“The commissioner shall evaluate school district and campus performance and assign each district and campus an overall performance rating of”

A B C D or F
A Two Year Process of Gathering Feedback

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

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

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

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

A = Exemplary Performance

B = Recognized Performance

C = Acceptable Performance

D = In Need of Improvement

F = Unacceptable Performance

2017-18 – Labels applied to districts

2018-19 – Labels will apply to campuses
Design Approach: Two Philosophical Commitments

1. “The commissioner shall ensure that the method used to evaluate performance is implemented in a manner that provides the mathematical possibility that all districts and campuses receive an A rating.”

2. HB22 changed the required accountability rule update cycle from “annually” to “periodically” This allows stability in the rules, so that schools don’t constantly face changing standards.

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

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

This design has produced ratings that are not strongly correlated with poverty.
Ratings Must Be Easy to Access

Stakeholders requested that rating information be easily viewable, with supporting material to help people understand them.

www.TXschools.gov
District Level Highlights

Including single campus districts* 1,187 ISDs/charters were evaluated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(90-100)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>(80-89)</td>
<td>43%***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>(70-79)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>(60-69)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(0-59)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16 districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* - 272 single campus districts/charters receive a Met Standard / Improvement Required label, but are still given a 0-100 point score
** - 83 districts/charters that received a Hurricane Harvey exception received either an A rating, or No Rating, but are still given a 0-100 point score
*** - Districts receive a max score of 89 if they have any IR campuses, even if they would have otherwise received an A
District Level Poverty Analysis

Student poverty is not a strong factor in how a district was rated

Correlation between the rate of students eligible for a free/reduced lunch and district overall A-F ratings: **.4 (moderate)**

**Domain Specific Correlations**

- **Student Achievement Domain:** **.6 (strong)**
- **School Progress Domain:** **.1 (weak)**
- **Closing the Gaps Domain:** **.5 (moderate)**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Enroll</th>
<th>Eco Dis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharyland ISD</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United ISD</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43,212</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen ISD</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23,640</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Fresnos CISD</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10,770</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburg CISD</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34,098</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst-Euless-Bedford ISD</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23,364</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Public Schools***</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35,595</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville ISD***</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45,535</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** - Districts receive a max score of 89 if they have any IR campuses, even if they would have otherwise received an A
8,253 campuses were rated* (including 347 paired campuses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Standard (90-100)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Standard (80-89)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Standard (70-79)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Standard (60-69)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Required (0-59)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Because of Hurricane Harvey, about 1200 campuses were eligible to receive a “Not Rated” designation if they would have otherwise been rated Improvement Required. 86 campuses will receive a Not Rated designation, but the underlying 0-100 point score information is still visible. The total number of campuses receiving an “Improvement Required” rating is 349. The total number of rated campus is 8,167.
Campus Level Poverty Analysis

Student poverty is not a strong factor in how a campus was rated

Correlation between the rate of students eligible for a free/reduced lunch and campus overall A-F ratings: $0.4$ (moderate)

Domain Specific Correlations
- Student Achievement Domain: $0.7$ (strong)
- School Progress Domain: $0.1$ (weak)
- Closing the Gaps Domain: $0.4$ (moderate)

There are 259 high-poverty campuses (80-100% Eco Dis) that received a score of 90-100 (ie, “A”). This represents 11% of all high-poverty campuses.

There are 169 low-poverty campuses (0-20% Eco Dis) that received a score below 90 (ie, less than an “A”).
Design Details
Student Achievement Domain

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
Student Achievement: Calculating Score

- Rule adjusted proportional weighting for High School in the Student Achievement domain to 40-40-20

- College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
- Graduation Rates
Student Achievement: Calculating Score

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

By **2030**, at least **60%** of Texans ages 25–34 will have a certificate or degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tests</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,212</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Approaches Grade Level or Above</td>
<td><strong>2,977</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Meets Grade Level or Above</td>
<td><strong>1,945</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Masters Grade Level</td>
<td><strong>878</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Approaches Grade Level or Above</td>
<td><strong>92.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meets Grade Level or Above</td>
<td><strong>60.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Masters Grade Level</td>
<td><strong>27.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of 3

\[
\frac{92.7 + 60.6 + 27.3}{3} = 60.2
\]
### Student Achievement: CCMR Indicators - HS

#### College Ready
- Meet criteria on AP/IB exams
- Meet TSI criteria (SAT/ACT/TSIA) in reading and mathematics
- Complete a college prep course offered by a partnership between a district and higher education institution as required from HB5
- Complete a course for dual credit
- Complete an OnRamps course
- Earn an associate’s degree
- Meet standards on a composite of indicators indicating college readiness

#### Career Ready
- Earn industry certification
- Be admitted to post-secondary industry certification program

#### Military Ready
- Enlist in the United States Armed Forces

---

Rule provided partial credit in the near term for coherent sequence students who participate in aligned coursework, even if they don’t receive a certification.
**Student Achievement: CCMR Indicators - HS**

**College Ready**
- Meet criteria on AP/IB exams
- Meet TSI criteria (SAT/ACT/TSIA) in reading and mathematics
- Complete a college prep course offered by a partnership between a district and higher education institution as required from HB5
- **Complete dual credit courses**
- Complete OnRamps courses
- Earn an associate’s degree
- Meet standards on a composite of indicators indicating college readiness

**Career Ready**
- Earn industry certification
- Be admitted to post-secondary industry certification program

**Military Ready**
- Enlist in the United States Armed Forces

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

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

**PART 1**

**Student Growth**

**PART 2**

**Relative Performance**

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

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

STAAR Performance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Grade Example</th>
<th>4th Grade Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches</td>
<td>Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Exceeds** +1 Point Awarded
  For meeting or exceeding expected growth

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

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

- **Limited** +0 Points Awarded
  For falling to a lower level

Rule provided partial credit for maintaining Meets or Approaches Grade Level, even if vertical scale scores don’t increase.
School Progress Domain: Relative Performance

Rule used a curved line of best fit (quadratic vs linear) to reduce rating biases of very low & very high poverty campuses.
Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

Graph showing the relationship between poverty and student achievement. The graph has two axes: the x-axis represents poverty from 0% to 100%, and the y-axis represents student achievement from 0% to 100%. The graph includes data points and color-coded areas labeled A, B, C, D, and F, indicating different performance levels.
Closing the Gaps: Educational Equity

Domain 3 in the Rule complies with ESSA requirements, allowing a single state & federal accountability system.

- All Students
- Race/Ethnicity
- Special Education
- Continuously Enrolled and Mobile
- English Learners (ELs)
- Economically Disadvantaged
Closing the Gaps: Educational Equity

**Student Groups (Up to 13)**
- All Students
- African American
- Hispanic
- White
- American Indian
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Two or More Races
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Current and Former Special Education
- Current and Monitored English Learners
- Continuously Enrolled
- Non-Continuously Enrolled

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

Rule included weighting for growth at 50% of Domain 3 indicators
Closing the Gaps: Educational Equity

Rule includes targets for the first five years equal to current state averages.
Local Accountability

- Student Achievement
- School Progress
- Closing The Gaps
- Extra-Curricular Activities
- Local Assessments
A–F Timeline: Implementation of HB 22

- **Start of pilot group to design local accountability** (Fall 2017)
- **HB 22 Passed** by the 85th Texas Legislature (May 2017)
- **Rules finalized for three domain system** (Summer 2018)
- **Rules adopted for local accountability system and application window opens** (Fall 2018)
- **Three domain system rates all campuses and districts**
- **Districts:** A–F Rating Labels
- **Campuses:** Improvement Required or Met Standard (August 2018)
- **“What If” report on campus performance, based on data used to assign 2018 ratings.** (December 2018)
- **Campuses: A–F labels take effect and local accountability system is incorporated** (August 2019)
Appendix
STAAR is Based on SBOE Curriculum Standards

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

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

A) $736 - 197 - 150 = \_\_\_\_\_$
B) $736 - 197 + 150 = \_\_\_\_\_$
C) $736 + 197 + 150 = \_\_\_\_\_$
D) $736 + 197 - 150 = \_\_\_\_\_$

Learn more at: [www.texasassessment.com](http://www.texasassessment.com)
Monitoring performance with school ratings has been shown to have long term benefits for students:

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

From the study, the biggest risks come if the system allows certain students to be exempted from accountability.

Source: https://www.educationnext.org/when-does-accountability-work-texas-system/
Why Average Approaches, Meets, and Masters?

- This scatterplot shows the correlation (.982) between the Student Achievement domain score (average of three PLDs) and the percentage of tests (by campus) that achieve the Meets Grade Level standard.
- The y-axis is the Student Achievement domain score; the x-axis is the percentage of tests at the Meets Grade Level standard.
- Each dot represents one campus.
- Dots are colored by campus type.
CCMR Indicators

Computational Logic

- Denominator is annual graduates.
- Student who accomplishes any one is in numerator.
- All CCMR indicators lag by one year. (CCMR data used in 2017–18 accountability will be from the 2016–17 school year.)
## School Progress Domain: 2016-17 Benchmarking

### Part A Scores: Frequency by Campus Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantile</th>
<th>Elementary (4,219)</th>
<th>Middle School (1,653)</th>
<th>K-12 (334)</th>
<th>District (1,203)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% (Max)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% (Q3)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (Med)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% (Q1)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (Min)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can’t assess growth until fourth grade. Because the first STAAR tests are given in third grade, we can’t use STAAR progress measure to assess growth until the year after.

In high school, there are limitations to measuring growth with STAAR. It can only possibly be done for 9th graders who take Algebra I, and then only for 9th and 10th graders taking English I or English II.
### STAAR Performance Status (% at Meets Grade Level or Above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Two or more races</th>
<th>Special Ed.</th>
<th>Econ. Disadv.</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Continuous</th>
<th>Non-Continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary &amp; Middle</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp/Dis</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp/Dis</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAAR Growth Status (Elementary and Middle Schools)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp/Dis</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp/Dis</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4-Year Federal Graduation Status (High Schools and K-12)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad Rate</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp/Dis</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### English Language Learner Proficiency Status

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELP</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp/Dis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College, Career and Military Readiness Performance Status (High Schools and K-12)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCMP</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp/Dis</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Achievement Domain (STAAR Only) (Elementary and Middle Schools, certain K-12/HS)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAAR</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp/Dis</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>#% (Y)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2016-17, the state used a 4 index system. There were 258 Improvement Required (IR) campuses.

To perform an apples-to-apples comparison, TEA modeled what would happen if the new 3-domain A-F system were applied to the 2016-17 school year. Using the A-F methodology, there would have been 674 IR campuses.

In 2017-18, there are 432 IR campuses (including the Harvey exceptions).

This represents a one year reduction of 240 IR campuses. **This is likely the largest improvement in low performing campuses in the state’s recent history.**