House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

How did House Bill (HB) 22 change the state academic accountability system?

From 2013 through 2017, the state academic accountability system framework used four indices, Student Achievement, Student Progress, Closing Performance Gaps, and Postsecondary Readiness, to assign either a *Met Standard* or *Improvement Required* rating to districts and campuses. House Bill 22, passed by the Texas Legislature in June 2017, establishes three domains of indicators to evaluate the academic performance of districts and campuses: Student Achievement, School Progress, and Closing the Gaps. It requires the commissioner to adopt rules to assign districts a rating of *A, B, C, D*, or *F* for overall performance, as well as for performance in each domain, beginning in August 2018. Campuses will receive *A–F* ratings beginning in August 2019.

Additionally, HB 22 establishes local accountability systems to 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 together with the three state-mandated domains to assign overall *A–F* ratings for each campus.

Finally, HB 22 requires the commissioner to report to the legislature by January 1, 2019, the overall and domain performance rating each campus would have received for the 2017–18 school year if the *A–F* ratings for campuses had been in place.

What is the purpose of the Student Achievement domain?

The Student Achievement domain evaluates district and campus performance based on student achievement in three areas: performance on STAAR assessments, College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicators, and graduation rates.

What is the purpose of the School Progress domain?

The School Progress domain measures district and campus outcomes in two areas, Part A: Academic Growth and Part B: Relative Performance. Academic Growth evaluates the number of students that grew at least one year academically (or are on track) as measured by STAAR results, and Relative Performance evaluates the achievement of students relative to districts or campuses with similar economically disadvantaged percentages.

How does the state evaluate academic growth in School Progress, Part A?

School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth awards points to districts and campuses based on whether the student achieved *Expected* or *Accelerated* on the STAAR progress measure or maintained proficiency from the prior year to the current year. The following charts provide additional details.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

STAAR

		Did Not Meet Grade Level	Approaches Grade Level	Meets Grade Level	Masters Grade Level
Prior-Year Performance on STAAR	**Did Not Meet Grade Level**	Met or Exceeded Growth Expectation=1 point, Else=0 points	Met or Exceeded Growth Expectation=1 point, Else=0.5 point	1 point	1 point
	Approaches Grade Level	Met or Exceeded Growth Expectation=1 point, Else=0 points	Met or Exceeded Growth Expectation=1 point, Else=0.5 point	1 point	1 point
	Meets Grade Level	0 points	0 points	Met or Exceeded Growth Expectation=1 point, Else=0.5 point	1 point
	Masters Grade Level	0 points	0 points	0 points	1 point

Current-Year Performance on STAAR

STAAR Alternate 2

		Level I: Developing	Level II: Satisfactory	Level III: Accomplished
Prior-Year Performance on STAAR Alternate 2	**Level I: Developing**	Met or Exceeded Growth Expectation=1 point, Else=0 points	1 point	1 point
	Level II: Satisfactory	0 points	Met or Exceeded Growth Expectation=1 point, Else=0.5 point	1 point
	Level III: Accomplished	0 points	0 points	1 point

Current-Year Performance on STAAR Alternate 2

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

What is the STAAR progress measure?

The STAAR progress measure quantifies a student's year-to-year improvement by comparing current and prior-year scores on STAAR. By comparing the change in his or her score to growth expectations, each student is assigned to one of three categories: *Limited*, *Expected*, or *Accelerated*. More information about the STAAR progress measure is available on the TEA website at http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/.

Why didn't a student get a progress measure?

There are several reasons why a student might not receive a STAAR progress measure. More information about the STAAR progress measure is available on the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/progressmeasure/.

How is School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance evaluated?

For elementary and middle schools, School Progress, Part B evaluates the overall student performance on the Student Achievement STAAR component compared to campuses with similar percentages of economically disadvantaged students, as reported in the TSDS PEIMS fall snapshot.

For high schools, K–12 campuses, and districts, School Progress, Part B evaluates the average of the Student Achievement STAAR and the College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) components compared to districts or campuses with similar percentages of economically disadvantaged students, as reported in the TSDS PEIMS fall snapshot.

If CCMR outcomes are not available for a high school, K–12, or district, only the Student Achievement STAAR component is used.

What is the purpose of the Closing the Gaps domain?

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

How does the accountability system ensure that individual student groups are not ignored?

The Closing the Gaps domain is specifically designed to address this concern. Closing the Gaps is the critical domain in the overall district or campus evaluation that ensures their lowest-performing student groups receive focused interventions. The system evaluates the performance of fourteen student groups: all students, African American, Hispanic, white, American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander, two or more races, economically disadvantaged, current special education, former special education, current and monitored English learners, continuously enrolled, and non-continuously enrolled.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

Who helped TEA develop the state accountability rating system?

Two advisory committees, the Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) and the Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC), met with TEA staff numerous times to consider the complex technical issues related to accountability and make recommendations to the commissioner on the specific features of the system. The accountability development materials that were reviewed at each meeting by the advisory groups are available online at the [2018 Accountability Development Materials](#) website.

Furthermore, TEA sought feedback from many sources, including 60+ regional forums with superintendents, 40+ focus group meetings, and countless emails and one-on-one conversations conducted by multiple agency staff with superintendents, school board members, principals, teachers, parents, students, business leaders, professional associations, and other advocacy groups. As is expected given the complexity of the topic and the size of Texas, stakeholders brought a range of perspectives. The feedback the agency solicited did not give us one consistent direction, and at times stakeholders proposed radically different or even directly conflicting directions for our A–F framework. To help us weigh competing recommendations, the Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC), with technical support provided by the Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC), reviewed much of this feedback and engaged in rigorous discussions on these topics. These advisory groups then submitted synthesized recommendations from this feedback, which we found immensely helpful in reconciling competing points of view, but even their recommendations were not unanimous in all cases.

Despite these challenges, this feedback was immensely helpful and guided our revisions to the accountability system framework substantially. For additional details about feedback received by the agency, please see the "Notable Changes to House Bill 22 Framework Based on Feedback" document at https://tea.texas.gov/2018AccountabilityDevelopment/.

Why are districts rated *A–F* but campuses are rated *Met Standard* or *Improvement Required*?

House Bill 22 (85th Texas Legislature, 2017) requires that districts receive *A–F* ratings and campuses receive *Met Standard* or *Improvement Required* ratings for 2018. Both districts and campuses will receive *A–F* ratings in 2019.

Will the *Met Standard/Improvement Required* ratings that campuses receive in August 2018 be based on the four indices that have been in place since 2013?

No. Both districts and campuses will be evaluated on all three domains. Districts receive *A–F* ratings beginning in August 2018. In 2018, campuses will be evaluated on the three domains and receive a *Met Standard or Improvement Required* rating. Campuses will receive *A–F* ratings beginning in 2019.

What are the domain cut points for 2018?

Cut points vary for each domain and depend on the campus type (elementary, middle, high/K–12) and whether the campus is an alternative education campus. Chapter 5 of the *2018 Accountability Manual* will provide domain cut points. The manual will be available on the TEA website at

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

http://tea.texas.gov/2018accountabilitymanual.aspx.

All the campuses in our district are rated *Met Standard,* but the district is rated an *F*. How is this possible?

It's not uncommon for a campus to have a higher rating than its district. This could be caused by any of several scenarios:

- One or more student groups are excluded from a campus's accountability rating because the groups do not meet minimum-size criteria. At the district level, however, these student groups meet minimum-size criteria and are included in the district's accountability rating.

- Students move between campuses in a district during the school year. The STAAR results of these students are not included in the accountability ratings of either campus. The results are, however, included in the district's accountability ratings.

- A district's high school has a low graduation rate. Because elementary and middle schools are not accountable for the graduation rate component, they would be unaffected, but the district's rating would reflect the low graduation rate.

How are multiple-year *Improvement Required* status for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions be determined this year?

In determining consecutive years of *Improvement Required* ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions, considerations for multiple-year *Improvement Required* status will continue from the previous index system to the new three-domain system. Years that a district, charter school, or campus is assigned an accountability rating shown below will be considered.

- 2018: *A, B, C, D, F* for districts and *Met Standard, Met Alternative Standard, Improvement Required* for campuses

- 2013–2017: *Met Standard, Met Alternative Standard, Improvement Required*

- 2012: [No state accountability ratings issued]

- 2004–2011: *Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, Academically Unacceptable, AEA: Academically Acceptable, AEA: Academically Unacceptable*

While no ratings were issued in 2012, an *Improvement Required* rating assigned in 2013 and *Academically Unacceptable/AEA: Academically Unacceptable* ratings assigned in 2011 are considered consecutive years. In addition, although the consecutive years of *F/Improvement Required* ratings may be separated by one or more years of temporary closure or *Not Rated* ratings, such separations, whether for single or multiple years, do not break the chain of consecutive years of unacceptable ratings for purposes of accountability interventions and sanctions. This policy applies to districts and charter schools as well as campuses when *Not Rated* and *Not Rated: Data Integrity Issues* labels are assigned.

Did the accountability subset rule change at all?

No. The agency will continue to hold districts and campuses accountable for students who were reported as enrolled on the previous TSDS PEIMS fall snapshot and testing date.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

Did the accountability cycle change?

No. The accountability cycle remains the same: summer, fall, and spring. Accountability ratings released in August 2018 will be based on assessments administered in summer 2017, fall 2017, and spring 2018.

How are substitute assessments included in 2018 accountability?

Substitute assessments are included at the Meets Grade Level standard in Student Achievement, School Progress, Part B and Closing the Gaps. They are not included in School Progress, Part A because they don't have a STAAR progress measure. The agency will explore using the differentiated performance level descriptors to calculate academic growth for substitute assessments in the future. The goal is for this to be in place for the 2020 accountability ratings.

How does the agency determine whether a graduate was enrolled in a CTE coherent sequence and completed and earned credit for coursework aligned with the approved industry-based certification list for College, Career, and Military Readiness?

The CTE coherent sequence status comes from the summer 2017 submission of TSDS PEIMS Element ID E0031. Then the agency verifies the graduate completed one of the 85 aligned courses through the TSDS PEIMS course completion records. See the TSDS PEIMS Data Standards for more information.

How does the agency determine whether a graduate met the criteria for dual-credit course completion for College, Career, and Military Readiness?

The dual credit course completion data comes from two elements in TSDS PEIMS. Specifically, Element ID E1011 and Element ID E1081 are used to determine whether the graduate met the requirements. See the TSDS PEIMS Data Standards for more information.

Did the TSI criteria for the SAT change from last year?

The TSI criteria for SAT tests taken prior to 2016 did not change. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board adjusted the TSI exemption criteria for SAT tests taken in March 2016 or later. Subsequently, the TSI criteria used in accountability has also been adjusted. The following table shows the TSI criteria for each of the timeframes.

TSI Criteria	
SAT Taken Before March 2016	**SAT Taken in March 2016 or Later**
>= 500 on Critical Reading *and* >=1070 Total	>=480 on Evidenced-Based Reading
>= 500 on Mathematics *and* >=1070 Total	>=530 on Mathematics

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

Does the College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) component use the most recent SAT/ACT score instead of the best score to determine CCMR status? If a graduate took the SAT once in their sophomore year, would that score be captured for accountability in 2018?

For SAT/ACT results, the agency is provided with the most recent examination and only one record is received per student. Therefore, the results used for accountability are based on the most recent SAT/ACT outcome, not the best. If a student took the SAT as a sophomore and did not test again, TEA would receive that result and use it for accountability calculations.

The agency is working with the College Board and ACT to obtain multiple years of results. When that data is available, the agency will have the ability to use the best SAT/ACT result for future accountability years.

How does TEA get the Texas Success Initiative assessment (TSIA) data?

The College Board provides the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) with TSIA results of graduating seniors. The THECB provides the results to the TEA.

How does TEA match the TSIA data to students?

TEA uses TSIA data through October 2017 to match to the 2016–17 annual graduates file from TSDS PEIMS. TSIA results received from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board are matched to students on our annual graduates list using an algorithm which includes TSDS Unique ID, SSN, and a combination of first name, last name, and DOB. Then the results are attributed to the districts and campuses at which the students are identified as annual graduates in TSDS PEIMS.

How and when will the new College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicators be incorporated into accountability?

All CCMR indicators that are used in accountability lag by a year, meaning that, for 2017–18 accountability, the data for those indicators will be taken from the 2016–17 school year. This is not new; the accountability system has used lagging data for some time simply because the collection of that data comes too late in the year to be current in the accountability system. Because of this lag, and because some indicators take time to develop and for data collection to begin, there are three CCMR indicators that won't be used the first year of the *A–F* system:

- Successful completion of an OnRamps course (beginning in the 2018–19 school year)
- Admission to a postsecondary industry certification program (School year TBD)
- Meeting standards on a composite of indicators that indicate college preparation (School year TBD)

How do districts collect, report, and document that a student has enlisted or intended to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces so the student can be counted in the new indicator for college, career, and military readiness?

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

Each district decides how to collect this data. This may be a senior survey, contact with a local recruiter, or any other method. Each district must maintain supporting documentation.
Each fall districts will report military enlistment for the graduating class from the previous year in the TSDS PEIMS submission. Districts use element E1589 to indicate whether students enlisted in or intended to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces. These data were first collected in the fall 2017 TSDS PEIMS collection for 2017 graduates. The data may be updated any time until the January resubmission deadline.

How is the percentage of economically disadvantaged students calculated?

The district or campus overall percentage of economically disadvantaged students is calculated based on TSDS PEIMS Fall Snapshot data. The number of students in membership who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch or other public assistance is divided by the total number of students in membership. This percentage is used in School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance. Whether a student is considered economically disadvantaged is also reported on STAAR answer documents. This information, however, is not used to calculate the percentage of economically disadvantaged students for a district or campus. It is used only to identify which students are included in the economically disadvantaged student group where STAAR performance is reported.

How does district participation in the Texas Writing Pilot program impact accountability?

All STAAR writing assessment results (including STAAR Alternate 2) received for students in the accountability subset will be used for district and campus accountability calculations. Writing samples and portfolios from the pilot program will not be used in accountability calculations.

How are STAAR results for English learners (ELs) included in each of the domains?

ELs who are year one in U.S. schools are excluded from all 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 beginning in 2019.

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.

Why is there no longer an EL progress measure?

Due to changes to the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS), an EL progress measure is not calculated for 2018.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability FAQs

How are students with No Authentic Academic Response (NAAR), medical exception, or medically exempt designations included in accountability?

STAAR Alternate 2 students with NAAR, medical exception, or STAAR medically exempt designations are not included in domain calculations. In the Closing the Gaps domain, STAAR Alternate 2 students with NAAR designation are included as participants. Students with the medical exception or medically exempt designation are excluded from the participation rate.

What about distinction designations? Will they be awarded in 2018?

Yes. Distinction designations are awarded to campuses for outstanding performance in relation to 40 other similar campuses of similar type, size, grade span, and student demographics. A campus that receives an accountability rating of *Met Standard* is eligible for the following distinction designations in 2018. Districts that earn 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)

A campus earns a distinction designation if it is in the top quartile (Q1) of its comparison group for at least 33 percent (for high schools and K–12 campuses) or 50 percent (for elementary and middle schools) of the indicators used to award the distinction.

For an indicator to be used to evaluate campuses for a distinction designation, at least 20 campuses in the comparison group must have data for that indicator. If fewer than 20 campuses have data for an indicator, it cannot be used to evaluate campuses for the distinction. This often affects schools with non-traditional grade spans.