approval**

- The agency determines whether the plan meets the minimum requirements.
- An audit conducted by the agency verifies calculations included in the plan.
- A review panel approves the plan.

**One Condition**

A locally developed accountability system can only be used for campuses not assigned an overall rating of D or F by TEA.
**New Indicator:** Extracurricular/Cocurricular

### Feasibility Study

- Determine the feasibility of incorporating indicators that account for extracurricular and cocurricular student activity.
- The commissioner may establish an advisory committee.

### Report

A report to the legislature on the feasibility of these indicators is due by December 1, 2022, unless a similar indicator is adopted prior to December 1, 2022.
A-F Timeline: Implementation of HB 22

- **HB 22 Passed** by the 85th Texas Legislature (May 2017)
- Start of pilot group to design local accountability (Fall 2017)
- Rules finalized for three domain system (Spring 2018)
- Rules adopted for local accountability system and application window opens (Fall 2018)
- Three domain system rates all campuses and districts
  - **Districts:** A-F Rating Labels
  - **Campuses:** Improvement Required or Met Standard (August 2018)
  - "What If" report on campus performance, based on data used to assign 2018 ratings (January 2019)
- Campuses: A-F labels take effect and local accountability system is incorporated (August 2019)
- Task Force launches on how to incorporate extracurricular activities (Winter 2017)
## A–F Timeline: Domain Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Timeline</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug.–December 2017</td>
<td>Stakeholder feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATAC and APAC monthly subcommittee meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Sessions with ESC: HB 22 Overview and Student Achievement Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Sessions with ESC: School Progress Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Sessions with ESC: Closing the Gaps Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 18–19, ATAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 11–12, APAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November, ATAC meeting (final recommendations for 2018 A–F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December, APAC meeting (final recommendations for 2018 A–F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January–April 2018</td>
<td>Continued stakeholder feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner final 2018 A–F decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May–June 2018</td>
<td>2018 A–F accountability manual creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public comment on A–F accountability manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018 A–F Manual adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# A–F Timeline: Local Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Timeline</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug.–December 2017</td>
<td>Stakeholder feedback&lt;br&gt;ATAC and APAC monthly subcommittee meetings&lt;br&gt;September 18–19, ATAC meeting&lt;br&gt;October 11–12, APAC meeting&lt;br&gt;Launch of Local Accountability System Pilot&lt;br&gt;November, ATAC meeting (final recommendations for 2018 A–F)&lt;br&gt;December, APAC meeting (final recommendations for 2018 A–F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January–April 2018</td>
<td>Continued stakeholder feedback&lt;br&gt;Commissioner final 2018 A–F decisions&lt;br&gt;Ongoing Local Accountability System Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018–April 2019</td>
<td>Ongoing Local Accountability System Pilot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>