

**Accountability System Development for 2016  
Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC)**

**2016 Accountability Performance Index Review and Decision Points**

This document presents the ATAC's final recommendations on 2016 accountability decided at the December 2–3, 2015, meeting.

## **I. 2015 System Rigor**

The overall design of the accountability system will remain the same, evaluating performance according to four indices:

- Index 1: Student Achievement
- Index 2: Student Progress
- Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps
- Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

### **Changes Affecting All Four Performance Indices**

- **Increase in the student performance standards for STAAR grades 3–8 and end-of-course (EOC) general assessments.** By commissioner's rule, the scheduled increase in 2015–16 to the Phase-in 2 Level II passing standard is replaced with a standard progression approach which will begin in 2015–16 and continue until 2021–22, the year final Level II standards are scheduled to be in place. Attachment A provides the student performance standards that are set through the 2021–22 school year.
- **Inclusion of STAAR assessments in grades 3–8 mathematics.** The 2016 accountability system will include the performance results for grades 3–8 mathematics in all indices, including progress measures results for grades 3–8 mathematics, where applicable. The student performance standard for grades 3–8 mathematics will be the 2015–16 standard shown in Attachment A.
- **Inclusion of STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 assessments.** The 2016 accountability system will include the STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 performance results in Index 1 and will include the STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 progress measures results in Index 2, where applicable. Attachment D shows which assessments were included in each index over the past three years and the ATAC recommendation regarding the inclusion of assessments 2016.
- **ATAC Recommendation: Include STAAR A results in all indexes and STAAR Alternate 2 results in Index 1, Index 2, and Index 3.**

**Rationale:** Inclusion of STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 results in all applicable indexes encourages districts to administer the appropriate assessments to students with disabilities regardless of the impact on state accountability ratings. Concerns with student performance on these assessments can be addressed in the recommendations for 2016 performance index targets.

## 2. Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets

**Ratings Criteria.** Performance targets will be set for each index. In order to receive a *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating, all campuses and districts must meet the performance index target on the following indexes if they have performance data for evaluation:

Index 1 **OR** Index 2                      AND                      **Index 3**                      AND                      **Index 4**

**Rationale:** This recommendation reflects the committee’s original intent when the index framework was developed. Given the progress measures will be reported for the first time on the STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 assessments in 2016, it is difficult to anticipate how these new progress measures will affect the Index 2 outcomes. This also addresses the concern with the limited availability of progress measures on the EOC assessments for high schools and K–12 campuses and districts.

**2016 Performance Index Targets.** The majority of ATAC members recommended the following performance index targets for 2016. Bold targets indicate that TEA staff have offered an alternate recommendation.

### Index Targets and Recommendations for Non-AEA Districts and Campuses

	2015 Index Targets					ATAC Recommendation: 2016 Index Targets				
	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3	Index 4		Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
				All Components	STAAR Component Only				All Components	STAAR Component Only
Districts	60	20	28	57	13	<b>55</b>	**	***	60	12
Campuses										
Elementary	60	30	28	n/a	12	<b>55</b>	**	***	n/a	12
Middle		28	27	n/a	13		**	***	n/a	12
High School/K-12		15	31	57	21		**	***	60	<b>12</b>

\* 2015 Index 2 targets for non-AEA campuses were set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2015 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts corresponded to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2015 campus performance across all campus types.

\*\* 2016 Index 2 targets for non-AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts will correspond to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance across all campus types.

\*\*\* 2016 Index 3 targets for non-AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts will correspond to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance across all campus types.

**Index Targets and Recommendations for AEA Charter Districts and Campuses**

	2015 Index Targets					ATAC Recommendation: 2016 Index Targets				
	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3	Index 4		Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
				Both Components	Graduation/Dropout Rate Only				Both Components	Graduation Dropout Rate Only
AEA Charter Districts	35	7	11	33	45	30	**	***	33	45
AEA Campuses										

\* 2015 Index 2 targets for both AEA charter districts and AEA campuses were set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2015 campus performance.

\*\* 2016 Index 2 targets for both AEA charter districts and AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2016 campus performance.

\*\*\* 2016 Index 3 targets for both AEA charter districts and AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2016 campus performance.

**Rationale:**

**Index 1** – For 2016, set the target at 55, in recognition of the increase in the STAAR satisfactory standard and the inclusion of STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2. This target may be set back to 60 in 2017. AEA districts and campuses would have a target of 30. The vote was 21 members in favor with 3 voting to maintain the target at 60 for 2016. **Alternate TEA staff recommendation** – Maintain the Index 1 target at 60 (35 for AEA districts and campuses).

**Index 2** – For 2016, set targets at the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile by campus type based on 2016 performance. Due to changes in writing exams in grades 4 and 7, no STAAR progress measures will be available for grade 7 writing for 2016. Because of this, ATAC recommends Index 2 scores be based on progress outcomes for reading and mathematics only. The vote was unanimous.

**Index 3** – For 2016, ATAC—by a vote of 15 to 10—recommends including STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 in Index 3 and to set the target at the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile by campus type based on 2016 performance. Twenty members were in favor of setting the target at the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile.

**Index 4** – For 2016, ATAC—by a vote of 16 to 6—recommends including STAAR A in Index 4. With 11 members voting in favor, the committee also recommends increasing the target for districts and high school/K–12 campuses rated on all four components to a target of 60. The committee (by a vote of 17 to 6) also recommended setting one target for all campuses and districts that have only the STAAR component at a target of 12. AEA districts and campuses with both the STAAR and graduation component would have a target of 33, while those with the graduation component only would have a target of 45. **Alternate TEA staff recommendation** – Maintain the target for high schools and elementary/secondary schools with only the STAAR component at 21.

**Rating Labels.** The 2016 rating labels remain the same rating labels issued in 2015 accountability

- *Met Standard* – met the required performance index targets and other accountability rating criteria
- *Improvement Required* – did not meet the required performance index targets or other accountability rating criteria
- *Met Alternative Standard* – assigned to charter operators and alternative education campuses evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions
- *Not Rated* – under certain circumstances, districts or campuses may receive no rating label

### 3. Performance Indexes

The original design of each performance index remains the same as the prior year. Attachment E includes a table showing the inclusion of ELLs for each index.

**Index 1: Student Achievement.** Provides a snapshot of performance across subjects, on both general and alternative assessments, at the satisfactory performance standard.

#### **Inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs)**

- *ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are included at the Level II standard, regardless of their number of years in U.S. schools.*
- *ELLs whose years in U.S. schools exceeds their ELL plan year are included at the STAAR satisfactory standard.*
- *ELLs with parental denial for instructional services who are in their second or more year in U.S. schools are included at the STAAR satisfactory standard.*
- *ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have an ELL progress measure are excluded.*

**Index 2: Student Progress.** Measures of student progress provide an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for improving student performance independent of overall student achievement.

#### **Inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs)**

- *ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are included, regardless of their number of years in U.S. schools.*
- *ELLs whose years in U.S. schools exceeds their ELL plan year are included.*
- *ELLs with parental denial for instructional services who are in their second or more year in U.S. schools are included.*
- *ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have an ELL progress measure are excluded.*

**Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps.** Emphasizes the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students and the two lowest-performing racial/ethnic student groups.

The ATAC consensus for 2016 accountability was no changes to the Index 3 calculation.

#### **Inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs)**

- *ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are included at the Level II and Level III standard, regardless of their number of years in U.S. schools.*
- *ELLs whose years in U.S. schools exceeds their ELL plan year are included at the satisfactory standard and Level III standard.*
- *ELLs with parental denial for instructional services who are in their second or more year in U.S. schools are included at the satisfactory standard and Level III standard.*
- *ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have an ELL progress measure are excluded.*

**Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness.** Emphasizes the role of elementary and middle schools in preparing students for the rigors of high school, and the importance of earning a high school diploma that provides students with the foundation necessary for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military. Alternative procedures are provided for Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) campuses and charter districts serving at-risk students in alternative education programs.

#### **Inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs)**

- *ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 are excluded.*
- *ELLs whose years in U.S. schools exceeds their ELL plan year are included at the final Level II standard.*
- *ELLs with parental denial for instructional services who are in their second or more year in U.S. schools are included at the final Level II standard.*
- *ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have an ELL progress measure are excluded.*

#### **Graduation Plan**

- **ATAC Recommendation: Graduation Plan Component and Foundation High School Plan (FHSP) Transition**

For 2016 accountability, ATAC recommends calculating the two diploma plan rates shown on the next page and using the one that gives the district or campus the most points for the graduation plan component of Index 4.

**Rationale:** The Foundation High School Program (FHSP) will replace the Minimum (MHSP), Recommended (RHSP), and Distinguished Achievement (DAP) High School Programs for students who began grade 9 in 2014–15. Beginning with the class of 2018, all students will be required to select the FHSP. Until then, students may earn an MHSP, RHSP, or DAP diploma. During this transition period, this approach addresses the varying degrees to which FHSP graduation plans have been implemented across districts.

### Calculation that Excludes FHSP Students

$$(RHSP + DAP)$$

---

$$(MHSP + RHSP + DAP)$$

### Calculation that Includes FHSP Students

$$(RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP-E + FHSP-DLA)$$

---

$$(MHSP + RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP + FHSP-E + FHSP-DLA)$$

Notes:

FHSP: Foundation High School Program (FHSP) without endorsement

FHSP-E: FHSP with endorsement, and no distinguished level of achievement

FHSP-DLA: FHSP with endorsement and Distinguished Level of Achievement

### Texas Success Initiative

▪ **ATAC Recommendation: TSI Portion of postsecondary component.**

Include the results of the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) assessment in the postsecondary component and give credit for every student who

- meets the TSI requirement in reading on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT **and**
- meets the TSI requirement in mathematics on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT.

A student needs to meet the TSI requirement for both reading **and** mathematics, but does not need to meet them all on the same assessment. Meeting the TSI requirement in writing on the TSI assessment or ACT will not be used for accountability in 2016 but will be reported on TAPR until 2017–18.

With the inclusion of the TSI results, the postsecondary component evaluated in 2016 accountability for the 2014–15 graduates is as shown on the following page:

graduates meeting TSI criteria in both reading/ELA and mathematics ( <b>TSI</b> , SAT, or ACT)	<b>or</b>	graduates who completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual enrollment course in the current or prior school year	<b>or</b>	graduates who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses as part of a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits*
--	-----------	---	-----------	--

---

Number of annual graduates

**Rationale:** The 2013–14 annual graduates were the last graduating class with TAKS results that could have been used in the college-readiness indicator of the postsecondary component. Beginning with the graduates from the 2014–15 school year, the postsecondary component will incorporate the results from the TSI assessment and continue to credit students who meet the TSI criteria on either the SAT or ACT assessments.

**Modeling Results for 2016 Performance Index Targets**

- Attachment B provides the performance index targets and their corresponding percentiles for 2013, 2014, and 2015.
- Attachment C describes the rules and caveats that were used to produce various models of the 2015 accountability results to assist ATAC members in developing recommendations for 2016 performance index targets