A–F Accountability System Development for 2017–18 and Beyond
Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC)

Options for Domain I–IV Models

This document provides both a review of and topics for discussion regarding implementation of statutory requirements in House Bill 2804 (HB 2804), 84th Texas Legislature, for the 2017–18 school year and beyond.

Review of HB 2804 Domain Requirements

See the *Summary of HB 2804* and *HB 2804 Domain Indicators* documents for a general overview of HB 2804 domain requirements and indicators.

DOMAIN I: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

HB 2804 requires Domain I to include STAAR assessment results at both the satisfactory and college-readiness standards. The model outlined below includes advanced-level performance standards along with the standards required by statute. For purposes of modeling, data for Domain I is based on 2016 STAAR assessment results from the accountability ratings released in August and September 2016. The data are constructed at the test level using the universe of campuses and districts for 2016 accountability.

The Domain I calculation uses a methodology in which scores are calculated based on students' level of performance at Level II or above, Final Level II or above, and Advanced Level III. Assessments are included in the model based on the following assumptions:

Non ELL or Tests with No ELL PM Such as Parental Denials and ELL PM Plan Exceeders

Standard	STAAR and STAAR A Tests	STAAR Alternate 2 Tests
Level II Satisfactory Performance or above	Level II Satisfactory Standard or above (**including substitute assessments**)	Level II Satisfactory or above
Final Level II Performance or above	Final Level II or above (**including substitute assessments**)	Level II Satisfactory or above
Advanced Level Performance	Advanced Level III	Level III Accomplished

ELL (excludes all year one and asylee/refugee/SIFE through year five)

Standard	Years in US 2–4 (STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR-L)	Years in US 5 or above (STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR-L)
Level II Satisfactory Performance or above	Met or Exceeded ELL PM	Level II Satisfactory Standard or above (**including substitute assessments**)
Final Level II Performance or above	Exceeded ELL PM or Met Level II Satisfactory standard or above	Final Level II or above (**including substitute assessments**)
Advanced Level Performance	Final Level II or above	Advanced Level III

One point is given for each percentage of assessment results that are at or above the following:

- Level II Satisfactory Performance or above;
- Final Level II Performance or above; and
- Advanced Level Performance.

Performance is measured across all grades and subjects. Campuses and districts with less than 25 tests across all subjects and grades are not evaluated. No minimum size is applied to student groups. Domain I is calculated by dividing the total points (cumulative performance for the three performance levels) by 300 (the maximum number of points), resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100 for all campuses and districts.

A–F letter grades are determined using percentiles of Domain I scores by campus type grouped by elementary, middle schools, and high school/K–12. AEAs are grouped together as are districts that are not comprised of a single campus. For discussion purposes only, letter grades are distributed around the following percentages for the following campus types:

	A (10 percent)	B (30 percent)	C (45 percent)	D (10 percent)	F (5 percent)
Elementary	63 or more	48 – 62	34 – 47	29 – 33	28 or less
Middle	62 or more	45 – 61	32 – 44	26 – 31	25 or less
High School/K–12	63 or more	47 – 62	34 – 46	29 – 33	28 or les
AEA	37 or more	26 – 36	13 – 25	10 – 12	9 or less

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2016 STAAR Performance Standard Data Table
SAMPLE HS (999999) - SAMPLE DISTRICT

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
2016 STAAR Performance											
All Subjects											
Percent of Tests											
% at Level II Satisfactory or above	80	60	80	90	-	-	-	-	-	112	105
% at Final Level II or above	40	33	47	40	-	-	-	-	-	32	20
% at Advanced Level	13	7	20	13	-	-	-	-	-	12	10
% at Level II Satisfactory only	40	23	37	50	-	-	-	-	-	80	85
% at Final Level II only	27	20	33	27	-	-	-	-	-	20	10
% at Advanced Level only	13	7	20	13	-	-	-	-	-	12	10
Number of Tests											
# at Level II Satisfactory or above	960	180	240	540	-	-	-	-	-	280	210
# at Final Level II or above	480	100	140	240	-	-	-	-	-	80	40
# at Advanced Level or above	160	20	60	80	-	-	-	-	-	30	20
# at Level II Satisfactory only	480	70	110	300	-	-	-	-	-	200	170
# at Final Level II only	320	60	100	160	-	-	-	-	-	50	20
# at Advanced Level only	160	20	60	80	-	-	-	-	-	30	20
Total Tests	1200	300	300	600	-	-	-	-	-	250	200

Domain I Grade = C

A = 63–100 B = 47–62 C = 34–46 D = 29–33 F= 0–28

STAAR Performance Standard	Percent of Tests
Level II Satisfactory Performance or above	80
Final Level II Performance or above	40
Advanced Performance	13

Total STAAR Performance Standard Points	133
Domain I Maximum Points	300
Domain I Score	**44.3**

Required Improvement Option for Letter Grades of D or F

A required improvement option could exist for campuses and districts with a letter grade of D or F. In order for required improvement to move a campus or district to a letter grade of C or D, the campus or district must have shown enough improvement to be able to meet a Level II Satisfactory Performance Standard of 90 percent in five years.

Methodology: The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement:*

Actual Change		Required Improvement
(Level II Satisfactory Performance in 2016) – (Level II Satisfactory Performance in 2015)	≥	(Level II Satisfactory Performance Standard of 90 percent) – (Level II Satisfactory Performance in 2015) / 5

DOMAIN II: STUDENT PROGRESS

HB 2804 requires Domain II to include progress measure expectations for STAAR satisfactory and college-readiness standards. For discussion purposes only at this time, the options below include the satisfactory and college-readiness standards as well as standards of far below the satisfactory standard, below the satisfactory standard, and the advanced level standard.

Five possible options are outlined below assuming a growth measure based on transition tables were used to establish a grade for Domain II. For these options, scoring could be achieved by 1) totaling the transition values for all tests across all subjects and dividing by the number of tests or 2) calculating the percentage of each transition value across all grades and subjects.

Option 1: Use transition scores as reported by growth model.

		Current Year Test				
Previous Year Test		Far Below Level II Std (0)	Below Level II Std (1)	Level II Std (2)	Final Level II (3)	Advanced III (4)
	Far Below Level II Std (0)	0	1	2	3	4
	Below Level II Std (1)	-1	0	1	2	3
	Level II Std (2)	-2	-1	0	1	2
	Final Level II (3)	-3	-2	-1	0	1
	Advanced III (4)	-4	-3	-2	-1	0

Option 2: Use transition scores as reported by growth model with an adjustment to a low threshold of zero (0) for all negative transitions.

		Current Year Test				
Previous Year Test		Far Below Level II Std (0)	Below Level II Std (1)	Level II Std (2)	Final Level II (3)	Advanced III (4)
	Far Below Level II Std (0)	0	1	2	3	4
	Below Level II Std (1)	0	0	1	2	3
	Level II Std (2)	0	0	0	1	2
	Final Level II (3)	0	0	0	0	1
	Advanced III (4)	0	0	0	0	0

Option 3: Use transition scores as reported by growth model with an adjustment to a low threshold of zero (0) for all negative transitions and adjustment for maintenance of high performance.

		Current Year Test				
Previous Year Test		Far Below Level II Std (0)	Below Level II Std (1)	Level II Std (2)	Final Level II (3)	Advanced III (4)
	Far Below Level II Std (0)	0	1	2	3	4
	Below Level II Std (1)	0	0	1	2	3
	Level II Std (2)	0	0	1	1	2
	Final Level II (3)	0	0	0	1	1
	Advanced III (4)	0	0	0	1	1

Option 4: Use transition scores as reported by growth model with an adjustment to a low threshold of zero (0) for all negative transitions and exclude transitions that maintain high performance.

	Current Year Test					
Previous Year Test		Far Below Level II Std (0)	Below Level II Std (1)	Level II Std (2)	Final Level II (3)	Advanced III (4)
	Far Below Level II Std (0)	0	1	2	3	4
	Below Level II Std (1)	0	0	1	2	3
	Level II Std (2)	0	0	0	1	2
	Final Level II (3)	0	0	0		1
	Advanced III (4)	0	0	0		

Option 5: Use transition scores as reported by growth model with an adjustment to a low threshold of zero (0) for all negative transitions and include transition for tests that maintain the highest performance standard only.

	Current Year Test					
Previous Year Test		Far Below Level II Std (0)	Below Level II Std (1)	Level II Std (2)	Final Level II (3)	Advanced III (4)
	Far Below Level II Std (0)	0	1	2	3	4
	Below Level II Std (1)	0	0	1	2	3
	Level II Std (2)	0	0	0	1	2
	Final Level II (3)	0	0	0		1
	Advanced III (4)	0	0	0		1

DOMAIN III: CLOSING PERFORMANCE GAPS

HB 2804 requires Domain III to measure academic achievement differentials among students from different racial and ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds. Outlined below is an aggregated gap model that measures that differential for the two lowest performing racial and ethnic groups and economically disadvantaged students relative to a performance goal at the Final Level II standard.

The Domain III score is equal to the average gap of the economically disadvantaged and lowest performing racial/ethnic group(s) from a goal of a Final Level II performance at or above 60. For purposes of this model, determining which of the seven racial/ethnic groups is used to calculate a campus's or district's Domain III calculation is a two-step process.

1. Identify the racial/ethnic groups that have 40 or more tests across all grades and subjects (minimum-size criteria).
2. From the racial/ethnic groups that meet minimum-size criteria, select the lowest-performing group(s) based on the previous year's Final Level II Performance score. For purposes of this model the 2015 data used is based upon results that were provided to districts in December 2015.

- If three or more racial/ethnic groups meet minimum-size criteria, the two lowest-performing groups are used.
- If only two racial/ethnic groups meet minimum-size criteria, only the lowest-performing group is used.
- If only one racial/ethnic group meets the minimum-size criteria, that group is not used. In these cases, only the economically disadvantaged group is used to calculate the Index 3 score.

The current year (2015–16) performance results for the identified racial/ethnic student group(s) are included in the Domain III evaluation if there are at least 40 test results across all grades and subjects. Districts and campuses that do not meet minimum size criteria for the racial/ethnic student groups are evaluated on the economically disadvantaged student group alone.

For example, in the sample 2015 STAAR performance data table below, Sample HS has three racial/ethnic groups that meet minimum size of 40: African American, Hispanic, and White. The two lowest performing groups based on Final Level II or above performance, African American and White, would be evaluated along with the economically disadvantaged student group in Domain III. Using 2016 performance data from Sample HS, the two racial/ethnic groups and economically disadvantaged student group meet minimum size of 40 total tests.

	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races
2015 STAAR Performance							
All Subjects							
Percent of Tests							
% at Final Level II or above	38	40	39	-	-	-	-
Number of Tests							
# at Final Level II or above	75	95	225	-	-	-	-
Total Tests	200	235	575	-	-	-	-

The Domain III score is the average difference between the evaluated student groups' Final Level II or above performance and the 60 percent threshold.

Domain III Grade = C

A = -40–2 B = 3–9 C = 20–35 D = 36–40 F= 41 or more

Student Groups Evaluated	Threshold	2016 Percent of Tests at Final Level II or Above	Gap
Economically Disadvantaged	60	32	**28**
African American	60	33	**27**
White	60	40	**20**
	Sum of Gaps/Number of Groups Evaluated		**75/3**
		Domain III Score	**25**

A–F letter grades are determined using percentiles of Domain III scores by campus type grouped by elementary, middle schools, and high school/K–12. AEAs are grouped together as are districts that are not comprised of a single campus. For discussion purposes only, letter grades are distributed at around the following percentages for the following campus types:

	A (10 percent)	B (30 percent)	C (45 percent)	D (10 percent)	F (5 percent)
Elementary	5 or less	6 – 20	21 – 35	36 to 40	41 or more
Middle	10 or less	11 – 25	26 – 38	39 – 43	44 or more
High School/K–12	2 or less	3 – 19	20 – 35	36 – 40	41 or more
AEA	28 or less	29 – 45	46 – 54	55 – 57	58 or more

Domain III Required Improvement Option for Letter Grades of D or F

A required improvement option could be available for campuses and districts with a letter grade of D or F.

Methodology: The *actual change* must be equal to or greater than the *Required Improvement:*

- **Step 1:** Determine the difference in Final Level II performance from 2015 to 2016 for each of the groups evaluated for 2016 in Domain III.
- **Step 2:** Add the differences in Final Level II performance from 2015 to 2016 and divide by the number of groups evaluated to determine an improvement average. Only campuses and districts with positive improvement averages are eligible for required improvement.
- **Step 3:** In order to determine if the campus or district is on track for improvement in five years, multiply the improvement average by five (5).

- **Step 4:** Compare the projected improvement average to the 2016 Domain III score. Required improvement is awarded if the projected improvement average is greater than or equal to the Domain III score.

Example Domain III Required Improvement for Sample EL

Groups Evaluated	2015 Final Level II Performance	2016 Final Level II Performance	Final Level II Performance Difference
African American	48	53	5
White	50	50	0
Economically Disadvantaged	50	52	2
		Total Performance Difference	7
		Number of Groups Evaluated	3
		Improvement Average	2.3
		Projected Improvement Average	11.5
		Compare Projected Improvement Average to Domain III Score	11.5 ≥ 8.3
Met Required Improvement			

Domain IV Indicators Required by HB 2804

HB 2804 requires specific indicators be evaluated in Domain IV for high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools. This document describes the current use and availability of each required indicator. For existing indicators, a description of the current methodology used to create the indicator is provided. For new indicators that do not currently exist, a possible methodology is provided for review and discussion.

Domain IV – High School/K–12 Indicators

Dropout Rate

Current Use/Availability: Annual Dropout Rate is used in determining Index 4 for high schools and districts in cases where the campus or district has grade 9, 10, 11, or 12 but does not have a longitudinal graduation rate.

Current Methodology

Annual Dropout Rate	Number of grade 9–12 dropouts in a given school year (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Number of grade 9–12 students who were in attendance at any time during a given school year (*from PEIMS*)

Graduation Rate

Current Use/Availability: Graduation rates are available for 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year longitudinal cohorts as are annual rates for a given school year. They are used in determining Index 4 for high schools, K–12 campuses, and districts. Additionally, the 4-year longitudinal rate is included as an indicator in the Postsecondary Readiness distinction designation.

Current Methodology

Four-Year Longitudinal Graduation Rate (2015 example)	Number of students in 2011–12 cohort (students who first attended 9th grade in 2011–12 or who transferred in to Texas public schools on grade in 2012–13, 2013–14, or 2014–15) who received a high school diploma by August 31, 2015 *(from PEIMS)* **---divided by---** Number of students in the Class of 2015 (*from PEIMS and GED*)
Five-Year Longitudinal Graduation Rate (2014 example)	Number of students in the 2010–11 cohort (students who first attended 9th grade in 2010–11 or who transferred in to Texas public schools on grade in 2011–12, 2012–13, or 2013–14) who received a high school diploma by August 31, 2015 (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Number of students in the Class of 2014 (*from PEIMS and GED*)
Six-Year Longitudinal Graduation Rate (2013 example)	Number of students in the 2009–10 cohort (students who first attended 9th grade in 2009–10 or who transferred in to Texas public schools on grade in 2010–11, 2011–12, or 2012–13) who received a high school diploma by August 31, 2015 *(from PEIMS)* **---divided by---** Number of students in the Class of 2013 *(from PEIMS and GED)*

Complete Requirements for FHSP Distinguished Level of Achievement (FHSP-DLA) or Complete the Requirements for an Endorsement (FHSP-E)

Current Use/Availability: The longitudinal RHSP/DAP rate is currently used in determining Index 4; the annual rate may be used if a longitudinal rate is not available. Only the longitudinal RHSP/DAP rate is used to determine the distinction designation for postsecondary readiness. For 2016, a second graduation plan rate that includes FHSP-DLA and FHSP-E graduates was created and used in determining Index 4 and the distinction designation for postsecondary readiness, based on a "best of" comparison and application. Counts and percentages of all graduation plans for annual graduates will be reported on 2016 TAPR.

Current Methodology

Foundation High School Distinguished Level of Achievement (FHSP-DLA) or Foundation High School Plan Endorsement (FHSP-E)	Number of annual graduates in a given school year who completed a FHSP-DLA or FHSP-E *(from PEIMS)*

Complete a CTE Coherent Sequence

Current Use/Availability: CTE-coherent sequence graduation rate is used in determining distinction designations for postsecondary readiness. It is also one of the indicators used in the College and Career Readiness component of Index 4.

Current Methodology

CTE-Coherent Sequence Graduates	Number of annual graduates in a given school year who were enrolled in a CTE-coherent sequence of courses as part of a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits *(from PEIMS)*

Satisfy the TSI Benchmark

The statutory language for the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness benchmarks is provided below.

(vi) the percentage of students who satisfy the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness benchmarks prescribed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under Section 51.3062(f) on an assessment instrument in reading, writing, or mathematics designated by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under Section 51.3062(c);

Beginning in fall 2013, students enrolling in a Texas public institutions of higher education without a TSI exemption (19 TAC §4.54) are required to take the TSIA. Students are required to enroll in developmental education coursework if they do not reach the college-level standard on the TSIA prior to the start of a semester. Students are granted unlimited opportunities to take the TSIA prior to a semester before being required to enroll in developmental education. Students required to take the TSIA are subject to the following standards to be considered college-ready:

- Reading - 351
- Math - 350
- Writing - Essay score of 5 *-or-* 4 and a multiple choice score of 363

Per House Bill 18 (HB 18), 84th Texas Legislature, an institution of higher education (IHE) that administers a Texas Success Initiative (TSI) assessment instrument to students must report to each school district from which assessed students graduated high school all available information regarding student scores and performance on the TSI and student demographics. The THECB must adopt rules as necessary to implement this requirement, including rules for implementation that comply with federal law regarding confidentiality of student medical or educational information, including the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) and FERPA, and any state law relating to the privacy of student information. This requirement begins with TSI assessments administered by public IHEs to entering undergraduate students for the 2016 fall semester.

Current Use/Availability: The Texas Success Initiative (TSI) assessment results were new to accountability in 2016. As implemented, the TSI results will be used as part of the College and Career Readiness component of Index 4, as well as the College-Ready indicator used in determining distinction designations for postsecondary readiness.

Issues: HB 2804 does not specify how many exams or which subject areas should be satisfied. The TSI exam is available for reading/ELA, mathematics, and writing.

Current Methodology

Satisfy the TSI Benchmark	Number of annual graduates in a given school year who met the TSI criteria in reading/ELA and mathematics and/or writing *(from THECB)*

Twelve or More Hours of Postsecondary Credit

This indicator is created based on the HB 2804 requirement to determine the percentage of students who have earned at least 12 hours of postsecondary credit. The data is available via PEIMS, but is not currently collected for use in accountability. The statutory language for this indicator is provided below.

(vii) the percentage of students who earn at least 12 hours of postsecondary credit required for the foundation high school program under Section 28.025 or to earn an endorsement under Section 28.025(c-1).

Proposed Methodology for postsecondary credit indicator (Any Subject):

Numerator consists of qualifying annual graduates with at least 12 hours of postsecondary credit. This is calculated for 'Any Subjects' only.

- The student must have received credit for the course.

- The student must be in grade 9, 10, 11 or 12. This grade span can be adjusted to account for students with college credits prior to grade nine if desired.
- The course must have "college credit hours" greater than zero.
- The course must have a "dual credit" designation. There were no instances of a credit hours greater than zero that were not dual credit courses.
- The college credits follow the student to the graduating campus/district (i.e., the campus/district of accountability is the campus/district where graduation took place, making this a student level measure).
- Courses from regular and extended (summer) PEIMS collections are included for 9–12 graders.
- All student categories (demographics) are calculated.
- Course completion files from 2012–2015 are included. College credit hours are added across courses by student.

Denominator consists of all annual graduates for a given year for a given campus/district.

Rate: Data created overall and for each demographic having denominator > 0.

Current Use/Availability: Available via PEIMS. Collected for reporting on 2016 TAPR.

Issues: HB 2804 does not specify which modes are acceptable for postsecondary credit. PEIMS data are collected for dual credit and articulation agreement courses, but no other postsecondary credit opportunities. Also, statute does not address whether postsecondary credit can also be earned by achieving a specific score on the AP examinations.

Current Methodology

Earn at Least 12 Hours of Postsecondary Credit (SY 2014–15 example)	Number of 2015 annual graduates who earned 12 or more hours of postsecondary credit from 2012–15 **----- divided by -----** Number of 2015 annual graduates *(from PEIMS)*

Complete an AP Course

This indicator is based on the HB2804 requirement to determine the percentage of students who have taken at least one advanced placement course. The statutory language for this indicator is provided below.

(viii) the percentage of students who have completed an advanced placement course;

The consensus of the ATAC members in prior meetings was that this indicator should consider both advanced placement (AP) and international baccalaureate (IB) courses. AP/IB test participation and test performance data are currently used in accountability as is AP/IB course completion as part of advanced course/dual enrollment calculations. However, a specific AB/IB course completion calculation is not currently collected for use in accountability or reported via TAPR or TPRS.

Proposed Methodology for AP/IB course completion indicator (Any Subject):

Numerator consists of annual graduates with credit for at least one AP or IB course in any subject area. Data is available for years 2012–2015.

- The student must have received credit for the course.
- The course must have been the only course or last course in a course sequence.
- The course must have been designated as an AP or IB course (see AP/IB course list attachment).
- The AP/IB course credit follows the student to the graduating campus/district (i.e., the campus/district of accountability is the campus/district where graduation took place, making this a student level measure).
- Courses from regular and extended (summer) PEIMS collections are included for 9–12 graders.
- All student categories (demographics) are calculated.

Denominator consists of all annual graduates for that year for the given campus/district.

Rate: Qualifying students (students who completed one or more AP/IB course) per campus, 100 * numerator / denominator – overall and for each demographic having denominator > 0.

Current Use/Availability: AP/IB performance and participation results are made available to the agency via the College Board. They are used in the current accountability system to help determine the distinction designations for reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and postsecondary readiness.

Current Methodology

Complete an AP Course (SY 2014–15 example)	Number of 2015 annual graduates who completed one or more AP or IB courses from 2012–15 **----- divided by -----** Number of 2015 annual graduates *(from PEIMS)*

Enlist in the Armed Forces (not available for January 1, 2017 report)

Current Use/Availability: Not currently used or available to the agency. The current proposal is to gather the data through Fall PEIMS submissions or January resubmissions (Element ID E15JJ).

Issues: The data for enlistment in the armed forces is not readily available to the agency or to districts. Almost all graduates who enroll in the armed forces do so after graduation. The agency continues to explore other options for collecting the enlistment data directly from a military database, but there is no clear solution at this time.

Possible HB2804 Methodology

Enlist in the Armed Forces	Number of annual graduates in a given school year who enlisted in the armed forces prior to or immediately following graduation *(from PEIMS)*

Earn Industry Certification (not available for January 1, 2017 report)

Current Use/Availability: Not currently used or available to the agency. One option is to gather the data through Fall PEIMS submissions or January resubmissions. See the To The Administrator Addressed correspondence dated September 14, 2016, regarding the collection of industry-based certifications and certificates information.

Issues: Current data availability is limited to industry certifications earned while a student is enrolled in high school. Many other certifications are available to and earned by students one, two, or even three years following graduation.

Possible HB2804 Methodology

Earn Industry Certification	Number of annual graduates in a given school year who earned one or more industry certifications prior to or immediately following graduation *(from PEIMS)*

Domain IV Overall Model for High Schools and K–12 for January 1, 2017 Report (based on currently available indicators)

Graduation/Annual Dropout Rate Score (10 percent of 35 percent weight of Domain IV = 29 percent)

Combined performance across graduation/dropout rates for:

- Grade 9–12 Four-Year Graduation Rate for ten student groups; or
- Grade 9–12 Five-Year Graduation Rate for ten student groups, whichever contributes the most points
- Ten Student Groups: All Students and each racial/ethnic group (seven groups), Students with Disabilities, and ELLs

Postsecondary Readiness Score (25 percent of 35 percent weight of Domain IV = 71 percent)

Combined performance across postsecondary readiness rates for:

- Eight Student Groups: All Students and each racial/ethnic group (seven groups)

Proposed Domain IV – Postsecondary Readiness Methodology

Number of 2015 annual graduates who completed a RHSP or DAP or FHSP-E or FHSP-DLA

OR

Number of 2015 annual graduates who met the TSI criteria in reading and mathematics on the TSIA, SAT or ACT

OR

Number of 2015 annual graduates who were enrolled in a CTE-coherent sequence of courses as part of a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits

OR

Number of 2015 annual graduates who earned 12 or more hours of postsecondary credit from 2012–15

OR

Number of 2015 annual graduates who completed one or more AP or IB courses from 2012–15

---divided by---

Number of 2015 annual graduates

Domain IV –Middle Schools and Junior High Indicators

Student Attendance

Current Use/Availability: Attendance rate is used in determining distinction designations for academic achievement in reading/ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies. Once attendance rate is evaluated as an indicator in Domain IV, it will no longer be evaluated in the academic achievement distinctions.

Current Methodology

Student Attendance	Total number of days students in grade 1–12 are present during a given school year (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Total number of days students in grade 1–12 are in membership during a given school year *(from PEIMS)*

Chronic Absenteeism

Current Use/Availability: Not currently used or available to the agency. The current proposal is to gather the data through PEIMS attendance submissions. Data could be reported as part of TAPR or TPRS.

Possible HB2804 Methodology

Chronic Absenteeism	Total students absent 10 percent or more of the school year (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Total number of students in membership 83 percent or more of the school *(from PEIMS)*

Dropout Rate

Current Use/Availability: The annual dropout rate for grade 7–8 are available on TAPR for informational purposes only.

Current Methodology

Annual Dropout Rate (grade7–8)	Number of dropouts in grades 7 and 8 during a given school year (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Number of students in grades 7 and 8 who were in attendance at any time during a given school year (*from PEIMS*)

Percentage of Seventh and Eighth Grade Students who Receive Instruction in Preparing for High School, College, and Career (Middle School Indicator)

Per House Bill 18 (HB 18), 84th Texas Legislature, each school district must provide instruction to students in grade seven or eight in preparing for high school, college, and a career. The instruction must include information regarding the following:

- Creation of a high school personal graduation plan
- Distinguished level of achievement
- Each endorsement
- College readiness standards
- Potential career choices and the education needed to enter those careers

A school district is permitted to provide the required instruction as part of an existing course, provide the instruction as part of an existing CTE course designated by the SBOE as appropriate for that purpose, or establish a new elective course through which to provide the instruction. Beginning with the 2015–2016 school year, each school district must ensure that each student receives the instruction at least once in grade seven or eight. The statutory language for this indicator is provided below.

TEC 39.053(c)(4)(B)(ii)(b) – The percentage of students in grades seven and eight who receive instruction in preparing for high school, college, and a career that includes information regarding the creation of a high school personal graduation plan under TEC 28.02121, the distinguished level of achievement described by TEC 28.025(b-15), each endorsement described by TEC 28.025(c-1), college readiness standards, and potential career choices and the education needed to enter those careers.

Proposed 2016–2017 changes for TSDS PEIMS

In order to collect the data needed for the Texas public school accountability ratings in the 2017–2018 school year, the following requirements must be implemented beginning in the 2016–2017 school year PEIMS collections. See the attached excerpt from the 2016–2017 Texas Education Data Standards.

1. Related to the requirement of 7th and 8th grade students receiving instruction in preparing for high school, college, and a career, the Texas Education Agency will add a new data element(FHSP-COLLEGE-CAREER-INSTRUCTION-INDICATOR-CODE) to the StudentProgramExtension complex type starting with the 2016–2017 school year fall and summer submissions.

The Texas Education Agency will also add this new data element (FHSP-COLLEGE-CAREER-INSTRUCTION-INDICATOR-CODE) to the Texas Records Exchange System Data Standards for the 2016–2017 school year release of the TREx Data Standards.

Current Use/Availability: Not currently used or available to the agency. The current proposal is to gather the data through Fall PEIMS submissions or January resubmissions.

Issues: Districts will be responsible for submitting data via PEIMS to indicate whether a student has received the appropriate instruction. The difficulty lies in the denominator used for the methodology. Using a fall enrollment snapshot will not account for the students who receive instruction during the school year. Attendance records could be used, but a determination would need to be made regarding the threshold for campuses and districts being accountable for a student.

Possible HB2804 Methodology

Percentage of Seventh and Eighth Grade Students who Receive Instruction in Preparing for High School, College, and Career	Number of students in grade 8 who received instruction in high school preparation during the current or prior school year (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Number of students in grade 8 who were in attendance for 83 percent or more of a given school year (*from PEIMS*)

Percentage of Students who Completed One or More High School Level Courses Prior to Grade 9 (Middle School Indicator)

In the fall 2015 meetings of the APAC and ATAC, there was consensus that an additional indicator for middle schools could credit schools for percentages of students who earned credit in one or more high school courses prior to grade 9.

Current Use/Availability: Not currently used but data is available via PEIMS.

Possible HB2804 Methodology

Percentage of Students who Received High School Course Credit Prior to Grade 9	Number of students in grades 8 or below who received credit for at least one high school level course in the current or prior xx? years (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Number of students in grade 8 who were in attendance for 83 percent or more of a given school year *(from PEIMS)*

Domain IV –Elementary School Indicators

Student Attendance

Current Use/Availability: Attendance rate is used in determining distinction designations for academic achievement in reading/ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies. Once attendance rate is evaluated as an indicator in Domain IV, it will no longer be evaluated in the academic achievement distinctions.

Current Methodology

Student Attendance	Total number of days students in grade 1–12 are present during a given school year (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Total number of days students in grade 1–12 are in membership during a given school year *(from PEIMS)*

Chronic Absenteeism

Current Use/Availability: Not currently used or available to the agency. The current proposal is to gather the data through PEIMS attendance submissions. Data could be reported as part of TAPR or TPRS.

Possible HB2804 Methodology

Chronic Absenteeism	Total students absent 10 percent or more of the school year (*from PEIMS*) **---divided by---** Total number of students in membership 83 percent or more of the school *(from PEIMS)*

Domain IV Overall Model for Elementary and Middle Schools for January 1, 2017 Report (based on currently available indicators)

Elementary

Base A–F letter grade on percentage of students who are chronically absent. Base rating on combined outcomes for ten student groups: All Students and each racial/ethnic group (seven groups), Students with Disabilities, and ELLs

Middle Schools

Base A–F letter grade on both chronic absenteeism and annual 7–8 dropout rate. If no annual 7–8 dropout rate is available, base the grade on chronic absenteeism only.