

2018 Accountability Administrator's Guide

for Texas Public School Districts and Campuses



Office of Academics
Department of Performance Reporting

This page is intentionally blank.

Table of Contents

About this Guide	1
Part 1—Who is Rated?.....	2
Districts	2
Campuses.....	2
Rating Labels.....	2
Districts	2
Single-Campus Districts.....	2
Campuses.....	2
Part 2—Data Sources	4
2018 STAAR-Based Indicators.....	4
Accountability Subset Rule	4
STAAR Retest Performance.....	4
Accountability Subset Examples for EOC Retesters.....	5
2018 TSDS PEIMS-Based Indicators	5
2018 Other Assessment Indicators.....	6
Ensuring Data Integrity.....	6
Part 3—Overview of the 2018 Accountability System.....	8
Student Achievement Domain	8
STAAR Component—Methodology	8
College, Career, and Military Readiness Component—Methodology	8
Graduation Rate Component—Methodology.....	8
Student Achievement Domain Rating—Methodology	8
School Progress Domain	9
School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth—Methodology	9
School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance—Methodology	9
School Progress Domain Rating—Methodology	9
Closing the Gaps Domain	9
Academic Achievement—Methodology	10
Academic Growth Status—Methodology	10
Federal Graduation Status—Methodology	10
English Language Proficiency Component—Methodology	10
Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only—Methodology	10
College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance Status—Methodology.....	10
Closing the Gaps Domain Rating—Methodology	11
Overall District or Campus Rating.....	11

Part 4—Identification of Schools for Improvement	12
Comprehensive Support and Improvement	12
Targeted Support and Improvement	12
Additional Targeted Support.....	12
Part 5—Inclusion of English Learners in 2018 Accountability	13
Part 6—Other Accountability System Processes	14
Pairing.....	14
Alternative Education Accountability Provisions	14
Part 7—Local Accountability Systems	15
Part 8—Distinction Designations	16
Part 9—Appeals	17

2018 Accountability Administrator's Guide

About this Guide

The *2018 Accountability Administrator's Guide* briefly explains how the Texas Education Agency (TEA) uses the accountability system to evaluate the academic performance of Texas public schools. The guide describes the accountability system and explains how information from various sources is used to calculate and assign accountability ratings and award distinction designations.

This guide is intended to provide information that is relevant to school district and open-enrollment charter school administrators. The [*2018 Accountability Manual*](#) provides additional technical details and scenarios beyond those provided in this guide.

Part 1—Who is Rated?

Districts and campuses with students enrolled in the fall of the 2017–18 school year as shown in the TSDS PEIMS fall snapshot are assigned a state accountability rating.

Districts

Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, school districts and open-enrollment charter schools are rated based on the aggregate results of students in 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*.

Campuses

Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, campuses and open-enrollment charter schools, including alternative education campuses (AECs), are rated based on the performance of their students. For the purposes of assigning accountability ratings, campuses that do not serve any grade level for which the STAAR assessments are administered are paired with campuses in their district that serve students who take STAAR.

Rating Labels

Districts and campuses receive an overall rating, as well as a rating for each domain. The 2018 rating labels for districts and campuses are as follows.

Districts

- **A, B, C, or D:** Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to districts (including those evaluated under alternative education accountability [AEA]) that meet the performance target for the letter grade
- **F:** Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to districts (including AEAs) that do not meet the performance target to earn at least a *D*
- **Not Rated:** Assigned to districts that—under certain, specific circumstances—do not receive a rating

Single-Campus Districts

A school district or charter school comprised of only one campus that shares the same 2018 performance data with its only campus must meet the performance targets required for the campus in order to demonstrate acceptable performance. For these single-campus school districts and charter schools, the 2018 performance targets applied to the campus are also applied to the district, ensuring that both the district and campus receive identical ratings. Single-campus districts receive either a *Met Standard*, *Met Alternative Standard*, *Improvement Required*, or *Not Rated* rating for 2018 to align with the campus rating.

Campuses

- **Met Standard:** Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to campuses that meet the performance targets
- **Improvement Required:** Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to campuses (including AECs) that do not meet the performance targets
- **Met Alternative Standard:** Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to alternative education campuses evaluated under AEA provisions that meet the performance targets

- **Not Rated:** Assigned to campuses that—under certain, specific circumstances—do not receive a rating

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 labels.

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

- 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 district or campus met one of the criteria for the Hurricane Harvey Provision. For more information about the Hurricane Harvey Provision, please see "Chapter 10—Hurricane Harvey" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).
- The commissioner otherwise determines that the district or campus will not be rated.

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.

Not Rated: Annexation indicates that the campus is in its first school year after annexation by another district and, therefore, is not rated, as allowed by the annexation agreement with the agency.

Part 2—Data Sources

2018 STAAR-Based Indicators

Accountability Subset Rule

A subset of assessment results is used to calculate each domain. The calculation includes only assessment results for students enrolled in the district or campus in a previous fall, as reported on the TSDS PEIMS October snapshot. Three assessment administration periods are considered for accountability purposes:

STAAR results are included in the subset of district/campus accountability	if the student was enrolled in the district/campus on this date:
EOC summer 2017 administration	Fall 2016 enrollment snapshot
EOC fall 2017 administration	
EOC spring 2018 administration	Fall 2017 enrollment snapshot
Grades 3–8 spring 2018 administration	

The 2018 accountability subset rules apply to the STAAR performance results evaluated across all three domains.

- Grades 3–8: districts and campuses are responsible for students reported as enrolled in the fall (referred to as October snapshot) in the spring assessment results.
- End-of-Course (EOC): districts and campuses are responsible for
 - summer 2017 results for students reported as enrolled in fall 2016 snapshot;
 - fall 2017 results for students reported as enrolled in the fall 2017 snapshot; and
 - spring 2018 results for students reported as enrolled in the fall 2017 snapshot.

STAAR Retest Performance

The opportunity to retest is available to students who have taken grades 5 and 8 STAAR reading, mathematics, or EOC assessments in any subject.

- Student Success Initiative (SSI) – For students in grades 5 and 8, performance calculations will include assessment results for reading and mathematics from either the first administration or the first retest administration of all STAAR versions. The second retest administration in June 2018 is not used.
- For students in grades 5 and 8, the STAAR reading and mathematics assessment results from the first and second administration (first retest opportunity) are processed in two steps. First, the best result from both administrations is found for each subject. The best result is found for performance and progress, considered separately. If all results have the same level of performance, then the most recent result is selected for calculation. Second, the accountability subset rules determine whether the result is included in accountability.
- EOC retesters are counted as passers based on the passing standard in place when they were first eligible to take any EOC assessment.

The following charts provide examples of how the accountability subset is applied to EOC retesters.

Accountability Subset Examples for EOC Retesters

Enrolled	Tested	Enrolled	Tested	Tested
Fall 2016 Snapshot Campus A	Summer 2017 Campus A	Fall 2017 Snapshot Campus A	Fall 2017 Campus A	Spring 2018 Campus A
The best result is selected. Each result meets the accountability subset rule.				

For students who enrolled and tested at a different district or campus during the 2017–18 school year, the student's single best result for each EOC is selected. The best result is found for performance and progress, considered separately. If all results have the same level of performance, the most recent result is selected for calculations. The selected result is applied to the district and campus that administered the assessment if the student meets the accountability subset rule (discussed above).

Enrolled	Tested	Enrolled	Tested	Tested
Fall 2016 Snapshot Campus A	Summer 2017 Campus A	Fall 2017 Snapshot Campus A	Fall 2017 Campus B	Spring 2018 Campus B
The best result is selected. Only the summer 2017 result meets the accountability subset rule.				

2018 TSDS PEIMS-Based Indicators

One of the primary sources for data used in the accountability system is the TSDS PEIMS data collection. The TSDS PEIMS data collection has a prescribed process and timeline that offer school districts the opportunity to correct data submission errors or data omissions discovered following the initial data submission. TSDS PEIMS data provided by school districts and used to create specific indicators are listed below.

TSDS PEIMS data used for accountability indicators	Data for
4-year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	Class of 2017
5-year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	Class of 2016
6-year Longitudinal Graduation Rate	Class of 2015

TSDS PEIMS data used for accountability indicators	Data for
Annual Dropout Rate	2016–17 School Year
Enlist in U.S. Armed Forces	
Earn an Industry-Based Certification	
Earn an Associate's Degree	
Graduate with Completed IEP and Workforce Readiness	2016–17, 2015–16, 2014–15, and 2013–14 School Years
CTE Coherent Sequence Coursework Aligned with Industry-Based Certifications	
Complete College Prep Course	
Dual-Credit Course Completion	

2018 Other Assessment Indicators

The College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) component of the accountability system includes data from ACT, Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), SAT, and Texas Success Initiative (TSI) assessment results.

Other assessment data used for College, Career, and Military Readiness	Data reported for
ACT college admissions test	Tests as of June 2017 administration
AP examination	Tests as of May 2017 administration
IB examination	Tests as of May 2017 administration
TSI assessment	Tests as of October 2017 administration
SAT college admissions test	Tests as of June 2017 administration

Ensuring Data Integrity

Accurate data is fundamental to accountability ratings. The system depends on the responsible collection and submission of assessment and TSDS PEIMS information by school districts and charter schools. Responsibility for the accuracy and quality of data used to determine district and campus ratings, therefore, rests with local authorities.

Because accurate and reliable data are the foundation of the accountability system, the Texas Education Agency (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 may be approved with consideration of prior state accountability ratings. An *Improvement Required* rating for the same campus assigned two different campus numbers may be considered as consecutive years of unacceptable ratings for accountability interventions and sanctions, if the commissioner determines this is necessary to preserve the integrity of the accountability system.

- **Data Validation Monitoring:** The Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) is a comprehensive system designed to improve student performance and program effectiveness. The PBMAS, 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 PBMAS 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 assessment 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 certain test administration 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 *F* or an *Improvement Required* rating, though the commissioner of education has the authority to lower a rating, assign an *F* or an *Improvement Required* rating due to data quality issues. A *Not Rated* rating does not break the chain of consecutive years of unacceptable accountability ratings for accountability sanctions and interventions purposes. All districts and campuses with a final rating label of *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* are automatically subject to desk audits the following year.

Part 3—Overview of the 2018 Accountability System

The overall design of the accountability system evaluates performance according to three domains. For additional information on each domain, see Chapters 2, 3, and 4 of the [*2018 Accountability Manual*](#).

Student Achievement Domain

Student Achievement evaluates performance across all subjects for all students, on both general and alternate assessments, College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicators, and graduation rates.

STAAR Component—Methodology

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

- Approaches Grade Level or above
- Meets Grade Level or above
- Masters Grade Level

The STAAR component score is calculated by dividing the total points (cumulative performance for the three performance levels) by three resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100 for all districts and campuses.

College, Career, and Military Readiness Component—Methodology

The CCMR component of the Student Achievement domain measures graduates' preparedness for college, the workforce, or the military. One point is given for each annual graduate who accomplishes any one of the CCMR indicators, except for CTE coherent sequence graduates who earn one-half point credit for coursework completion and credit aligned with industry-based certifications:

- *Meet Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Criteria in ELA/Reading and Mathematics.*
- *Meet Criteria on Advanced Placement (AP)/International Baccalaureate (IB) Examination.*
- *Earn Dual Course Credits.*
- *Enlist in the Armed Forces.*
- *Earn an Industry-Based Certification.*
- *Earn an Associate's Degree.*
- *Graduate with Completed IEP and Workforce Readiness.*
- *CTE Coherent Sequence Coursework Aligned with Industry-Based Certifications.*

Graduation Rate Component—Methodology

The graduation rate component of the Student Achievement domain includes the best of the four-year, five-year, and six-year high school graduation rates or the annual dropout rate, if no graduation rate is available.

Student Achievement Domain Rating—Methodology

For elementary, middle, and high schools/K-12s without CCMR or graduation rate components, the STAAR component scaled score is the Student Achievement domain scaled score. For high schools, K-12s, and districts with CCMR and graduation rate component, the STAAR component scaled score is weighted at 40 percent, the CCMR component scaled score at 40 percent, and the

graduation rate converted score at 20 percent to determine the Student Achievement domain scaled score.

For districts and campuses lacking a graduation rate component, the STAAR component scaled score is weighted at 50 percent and the CCMR component scaled score at 50 percent to determine the Student Achievement domain scaled score.

For districts and campuses lacking both the CCMR and the graduation rate components, the STAAR component scaled score is the Student Achievement domain scaled score.

For more information about scaling, please see "Chapter 5—Calculating 2018 Ratings" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#) or visit our Scaling Resources page at www.tea.texas.gov/2018scalingresources.aspx.

School Progress Domain

School Progress measures district and campus outcomes in two areas: the number of students that grew at least one year academically (or are on track) as measured by STAAR results and the achievement of all students relative to districts or campuses with similar economically disadvantaged percentages.

School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth—Methodology

School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth provides an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for STAAR results in ELA/reading and mathematics that either meet the student-level criteria for the STAAR progress measure or maintain proficiency. For additional details about how points are awarded, please see "Chapter 3—School Progress Domain" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance—Methodology

School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance measures the achievement of all students on either STAAR across all subjects or STAAR across all subjects and the College, Career, and Military component (if available) relative to districts or campuses (by campus type) with similar economically disadvantaged percentages.

School Progress Domain Rating—Methodology

The better outcome of the School Progress, Part A or Part B scaled scores is used for the School Progress domain rating. If either Part A or Part B's scaled score results in an *F/Improvement Required* rating, the highest scaled score that can be used is an 89. For more information about scaling, please see "Chapter 5—Calculating 2018 Ratings" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

Closing the Gaps Domain

Closing the Gaps uses disaggregated data in four components to demonstrate differentials among racial/ethnic groups, socioeconomic backgrounds and other factors. The indicators included in this domain, as well as the domain's construction, align the state accountability system with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

The Closing the Gaps domain evaluates performance of fourteen student groups:

- All students
- Seven racial/ethnic groups: African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, white, and two or more races
- Economically disadvantaged
- Students receiving special education services
- Students formerly receiving special education services
- Current and monitored English learners (through year 4 of monitoring)

- Continuously enrolled
- Non-continuously enrolled

Academic Achievement—Methodology

Each student group is evaluated by subject area on the percentage of ELA/reading and mathematics assessment results that are at the Meets Grade Level or above standard. Each student group's performance is then compared to the 2018 Academic Achievement performance targets. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

Academic Growth Status—Methodology

For elementary and middle schools, as well as high schools, K–12s, and districts without graduation rates, each student group is evaluated by subject area on the percentage of ELA/reading and mathematics assessment results that maintained proficiency or met the growth expectations on STAAR. Each student group's performance is then compared to the 2018 Academic Growth Status performance targets. Please see "Chapter 3—School Progress Domain" for details on how points are awarded for growth. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

Federal Graduation Status—Methodology

For high schools, K–12s, and districts with graduation rates the Federal Graduation Status component measures the federal four-year graduation rate for each student group in the Class of 2017. Texas uses the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition and the federal calculation for graduation rate. For the Class of 2017, the four-year graduation target is 90 percent of students graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

English Language Proficiency Component—Methodology

The English Language Proficiency component measures an English learner's (EL) progress towards achieving English language proficiency. Current ELs are the only students evaluated in this component. Due to changes to the TELPAS, Texas requested a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education to waive the English Language Proficiency component for 2018 accountability. If granted, the English Language Proficiency component will be evaluated for the first time in 2019. If denied, the data evaluated in this indicator will lag a year. If evaluated in 2018 accountability, the English Language Proficiency component will evaluate TELPAS results from 2015–16 and 2016–17.

Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only—Methodology

For elementary and middle schools, as well as high schools, K–12s, and districts without annual graduates, the Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only evaluates STAAR results in all subject areas at the Approaches Grade Level or above, Meets Grade Level or above, and Masters Grade Level standard. The performance rates calculated in this component are the disaggregated results used in the Student Achievement domain. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance Status—Methodology

For high schools, K–12s, and districts with annual graduates the College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance Status component measures students' preparedness for college, the workforce, or the military. This component differs slightly from the CCMR component in the Student Achievement domain. The denominator used here is annual graduates plus students in grade 12 who did not graduate. The performance targets are provided in "Chapter 4—Closing the Gaps Domain" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

Closing the Gaps Domain Rating—Methodology

The percentage of eligible indicators met out of the total eligible indicators determines the component scores. Each component is weighted according to the following table and scaled. For more information about scaling, please see “Chapter 5—Calculating 2018 Ratings” of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

Closing the Gaps Component Weights		
Campus Types	Closing the Gaps Domain Component	Weight
Elementary and Middle Schools	Academic Achievement	30%
	Academic Growth Status	50%
	English Language Proficiency*	10%
	Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only	10%
High Schools, K-12s, AEAs, and Districts	Academic Achievement	50%
	Federal Graduation Status or Academic Growth Status ²	10%
	English Language Proficiency*	10%
	College, Career, and Military Readiness or Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only ³	30%

*Due to changes to the TELPAS, Texas requested a waiver from the USDE to waive the English Language Proficiency component for 2018 accountability. If granted, the English Language Proficiency component will be evaluated for the first time in 2019, and the English Language Proficiency component weight will be distributed proportionally among the remaining components in 2018.

Overall District or Campus Rating

The better outcome of the Student Achievement and the School Progress domain scaled scores is weighted at 70 percent. If either domain’s scaled score results in an *F/Improvement Required* rating, the highest scaled score that can be used is an 89.

The Closing the Gaps domain scaled score is weighted at 30 percent. The total weighted outcome of the two scaled scores is the overall score.

A district may not receive an overall or domain rating of *A* if the district includes any campus with a corresponding overall or domain rating of *Improvement Required*. In this case, the highest scaled score a district can receive for the overall or in the corresponding domain is an 89.

If an *F/Improvement Required* rating is received in three of the four areas of Student Achievement; School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth; School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance; or Closing the Gaps, the highest scaled score a district, open-enrollment charter school, or campus can receive for the overall rating is a 59. In order for this provision to be applied, the district, open-enrollment charter school, or campus must be evaluated in all four areas.

Part 4—Identification of Schools for Improvement

To align identification of schools for improvement with the state's accountability system, TEA utilizes a rank-ordering method based on the Closing the Gaps domain performance to identify comprehensive, targeted, and additional targeted support and improvement schools.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

The Closing the Gaps domain scaled score is used to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement. TEA rank orders the scaled domain score for all campuses. The lowest five percent of campuses that receive Title I, Part A funds are identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Also, if a campus does not attain a 67 percent four-year graduation rate for the all students group, the campus is also automatically identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Additionally, any Title I campus identified for targeted support and improvement for three consecutive years is identified for comprehensive support and improvement the following school year.

TEA will annually identify campuses for comprehensive support and improvement beginning with the August 2018 accountability release, which is based on school year 2017–18 performance data.

Targeted Support and Improvement

TEA uses the Closing the Gaps domain to identify campuses that have consistently underperforming student groups. TEA defines “consistently underperforming” as a campus having one or more student groups that do not meet interim benchmark goals for three consecutive years. Any campus that has one or more achievement gap(s) between individual student groups and the performance targets will be identified for targeted support and improvement.

Campuses are evaluated annually, and identification will occur for the first time in August 2019 based on 2017, 2018, and 2019 data.

Additional Targeted Support

Any campus that is not identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement will be identified for additional targeted support if an individual student group’s percentage of evaluated indicators met is at or below the percentage used to identify that campus type for comprehensive support and improvement.

For example, if 25 percent of evaluated indicators met is the cut point for elementary schools to be identified for comprehensive support and improvement, then any elementary campus with a student group that has met 25 percent or fewer of its evaluated indicators will be identified for additional targeted support.

Identification will begin with the August 2018 school ratings and will occur on an annual basis.

Part 5—Inclusion of English Learners in 2018 Accountability

English learners (ELs) who are year one in U.S. schools are excluded from accountability performance calculations. Due to changes to the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS), Texas requested a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education to exclude EL students who are year two in U.S. schools from 2018 performance calculations. If granted, ELs who are in their second year in U.S. schools will be included in accountability for 2019 and beyond. If denied, ELs who are in their second year in U.S. schools will be included in accountability for 2018.

STAAR Alternate 2 assessment results will be included regardless of an EL's years in U.S. schools.

The STAAR progress measure is used for ELs and non-ELs in the School Progress, Part A domain.

Unschooled asylees, unschooled refugees, and students with interrupted formal education (SIFEs) are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

Part 6—Other Accountability System Processes

Pairing

All campuses serving prekindergarten through grade 12 must receive an accountability rating. Campuses that do not serve any grade level for which STAAR assessments are administered are paired with another campus in the same district for accountability purposes. A campus may pair with its district and be evaluated on the district's results. For more information on campus pairing, please see "Chapter 7—Other Accountability System Processes" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

Alternative Education Accountability Provisions

Alternative education accountability (AEA) charter schools and campuses are evaluated on all the domains, components, and indicators except for School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance due to the small number of districts and campuses used for comparison.

Alternative procedures applicable to the graduation rate and annual dropout rate calculations are provided for approved campuses and charter schools serving at-risk students in alternative education programs.

Targets and cut points established by campus type have AEA-specific targets and cut points, as applicable. For more information, please see "Chapter 5—Calculating 2018 Ratings" of the [2018 Accountability Manual](#).

Part 7—Local Accountability Systems

House Bill 22 (85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017) established Local Accountability Systems, which allow districts and charter schools to develop plans to locally evaluate their campuses. Once a plan receives approval from the agency, districts and charter schools may use locally developed domains and indicators with the three state-mandated domains to assign ratings for campuses that meet certain criteria.

The integration of Local Accountability Systems will come in stages. The agency is overseeing a small-scale pilot program for the 2017–18 academic year. This pilot program will inform the full roll out of the local accountability system option. Additional information will be released during the 2018–19 academic year.

Part 8—Distinction Designations

Campuses that receive an accountability rating of *Met Standard* are eligible to earn distinction designations. Distinction designations are awarded for achievement in several areas and are based on performance relative to a group of campuses of similar type, size, grade span, and student demographics. The distinction designation indicators are typically separate from those used to assign accountability ratings. Districts that receive a rating of *A*, *B*, *C*, or *D* are eligible for a distinction designation in postsecondary readiness.

For 2018, distinction designations are awarded in the following areas:

- Academic Achievement in English Language Arts/Reading (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Mathematics (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Science (campus only)
- Academic Achievement in Social Studies (campus only)
- Top 25 Percent: Comparative Academic Growth (campus only)
- Top 25 Percent: Comparative Closing the Gaps (campus only)
- Postsecondary Readiness (district and campus)

Please see “Chapter 6—Distinction Designations” of the [*2018 Accountability Manual*](#) for more information.

Part 9—Appeals

While districts and charter schools may appeal for any reason, the accountability system framework limits the likelihood that a single indicator or measure will result in an *F* or *Improvement Required* rating. For this reason, a successful accountability appeal is usually limited to such rare cases as a data or calculation error attributable to the testing contractor(s), a regional education service center, or TEA. The compensatory nature of the performance framework minimizes the possibility that district or charter school data coding errors in the TSDS PEIMS or STAAR program will negatively impact the overall accountability rating. Online applications provided by TEA and the testing contractors ensure that districts and charter schools are aware of data correction opportunities, particularly through TSDS PEIMS data submissions and the Texas Assessment Management System (TAMS). District and charter school responsibility for data quality is the cornerstone of a fair and uniform rating determination. An appeal that is solely based on a district's submission of inaccurate data will likely be denied.

District and charter school appeals that challenge the agency determination of the accountability rating are carefully reviewed by an external panel. District superintendents and chief operating officers of charter schools may appeal accountability ratings by following the guidelines in "Chapter 8—Appealing the Ratings" of the [*2018 Accountability Manual*](#).



Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

July 2018