

Chapter 2 – Ratings Criteria and Index Targets

The *2016 Accountability Manual* describes the 2016 accountability system and explains how information from different sources is used to calculate and assign accountability ratings and award distinction designations. The manual attempts to address all possible scenarios; however, because of the number and diversity of districts and campuses in Texas, there could be some unforeseen circumstances that are not anticipated in the manual. In the event that a data source used to determine district or school performance is unintentionally affected by unforeseen circumstances, including natural disasters or test administration issues, the commissioner of education will consider those circumstances and their impact in determining whether or how that data source will be used to assign accountability ratings and award distinction designations. In such instances, the commissioner will interpret the manual as needed to assign the appropriate ratings and/or award distinction designations that preserve both the intent and the integrity of the accountability system.

2016 Ratings

The accountability system assigns ratings that designate acceptable and unacceptable performance for districts and campuses. In 2016, one of the following ratings is assigned to each district and campus based on its performance on the required indices. Unless otherwise noted, the term districts includes open-enrollment charters.

Met Standard indicates acceptable performance and is assigned to districts and campuses that meet the targets on all required indices for which they have performance data.

Met Alternative Standard indicates acceptable performance and is assigned to eligible CHARTER DISTRICTS AND ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION CAMPUSES (AECs) that are evaluated by ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY (AEA) provisions. To receive this rating, eligible charter districts and AECs must meet modified targets on all required indices for which they have performance data.

Improvement Required indicates unacceptable performance and is assigned to districts and campuses, including charter districts and AECs evaluated under AEA provisions, that do not meet the targets on all required indices for which they have performance data.

In a few specific circumstances, a district or campus does not receive a rating. When this occurs, a district or campus is given one of the following two labels.

Not Rated indicates that a district or campus did not receive a rating for one or more of the following reasons:

- The district or campus serves only students enrolled in early education (EE).
- The district or campus has no data in the ACCOUNTABILITY SUBSET.
- The district or campus has insufficient data to assign a rating.
- The district operates only residential facilities.
- The campus is a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP).
- The campus is a Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP).
- The campus is a residential facility.
- The test documents for either the district or campus were lost in transit between the district and the test contractor.

Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues indicates data accuracy or integrity have compromised performance results, making it impossible to assign a rating. The assignment of a *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* label may be permanent or temporary pending investigation.

2016 Index Targets

Each index has a specific target, and districts and campuses must meet an index's target to show acceptable performance for that index. Districts and non-AEA campuses (campuses not evaluated under alternative education accountability provisions) have separate targets from charter districts and AECs evaluated under alternative education accountability provisions. In addition, for non-AEA campuses only, separate targets are identified for each SCHOOL TYPE for Index 2, Index 3, and Index 4. Please see the explanation of school type later in this chapter.

The 2016 targets for Index 1 and Index 4 are provided in the table below. The 2016 targets for Index 2 and Index 3 for campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of 2016 campus performance by campus type and will be identified prior to the release of the 2016 accountability ratings. The 2016 Index 2 and Index 3 targets for non-AEA districts is set at about the fifth percentile of 2016 campus performance across all non-AEA campuses and will be identified prior to the release of the 2016 accountability ratings.

For non-AEA districts and campuses, Index 4 is comprised of four components: STAAR results, graduation rate, graduation-plan rate, and college and career readiness. Because not all districts and campuses have data for each of these components, Index 4 has two separate targets: one based on all four components and one based on STAAR results only. The target that a district, campus, or charter is required to meet is determined by whether it has data for each of the four components. For a district, high school campus, or campus serving grades K–12 (elementary/secondary), the target for Index 4 is based on all four components. For elementary campuses, middle school campuses, and any district or campus that does not have data for each of the four components, the target is based on the STAAR component only.

For AEA campuses and charter districts, Index 4 is comprised of two components: STAAR results and the graduation rate/dropout rate. Because not all AEAs have data for both of these components, Index 4 has two separate and distinct targets: one based on both components and one based on graduation rate/dropout rate only. AEAs can also earn bonus points towards their Index 4 score. Please see *Chapter 4 – Performance Index Indicators* for a complete description of bonus points.

2016 Accountability Performance Index Targets for Non-AEA Districts and Campuses

Target	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
				All Components	STAAR Component Only
Districts	60	5 th Percentile*	5 th Percentile*	60	13
Campuses					
Elementary	60	5 th Percentile*	5 th Percentile*	n/a	12
Middle		5 th Percentile*	5 th Percentile*	n/a	13
High School/K–12 and Elementary/Secondary		5 th Percentile*	5 th Percentile*	60	21

* Targets for non-AEA campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts correspond to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance across all campus types.

2016 Accountability Performance Index Targets – AEA Charter Districts and Campuses

Target	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
				Both Components	Graduation/ Dropout Rate Component Only
AEA Charter Districts and Campuses	35	5 th Percentile*	5 th Percentile*	33	45

* Targets for both AEA charter districts and campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2016 campus performance.

Index Targets for Single-Campus Districts or Charters

A district or charter comprised of only one campus that shares the same 2016 performance data with that campus must meet the index target required for the campus in order to demonstrate acceptable performance. For these single-campus districts and charters, the 2016 index targets applied to the campus will also be applied to the district, ensuring that both the district and campus receive identical ratings. Districts or charters that meet the definition above are considered single-campus districts or charters in any criteria outlined in this manual.

2016 Ratings Criteria

To receive a *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating, districts and campuses must meet the performance index target on the following indices if they have performance data:

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

For example, a campus with performance data for all four indices must meet the target on either Index 1 or Index 2 and the targets on Index 3 and Index 4. A campus with performance data for Index 1, Index 3, and Index 4 must meet the target on all three of those. A campus with performance data for only Index 1 and Index 3 must meet the target on both indices. A campus with performance data for only Index 1 and Index 2 needs only to meet the target on either one.

2016 Accountability System School Types

Every campus is labeled as one of four school types according to its grade span based on 2015–16 enrollment data reported in the fall PEIMS submission. The four types—elementary, middle school, elementary/secondary (also referred to as K–12), and high school—are illustrated by the table on the following page. The table shows every combination of grade levels served by campuses in Texas and the number of campuses that serve each of those combinations. The shading indicates the school type to which each grade span corresponds.

To find out how a campus that serves a certain grade span is labeled, find the lowest grade level reported as being served by that campus along the left column and the highest grade level reported as being served along the top row. The shading of the cell where the two grade levels intersect indicates which of the four school types that campus is considered. The number inside the cell indicates how many campuses in Texas serve that grade span. For example, a campus that serves early elementary (EE) through fourth grade only is labeled elementary; there are 170 campuses that serve only that grade span. A campus that serves grades five and six only is labeled middle school, and there are 146 such campuses statewide.

2016 Accountability System School Types (8,673 Total Campuses)



		Highest Grade Level Served →														
		EE	PK	KG	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Lowest Grade Level Served ↓	EE	7	70	52	44	72	42	170	1024	101	2	12	0	1	0	31
	PK		43	16	12	27	18	169	1123	190	9	67	1	3	4	135
	KG			3	4	11	25	138	675	118	11	58	6	4	5	56
	1				1	13	24	6	35	23	0	3	1	1	5	13
	2					2	20	14	22	3	1	2	0	0	2	5
	3						0	15	87	9	1	4	3	1	0	5
	4							1	56	34	2	5	0	1	3	11
	5								11	146	1	86	1	3	5	7
	6									39	10	1108	13	22	19	142
	7										5	254	10	5	19	134
	8											9	5	14	20	33
	9												60	33	23	1334
	10													14	3	41
11														10	21	
12															20	

TEA Division of Performance Reporting

Who is Rated?

Districts and campuses that have students enrolled in the fall of the 2015–16 school year are assigned a state accountability rating.

Districts

Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, districts and charter operators are rated based on the aggregate results of their campuses. Districts without any students enrolled in the grades for which STAAR assessments are administered (3–12) are assigned the rating label of *Not Rated*.

State-administered school districts, including Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired, Texas School for the Deaf, Texas Juvenile Justice Department, and Windham School District are not assigned a state accountability rating.

Campuses

Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, campuses, including AECs and open-enrollment charter schools, are rated based on the performance of their students. For the purposes of assigning accountability ratings, campuses that do not serve any of the grade levels for which the STAAR assessments are given are PAIRED with campuses in their district that serve students who take STAAR. Please see *Chapter 6 – Other Accountability System Processes* for information on pairing.

The following campuses are assigned the rating label of *Not Rated* in 2016:

- **Residential facilities:** For AECs identified as residential facilities, and AEA charter districts that operate only residential facilities, performance index results are reported, but a rating label is not assigned. Students enrolled in AECs and charter districts operating as residential facilities are excluded from accountability only if the student attribution codes are entered and submitted accurately during the fall 2015 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) submission. Please see *Appendix G – Inclusion or Exclusion of Performance Data*.
- **Campuses that close mid-year:** If data for an accountability index exists for a campus that closes mid-year, the data are included in the district's accountability rating. A campus that closes after the end of the school year is assigned a rating for that school year.
- **JJAEPs and DAEPs:** Attendance and performance data for students served in JJAEPs and DAEPs are reported to the students' home campuses, and the HOME CAMPUS is evaluated based on the results.
- **Campuses that have no students in the accountability subset:** Campuses that serve students in grades 3–12, but have no test results due to the accountability subset are not rated. This includes AECs with short-term student placements.
- **Charter campuses with no students in grades tested:** Open-enrollment charter schools without any students enrolled in the grades for which STAAR assessments are administered (3–12) are not rated.

Timeline for Ratings Release

- **Friday, August 12, 2016:** The 2016 accountability ratings are released to districts and campuses through the TEA Secure Environment (TEASE) website. Please see *Appendix E – TEASE Accountability*.
- **Monday, August 15, 2016:** Accountability ratings are released to the public on the TEA website.
- **By Friday, August 26, 2016:** Data tables released through TEASE (unmasked) and public website (masked)
- **By Friday, September 16, 2016:** System safeguards, distinction designations, and accountability summaries released through TEASE (unmasked) and public website (masked)
- **December 2016:** Final accountability ratings that reflect the outcome of any ratings appeals are released to the public on the TEA website.

Ensuring Data Integrity

Accurate data is fundamental to accountability ratings. The system depends on the responsible collection and submission of assessment and PEIMS information by school districts and charter operators. Responsibility for the accuracy and quality of data used to determine district and campus ratings, therefore, rests with local authorities. Any appeal of an *Improvement Required* rating that is based on a district's submission of inaccurate data will be denied.

Because accurate and reliable data are the foundation of the accountability system, TEA has established several steps to protect the quality and integrity of the data and the accountability ratings that are based on that data.

- **Campus Number Tracking:** Requests for campus number changes are approved in light of prior state accountability ratings. An *Improvement Required* rating for the same campus assigned two different campus numbers may be considered to be consecutive years of low ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions.
- **Data Validation Monitoring:** The Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBM system, like the state accountability system, is a data-driven system based on data submitted by districts; therefore, the integrity of districts' data is critical. The PBM system includes annual data validation analyses that examine districts' leaver and dropout data, student assessment data, and discipline data. Districts identified with potential data integrity concerns engage in a process to either validate the accuracy of their data or determine that erroneous data were submitted. This process is fundamental to the integrity of all the agency's evaluation systems. For more information, see the Data Validation Manuals on the PBM website at <http://tea.texas.gov/pbm/DVManuals.aspx>.
- **Test Security:** As part of ongoing efforts to improve security measures surrounding the assessment program, TEA uses a comprehensive set of test security procedures designed to assure parents, students, and the public that test results are meaningful and valid. Among other measures, districts are required to implement seating charts during all administrations, conduct annual training for all testing personnel, and maintain test security materials for five years. Detailed information about test security policies for the state assessment program is available online at <http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/security/>.

- ***Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues:*** This rating is used when the accuracy and/or integrity of performance results have been compromised, preventing the assignment of a rating. This label may be assigned temporarily pending an on-site investigation or may be the final rating for the year. It is not equivalent to an *Improvement Required* rating, though the commissioner of education has the authority to lower a rating, assign an *Improvement Required* rating due to data quality issues, or consider the rating of *Improvement Required* for purposes of determining consecutive years of low ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

These steps can occur either before or after the ratings release, and sanctions can be imposed at any time. To the extent possible, ratings for the year are finalized when updated ratings are released following the resolution of appeals. A rating change resulting from an imposed sanction will stand as the final rating for the year.

Special Processing for Spring 2016 Testing Issues

The results of the grade 5 and 8 reading and mathematics, grade 4 and 7 writing, and EOC English I and English II tests affected by the online testing issues that occurred in March will be excluded from 2016 state accountability. In addition, any grades 5 and 8 results from the May retest administration for the affected students will also be excluded. If, however, including the results from either the March or May test administration would change a district or campus rating from *Improvement Required* to *Met Standard*, that district or campus will receive a *Met Standard* rating. The data will remain the same; only the rating will change. TEA will conduct this analysis prior to the release of the ratings on August 12. The results evaluated for distinction designations and system safeguards will also exclude the affected tests.

This page is intentionally blank.