Expectations Matter

We believe that all students can learn & achieve at high levels.
The SBOE has defined what all students should know and be able to do at each grade level if they are to be well prepared for success in life. These are called the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

**What does this look like in practice?**

**TEKS 3.5A:** Represent one- and two-step problems involving addition and subtraction of whole numbers to 1,000 using pictorial models, number lines, and equations.
TEKS 3.5A: Represent one- and two-step problems involving addition and subtraction of whole numbers to 1,000 using pictorial models, number lines, and equations

Actual STAAR Question:
An art teacher had 736 crayons. She threw away 197 broken crayons. Then she bought 150 more crayons. Which equation shows how to find the number of crayons the art teacher has now?

A) 736 - 197 - 150 = ____
B) 736 - 197 + 150 = ____
C) 736 + 197 + 150 = ____
D) 736 + 197 - 150 = ____

Learn more at: www.texasassessment.com
You can’t improve what you can’t see. In order to serve all students well, we need easy-to-access information regarding how schools and districts are doing.
Monitoring performance with school ratings has been shown to have long term benefits for students:

“Our analysis reveals that pressure on schools to avoid a low performance rating led low-scoring students to score significantly higher on a high-stakes math exam in 10th grade. These students were also more likely to accumulate significantly more math credits and to graduate from high school on time. Later in life, they were more likely to attend and graduate from a four-year college, and they had higher earnings at age 25.”

The biggest risks come if the system allows certain students to be exempted from accountability. The system design matters.

Source: https://www.educationnext.org/when-does-accountability-work-texas-system/
"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
A Two Year Process of Gathering Feedback

TEA staff conducted hundreds of stakeholder meetings starting as early as January 2016 with:

- School Board Members
- Superintendents
- Principals
- Other Administrators
- Teachers
- Parents
- Business Leaders
- Advocates
- Students

TEA made significant changes to the proposed A-F system based on feedback.

Certain design details noted with a ⚠️ in this presentation were changes made based on feedback.
A–F Accountability: New Labels/Grades

A = Exemplary Performance
B = Recognized Performance
C = Acceptable Performance
D = In Need of Improvement
F = Unacceptable Performance
Design Approach: Two Philosophical Commitments

1. “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.”

2. We **WANT** stability in the model, we do not want the bar to keep changing. We want to commit to something where the bar will remain static for 5 years, where the rules don’t change.

These commitments reinforce a system that supports continuous improvement over time.
This design reflects a commitment:

- to recognize high student achievement and
- to recognize the impact of highly effective educators, and
- while maintaining focus on the students most in need.

This design has produced ratings that are not strongly correlated with poverty.
Stakeholders requested that rating information be easily viewable, with supporting material to help people understand them.

On August 15, the tool will launch at: www.TXschools.org
2017-18 Results
Including single campus districts*, **1,187 ISDs/charters** were evaluated**

- **A** (90-100) – 16% - **153 districts**
- **B** (80-89) – 43%***
- **C** (70-79) – 30%
- **D** (60-69) – 8%
- **F** (0-59) – 3% - **16 districts**

**Excluding Single Campus Districts:**
- A – 18%
- B – 43%
- C – 30%
- D – 7%
- F – 2%

* - 272 single campus districts/charters receive a Met Standard / Improvement Required label, but are still given a 0-100 point score
** - 83 districts/charters that received a Hurricane Harvey exception received either an A rating, or No Rating, but are still given a 0-100 point score
*** - Districts receive a max score of 89 if they have any IR campuses, even if they would have otherwise received an A
Student poverty is not a strong factor in how a district was rated. Correlation between the rate of students eligible for a free/reduced lunch and district overall A-F ratings: $0.4$ (moderate)

**Domain Specific Correlations**
- Student Achievement Domain: $0.6$ (strong)
- School Progress Domain: $0.1$ (weak)
- Closing the Gaps Domain: $0.5$ (moderate)

**Large, high-performing, high poverty districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Enroll</th>
<th>Eco Dis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharyland ISD</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10170</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United ISD</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43212</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen ISD</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23640</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Fresnos CISD</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10770</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburg CISD</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34098</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst-Euless-Bedford ISD</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23364</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Public Schools***</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35595</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville ISD***</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45535</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** - Districts receive a max score of 89 if they have any IR campuses, even if they would have otherwise received an A.
# Campus Level Highlights

8,253 campuses were rated* (including 347 paired campuses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of Campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Standard</td>
<td>(90-100)</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1,561 campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Standard</td>
<td>(80-89)</td>
<td>[B]</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Standard</td>
<td>(70-79)</td>
<td>[C]</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Standard</td>
<td>(60-69)</td>
<td>[D]</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Required</td>
<td>(0-59)</td>
<td>[F]</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>432 campuses (349)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Because of Hurricane Harvey, about 1200 campuses were eligible to receive a “Not Rated” designation if they would have otherwise been rated Improvement Required. 86 campuses will receive a Not Rated designation, but the underlying 0-100 point score information is still visible. The total number of campuses receiving an “Improvement Required” rating is 349. The total number of rated campus is 8,167.
There are 259 high-poverty campuses (80-100% Eco Dis) that receive a score of 90-100 (ie, “A”). This represents 11% of all high-poverty campuses. There are 169 low-poverty campuses (0-20% Eco Dis) that receive a score below 90 (ie, less than an “A”).

**Domain Specific Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>.7 (strong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Progress</td>
<td>.1 (weak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing the Gaps</td>
<td>.4 (moderate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a .4 (moderate) correlation between the rate of students eligible for a free/reduced lunch and campus overall A-F ratings.
Design Details
Student Achievement Domain

- Student Achievement
- School Progress
- Closing The Gaps
Proposed Rule will adjust proportional weighting for High School in the Student Achievement domain to 40-40-20

- College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
- Graduation Rates
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
By **2030**, at least **60%** of Texans ages 25–34 will have a certificate or degree.

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

**Student Achievement Score**

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

**Student Achievement: Calculating Score**
**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

---

Proposed Rule will provide partial credit in the near term for coherent sequence students who participate in aligned coursework, even if they don’t receive a certification.
**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 dual credit courses**
- Complete OnRamps courses
- 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

---

**Proposed Rule** will provide credit for a single course passed in English or math, or for 9 credit hours in any subject area
School Progress Domain

- Student Achievement
- School Progress
- Closing The Gaps
School Progress Domain: Two Aspects

**Part 1**

**Student Growth**

**Part 2**

**Relative Performance**

Even though growth measures are limited for HS, the Proposed Rule will include best of credit in HS for growth.

Proposed Rule will provide credit for best campus rating between part 1 and part 2, rather than an average, with caveat that an F in 3 out of 4 (sub)domains (including these two parts) will be an F overall.
School Progress Domain: Student Growth

Exceeds +1 Point Awarded
For meeting or exceeding expected growth

Expected

+ .5 Points Awarded
For maintaining proficiency but failing to meet expected growth

Maintains

Limited +0 Points Awarded
For falling to a lower level

Proposed Rule will provide partial credit for maintaining Meets or Approaches Grade Level, even if vertical scale scores don’t increase.
Proposed Rule will use a curved line of best fit (quadratic vs linear) to reduce rating biases of very low & very high poverty campuses.
Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

The diagram illustrates the relationship between poverty levels and student achievement. It shows how schools with higher poverty rates tend to have lower student achievement. Schools are categorized into different performance levels indicated by letters A through F, with A representing the highest achievement and F the lowest.
Closing The Gaps Domain

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
Closing the Gaps: Educational Equity

Domain 3 in the Proposed Rule complies with ESSA requirements, allowing a single state & federal accountability system.
Closing the Gaps: Educational Equity

**Student Groups (Up to 13)**
- 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 (Up to 6)**
- Academic Achievement on STAAR in Reading and Mathematics at Meets Grade Level standard
- English Learner Language Proficiency Status
- Elementary & Middle School:
  - Growth in Reading and Mathematics on STAAR
  - Student Achievement Domain score
- High School / K-12 / Districts:
  - 4 Year Graduation Rates
  - College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance

Proposed Rule includes weighting for growth at 50% of Domain 3 indicators
Proposed Rule includes targets for the first five years equal to current state averages.
Local Accountability

- Student Achievement
- School Progress
- Closing The Gaps
- Extra-Curricular Activities
- Local Assessments
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 system (Fall 2017)

Rules adopted for local accountability system and application window opens (Fall 2018)

Rules finalized for three domain system (Summer 2018)

Three domain system rates all campuses and districts. Takes effect as follows:

**Districts:** A–F Rating Labels

**Campuses:** Improvement Required or Met Standard (August 2018)

Campuses: A–F labels take effect and local accountability system is incorporated (August 2019)

“What If” report on campus performance, based on data used to assign 2018 ratings. (December 2018)