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### TEA December 1, 2016 Correspondence: Key Dates for Release of Provisional A–F Academic Accountability System Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By December 1, 2016</td>
<td>TEA releases indicators for Domains I–IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 16, 2016</td>
<td>TEA releases unmasked data tables and planned methodologies for determining ratings to districts via TEASE.  (This release will not include ratings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 30, 2016</td>
<td>TEA sends provisional A–F report (with ratings) via email to Texas Legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 4, 2017</td>
<td>TEA releases provisional A–F report (with ratings) to districts on TEASE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 6, 2017</td>
<td>TEA releases provisional A–F report (with ratings) to public on TEA website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOMAINS I–IV: TEA Preliminary Report Domain Ratings
Performance Index Report

Index Framework
Accountability Rating

Acceptable Performance:
- Met Standard
- Met Alternative Standard

Unacceptable Performance:
- Improvement Required

In 2016, to receive a Met Standard or Met Alternative Standard rating, districts and campuses must meet targets on three indexes: Index 1 or Index 2 and Index 3 and Index 4.
Current Work-In-Progress Model: Overall Grade Calculation

Domain Framework Accountability Rating

- **Letter Grade Rating:**
  - Domain Level A-F
  - Overall Level A-F
TEA Preliminary A-F Ratings Report
District Summary: Domains I - IV

• Sample District Summary
DOMAIN I: Student Achievement Model
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Domain I: HB 2804 State Accountability Requirements

Measures of Satisfactory Level Performance and College-Readiness

Level Performance
Domain I Model
(HB 2804 Requirements)

Performance Index Framework
Index 1 Level of Performance 2016-2017

Index 1
Level II Satisfactory Standard

Five Domain Framework
Domain I Levels of Performance 2017-2018

Domain I
Level II Satisfactory Standard
Final Level II
Domain I: HB 2804 and Commissioner Recommendations

Measures of Satisfactory Level Performance, College-Readiness Level Performance, and Advanced Level Performance
Domain I Model
(Commissioner Recommendations)

Performance Index Framework
Index 1 Level of Performance 2016-2017

Index 1
Level II Satisfactory Standard

Five Domain Framework
Domain I Levels of Performance 2017-2018

Advanced Level III
Final Level II
Level II Satisfactory Standard
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**D1: Focus on Measuring Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Performance Level Designation (PLD)</th>
<th>Current Public Label</th>
<th>New PLD/Public Label</th>
<th>Post-Secondary Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td><strong>Does Not Meet</strong></td>
<td>Far Below Grade Level Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase-in Level II</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td><strong>Approaches</strong></td>
<td>Approaching Grade Level Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Level II</td>
<td>Postsecondary Ready</td>
<td><strong>Meets</strong></td>
<td>Indicative of 60% College Level Success (M/E)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td><strong>Masters</strong></td>
<td>Indicative of 75% College Level Success (M/E)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Freshman College Level Courses*
The four goals in the 60x30TX Plan are essential to the future prosperity of Texas.

**THE OVERARCHING GOAL: 60x30**
- At least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.
- Supports the economic future of the state.

**THE SECOND GOAL: COMPLETION**
- At least $50,000 students in 2030 will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas.
- Requires large increases among targeted groups.

**THE THIRD GOAL: MARKETABLE SKILLS**
- All graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills.
- Emphasizes the value of higher education in the workforce.

**THE FOURTH GOAL: STUDENT DEBT**
- Undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.
- Helps students graduate with manageable debt.
## Domain I Performance Targets - Sample Grade Level Transition

### State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Grades 3-8 Assessments Performance Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 Mathematics</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness Grades 3-8 Assessments Performance Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 Mathematics</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Domain I Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain I Performance Standard</th>
<th>Percent Met</th>
<th>Points (1 point for each percent)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Standard or Above (P1)</td>
<td>P1 %</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Readiness Standard or Above (P2)</td>
<td>P2 %</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Standard (P3)</td>
<td>P3 %</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 + P2 + P3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Domain Score:**

\[
\text{Range 5} \\
\text{Range 4} \\
\text{Range 3} \\
\text{Range 2} \\
\text{Range 1}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range 5</th>
<th>Range 4</th>
<th>Range 3</th>
<th>Range 2</th>
<th>Range 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domain I: Performance Standards and Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>STAAR and STAAR A Tests</th>
<th>STAAR Alternate 2 Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Standard or Above</td>
<td>Level II Satisfactory Standard or Above (including substitute assessments)</td>
<td>Level II Satisfactory or Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Readiness Standard or Above</td>
<td>Final Level II or Above (including substitute assessments)</td>
<td>Level II Satisfactory or Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Standard</td>
<td>Advanced Level III</td>
<td>Level III Accomplished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Years in US 2–4 (STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR-L)</th>
<th>Years in US 5 or More (STAAR and STAAR A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Standard or Above</td>
<td>Met or Exceeded ELL PM</td>
<td>Level II Satisfactory Standard or Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Readiness Standard or Above</td>
<td>Exceeded ELL PM or Met Level II Satisfactory Standard or Above</td>
<td>Final Level II or Above (including substitute assessments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Standard</td>
<td>Final Level II or Above</td>
<td>Advanced Level III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessments are included in the model based on the following assumptions:

**Non-ELL or Tests with No ELL PM Such as Parental Denials and ELL PM Plan Exceders**
### Domain I Targets

#### ATAC/APAC Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type/District</th>
<th>Rating and Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>A:63, B:48, C:34, D:29, F:Less than 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>A:62, B:45, C:32, D:26, F:Less than 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/K-12</td>
<td>A:63, B:47, C:34, D:29, F:Less than 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>A:37, B:26, C:13, D:10, F:Less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (Non-AEA)</td>
<td>No Draft Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA District</td>
<td>No Draft Recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commissioner Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type/District</th>
<th>Rating and Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>A:60, B:51, C:40, D:34, F:Less than 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>A:60, B:48, C:37, D:31, F:Less than 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/K-12</td>
<td>A:60, B:51, C:40, D:33, F:Less than 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>A:35, B:29, C:19, D:13, F:Less than 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (Non-AEA)</td>
<td>A:60, B:47, C:39, D:35, F:Less than 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA District</td>
<td>A:35, B:29, C:20, D:15, F:Less than 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOMAIN I Required Improvement Option for Letter Grades of D or F

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

• The campus of district must have shown enough improvement to be able to meet a Level II Satisfactory Performance Standard of 90 percent in five years.

• Methodology:
  • Actual Change: (2016 Level II SP – 2015 Level II SP)
  • Required Improvement: (Level II SP Standard of 90 – 2015 Level II SP) / 5
  • Actual Change ≥ Required Improvement
Domain I:
Key Considerations
Roundtable Discussions
Quality Framework for Continuous Learning System Improvement

Tier I
Comprehensive PD for Content Mastery Support

Tier II
Comprehensive PD for Pedagogy and Diverse Learners Support

Tier III
Developing Turn-Around Leadership Competencies

Tier IV
Implementing Comprehensive Learning Designs
DOMAIN II: Student Progress Model
Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability

TEA A–F Domain Rating – Draft Recommendation

Domain II: Student Progress Model

Transition Table Growth Measures (Options 1 - 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Year Test</th>
<th>Far Below Level II Standard (0)</th>
<th>Below Level II Standard (1)</th>
<th>Level II Standard (2)</th>
<th>Final Level II (3)</th>
<th>Advanced Level III (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Below Level II Standard (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Level II Standard (1)</td>
<td>-1/0/0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II Standard (2)</td>
<td>-2/0/0</td>
<td>-1/0/0</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Level II (3)</td>
<td>-3/0/0</td>
<td>-2/0/0</td>
<td>-1/0/0</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Level III (4)</td>
<td>-4/0/0</td>
<td>-3/0/0</td>
<td>-2/0/0</td>
<td>-1/0/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TEA Provisional A-F Ratings Report
Domain II Alternative Methodology: Index 2 Progress Measure

Level I

Phase-in Level II

Final Level II

Advanced Level III

STAAR Scale Score

Grade 3

Grade 4

Meets

Exceeds

$\text{Advanced Level III}$

$\text{Final Level II}$

$\text{Phase-in Level II}$

$\text{Level I}$

$\text{Advanced Level III}$

$\text{Final Level II}$

$\text{Phase-in Level II}$

$\text{Level I}$
Domain II: Student Progress Sample Calculation  
Ten Student Groups Combined Across ELA/Reading and Mathematics

<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>ELL (current &amp; monitored)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Tests</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Met or Exceeded Progress</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Exceeded Progress</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Met or Exceeded Progress</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exceeded Progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain II Points</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\frac{56+46+50+52+80+58+43+55}{200\times8} = 0.275 \quad \text{Rounds to} \quad 0.28 \quad \text{Domain II Score} = 28
\]
Guide to Computing STAAR Progress Measures

Does the student’s raw score fall within the **top score range** on the **current-year test**?
- Yes
- No

Does the student’s raw score fall within the **chance score range** on the **current-year test**?
- Yes
- No

Calculate the **gain score** by subtracting the **prior-year test** scale score from the **current-year test** scale score.

**Level I or Level II**
- What was the student’s performance level on the **prior-year test** (based on the standards in place in the prior year)?
  - Yes
  - No

**Level II**
- Is the student’s **gain score** greater than or equal to **Met Level I/II**?
  - Yes
  - No

**Level III**
- Is the student’s **gain score** greater than or equal to **Met Level III**?
  - Yes
  - No

Did the student achieve Level III performance on the **current-year test** (based on the standards in place in the current year)?
  - Yes
  - No

Is the student’s **gain score** greater than **Exceeded**?
  - Yes
  - No

**Did Not Meet Progress**

**Met Progress**

**Exceeded Progress**
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DOMAIN III: Closing Performance Gaps Model
Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability

TEA A–F Domain Rating – Draft Recommendation

Domain III: Closing Performance Gaps Model

Domain III
Closing Performance Gaps:
Economically Disadvantaged
+ Identified Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Groups [3(2 selected), 2(1 selected), 1(None Selected)]

Domain III Letter Grade Designation Methodology
Performance Gap Score:
Percent of Tests at Final Level II or Above from Threshold of 60 for ED and Identified R/E Groups (Sum of Gaps/Number of Groups Evaluated)

Domain III Required Improvement:
Option where Campus or District’s Projected Improvement Average from Prior Year to Current Year is greater than or equal to the Current Year Domain III Score
Economic Status is Major Factor for Completion

- Of 8th graders enrolled in fall 2003:
  - 165,069 Not Economically Disadvantaged
  - 159,247 Economically Disadvantaged

- Graduated from high school:
  - 129,647 Not Economically Disadvantaged
  - 95,216 Economically Disadvantaged

- Enrolled in higher education:
  - 63,880 Not Economically Disadvantaged
  - 108,675 Economically Disadvantaged

- Received a higher education degree or certificate:
  - 49,297 Not Economically Disadvantaged
  - 16,623 Economically Disadvantaged
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# Domain III: Closing Performance Gaps

Using Statewide Data for Performance of ED Students from 2015-2016

| Formulas by District and Campus Type to Calculate Predicted Domain $I_{DIII}$ Score |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Elementary Campus**           | $y = -.10992x + 47.31887$       |
| **Middle School Campus**        | $y = -.18288x + 47.49244$       |
| **High School/K-12 Campus**     | $y = -.1281x + 46.78849$        |
| **AEA Campus**                   | $y = -.09541x + 29.52348$       |
| **Non-AEA District**            | $y = -.15666x + 45.89303$       |
| **AEA District**                 | $y = -.14709x + 34.41915$       |

Variables: $y$ is the Predicted Domain $I_{DIII}$ Score and $x$ is the District/Campus percentage of students who are economically disadvantaged

Domain III Score = District/Campus Actual Domain $I_{DIII}$ Score − Predicted Domain $I_{DIII}$ Score
Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability

TEA A–F Domain Rating – Preliminary Report

Domain III: Closing Performance Gaps Model

Linear Regression on Domain I for Economically Disadvantaged by Percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students across Texas “Expected Line” or “Average Line”
Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability

TEA A–F Domain Rating – Preliminary Report

Domain III: Closing Performance Gaps Model

Economically Disadvantaged

Student Achievement on STAAR (Domain I)

Expected or Average Performance

Grade of A
Grade of B
Grade of C
Grade of D
Grade of F

Campus/District Actual Performance

Percent of Economically Disadvantaged Students
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Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability

TEA A–F Domain Rating – Preliminary Report

Domain III: Closing Performance Gaps Model

Economically Disadvantaged Student Achievement on STAAR (Domain I)

Percent of Economically Disadvantaged Students
DOMAIN III Required Improvement Option for Letter Grades of D or F

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

• The campus of district must have shown enough improvement to be able to meet a Level II Satisfactory Performance Standard of 90 percent in five years.

• Methodology:
  • Projected Improvement Average:
    • Step 1: Determine Performance Difference: 2016 Final Level II Performance – 2015 Final Level II Performance for each of Domain III Student Groups Evaluated
    • Step 2: Determine Improvement Average: Sum of Differences from Step 1 / # of Student Groups Evaluated
    • Step 3: Determine Projected Improvement Average: Multiply Improvement Average by 5
    • Determine difference in Final Level II per(2016 Level II SP – 2015 Level II SP)
  • Projected Improvement Average > Domain III Score
Current Work-In-Progress Model: Overall Grade Calculation

Domain Framework Accountability Rating

Letter Grade Rating:
- Domain Level A-F
- Overall Level A-F
Domain II and III: Key Considerations
Roundtable Discussions
Quality Framework for Continuous Learning System Improvement

Tier I: Comprehensive PD for Content Mastery Support

Tier II: Comprehensive PD for Pedagogy and Diverse Learners Support

Tier III: Developing Turn-Around Leadership Competencies

Tier IV: Implementing Comprehensive Learning Designs
Postsecondary Readiness at a Glance

Performance Index Framework
Index 4

- STAAR Postsecondary Readiness
  Final Level II Performance
- Graduation Rate or Dropout Rate
- Graduation Diploma Plan
- Post Secondary Component

Five Domain Framework
Domain IV

- Attendance/Chronic Absenteeism Rate; Annual Dropout Rate
- Graduation Rate
- Graduation Diploma Plan
- Post Secondary Component

2015-2016

2017-2018
Domain IV Model

Performance Index Framework
Index 4 Postsecondary Readiness

- STAAR Postsecondary Readiness
- Graduation Rate
- Graduation Diploma Plan
- Post Secondary Component

Five Domain Framework
Domain IV 2017-2018

- Attendance/Chronic Absenteeism Rate;
- Annual Dropout Rate
- Graduation Rate
- Graduation Diploma Plan
- Post Secondary Component
Chronic Absenteeism Rate Methodology
Elementary & Middle School

Days in Membership
Days Taught

Students At or above 83% Membership (Non-Mobile)

Students Below 83% Membership

Not absent at Least 10% days Eligible to attend

Absent at least 10% days Eligible to attend

100 - %

% of students who are not chronically absent

2015-2016 data used for January 1 reports
Caveat: 17-18 ratings and beyond will be a lagging indicator.
Annual 7-8 Grade Dropout Rate

Number of dropouts in grades 7 & 8 during a given school year

# of students in grades 7 & 8 who were in attendance at any time during a given school year
## Domain IV Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postsecondary Readiness Component</th>
<th>Weight in Overall Grade</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Weight in Domain IV Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6% of Domain Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Diploma Plan</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3% of Domain Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary Component</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.1% of Domain Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain IV Postsecondary Readiness</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.6 + 14.3 + 57.1 = 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### January 1 Reports

2014–15 annual graduates who do at least one of the following:

- Complete CTE Coherent Sequence
- Complete one or more AP/IB
- Complete 12 hours or more of earned postsecondary credits
- Achieve TSI benchmark on TSIA, SAT, or ACT
### Chronic Absenteeism
- **100% of Domain IV**

### Annual 7-8 Dropout Rate
- **50% of Domain IV**

### Graduation Rate
- **28.6% of Domain IV**

### College and Career Ready
- **57.1% of Domain IV**

### Graduation Plan
- **14.3% of Domain IV**
### Domain IV Preliminary Report from TEASE

#### 4-Year Graduation Rate (Gr 9-12): Class of 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total in Class</th>
<th># Graduated</th>
<th>% Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5-Year Extended Graduation Rate (Gr 9-12): Class of 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total in Class</th>
<th># Graduated</th>
<th>% Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Annual Dropout Rate (Gr 9-12): SY 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students</th>
<th># Dropped Out</th>
<th>% Dropped Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5549</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5051</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Longitudinal RHSP/DAP Graduates: Class of 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Graduates</th>
<th>% RHSP/DAP Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Longitudinal RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FSHP-MLA Graduates: Class of 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Graduates</th>
<th>% RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FSHP-MLA Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Annual RHSP/DAP Graduates: SY 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Graduates</th>
<th>% RHSP/DAP Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Annual RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FSHP-MLA Graduates: SY 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Graduates</th>
<th>% RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FSHP-MLA Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Graduates</th>
<th>% College- and Career-Ready Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### College and Career Ready Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSI Criteria</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>College &amp; Career Ready Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA/Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met TSIA</td>
<td>Met ACT</td>
<td>Met ELA Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College &amp; Career Ready Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met TSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Domain IV Ratings and Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type/District</th>
<th>Rating and Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>A=98 B=96 C=93 D=90 F=Less than 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>A=99 B=97 C=94 D=91 F=Less than 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/K-12</td>
<td>A=98 B=92 C=82 D=74 F=Less than 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>A=73 B=54 C=40 D=33 F=Less than 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (Non-AEA)</td>
<td>A=96 B=91 C=81 D=73 F=Less than 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA District</td>
<td>A=80 B=64 C=35 D=33 F=Less than 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domain IV Postsecondary Readiness

Preliminary Domain IV A-F Rating

Maximum Number of Points

Graduation Rate
- State Maximum: 28.6
- District 1: 25.2
- District 2: 25.6

College & Career
- State Maximum: 57.1
- District 1: 50.8
- District 2: 26.2

Graduation Plan
- State Maximum: 14.3
- District 1: 13.5
- District 2: 13.8

Sample Districts
- District 1 = 89.5 (C)
- District 2 = 65.6 (F)

Postsecondary Readiness Indicators
- State Maximum
- District 1
- District 2
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Domain IV: Postsecondary Readiness
2017-2018 and Beyond

January 1 Reports

- Complete CTE Coherent Sequence
- Complete one or more AP/IB
- Complete 12 hours or more of earned postsecondary credits
- Achieve TSI benchmark on TSIA, SAT, or ACT

2017-2018

- Complete CTE coherent sequence of courses/earn industry (nationally recognized) certification
- Perform at or above criterion score on one or more AP/IB examinations
- Complete 12 hours or more of earned postsecondary credit
- Achieve TSI benchmark on TSIA, SAT, or ACT
- Enlist in the U.S. armed forces
DOMAIN V: Community and Student Engagement
School District Evaluation of Performance Community and Student Engagement (C.a.S.E)

HB 5

2015-2016 TAA Guidance on C.a.S.E

May 26, 2016

Action Required

TO THE ADMINISTRATOR ADDRESSED:

Subject: 2015–16 Reporting Requirements for Community and Student Engagement

This letter is a reminder that Texas Education Code, §39.0945, requires each district and charter school to annually evaluate its performance and the performance of each of its campuses in the area of community and student engagement. Each district and charter must assign a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to staff and to each of its campuses. Ratings are to be designated for overall performance as well as for each of the following categories:

- Fine arts
- Wellness and physical education
- Community and parental involvement
- The 21st Century Workforce Development program
- The second language acquisition program
- The digital learning environment
- Dropout prevention strategies
- Educational programs for gifted and talented students

In addition, each district and charter must indicate whether it and each of its campuses has complied with statutory reporting and policy requirements. Beginning with the 2015–16 School Year submission, a new indicator, STATUTORY REPORTING AND POLICY AND COMPLIANCE INDICATOR (CODE: 0,206), is used for this indicator. Districts indicate either a “0” or “1”, as defined below, if the field cannot be left blank.

- 0 – Not in Compliance
- 1 – Yes (In Compliance)

Districts and charters must designate local committees to determine the criteria used to evaluate performance and assign community and student engagement ratings and to evaluate and indicate compliance with statutory reporting and policy requirements. As with last year, the locally-assembled district and campus community and student engagement ratings information will be collated through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) summer collection on the following timeline:

1. The PEIMS Summer submission reflecting the data from the 2015–16 school year is due on June 23, 2016.
2. The PEIMS Summer reassembly reflecting the data from the 2015–16 school year is due on July 21, 2016.
3. For districts operating on a year-round track, the PEIMS Summer submission is due on June 23, 2016, and the PEIMS Summer reassembly is due on August 15, 2016.
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School District Evaluation of Performance
Community and Student Engagement; Compliance

**District Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Fine arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Wellness and physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Community and parental involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 21st century workforce development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Second language acquisition program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Digital learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Dropout prevention strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Educational programs for gifted and talented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Performance**

- Exemplary
- Recognized
- Acceptable
- Unacceptable

**District Assigns and Reports Ratings**

- **District Reports Compliance**
  - Statutory Reporting and Policy Requirement for district and each campus
  - 0 – No (Not in Compliance)
  - 1 – Yes (In Compliance)

No later than August 8 of each year, the district shall report each performance rating to the agency and make the performance ratings publicly available as provided by the commissioner rule.

Texas Education Code, §39.0545
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Community and Student Engagement; Compliance Tool

HB5 Tool
https://prodev.esc1.net/surveys/LandingPage.aspx

HB5 Page
Complete Steps 1, 2 & 3

Confirmation Message

Thank you for your interest in the CSE Tool Resource.

A confirmation has been sent to degolaco@es1.net.

The email will contain the software requested along with the "End User Agreement" for future reference.

If you do not receive the email, please consider the following:

• Check that you entered your email correctly
• Check your spam and/or junk folder
• Check if your district allows you to receive attachments

If you have any additional questions please feel free to contact the Region One ESC Division of Instructional Support at (956) 984-6022.
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Timeline for Establishing New PEIMS Data Standards

- Data Governance Board Meeting: February
- PCPEI Meeting: January
- ITF Meeting: February
- Addendum to 2016–17 TEDS Published: July 2016
- Data Standards Published in 2016–17 TEDS: March 2016
- ITF Meeting: February
- PCPEI Meeting: January
- Addendum to 2017–18 TEDS Published: July 2017
- Data Standards Published in 2017–18 TEDS: March 2017
- 2016–17 School Year: August 2016
- 2017–18 School Year: August 2017
- A–F Ratings Released: August 15, 2018
- Districts Report Domain V Ratings: April 2018
- 2018–19 School Year: August 2018

*When new data standards are published, districts and vendors update their data collection systems in time for the first required collection.

Texas Education Agency | Assessment and Accountability | Performance Reporting
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# HB5: the Transition to Domain V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE Year</th>
<th>Submission Dates</th>
<th>Deadline for Districts to Post Ratings</th>
<th>TEA Required to Report Local Performance on TEA Website</th>
<th>Categories Self-Rated</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Region One Rating Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2013-2014 | First Submission: No later than June 26, Resubmission: No later than July 24 | August 8 | • Fine arts  
• Wellness and physical education  
• Community and parental involvement  
• The 21st Century Workforce Development program  
• The second language acquisition program  
• The digital learning environment  
• Dropout prevention strategies  
• Educational programs for gifted and talented students | Collaboratively created tool with Region One and districts, with indicators |
| 2014-2015 | First Submission: No later than June 25, Resubmission: No later than July 23 | August 7 | No later than October 1 | Exemplary  
Recognized  
Acceptable  
Unacceptable |
| 2015-2016 | First Submission: No later than June 23, Resubmission: No later than July 21 | | | Statutory  
Reporting and Policy Requirement for district and each campus (Yes or No) |
<p>| 2016-2017 | First Submission: No later than June 22, Resubmission: No later than July 20 | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.a.S.E. Year</th>
<th>Submission Dates</th>
<th>TSDS Data Element</th>
<th>Deadline for Districts to Submit Ratings</th>
<th>Districts and Campuses still Required to Rate all C.a.S.E Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HB5 and HB 2804 (Domain V) | 2017-2018 | First-Case-Choice-Code Indicates the first choice of three of the eight community and student engagement indicators  
Second-Case-Choice-Code Indicates the second choice of the three of the eight community and student engagement indicators  
Third-Case-Choice-Code Indicates the third choice of the three of the eight community and student engagement indicators  
CaSE Ratings-Criteria-Link Indicates the internet website link to the CaSE ratings criteria that are used by the LEA and campuses to determine the ratings for the LEA and campuses | Final Due Date May 4, 2018 | • Fine arts  
• Wellness and physical education  
• Community and parental involvement  
• The 21st Century Workforce Development program  
• The second language acquisition program  
• The digital learning environment  
• Dropout prevention strategies  
• Educational programs for gifted and talented students  
Statutory Reporting and Policy Requirement for district and each campus (Yes or No) |
CASE Timeline for 2016-2017

June 22/July 20, 2017 TSDS Submission

No later than August 8, 2017

No later than October 1, 2017

Data for SY 16-17
- Districts submit 8 categories Ratings for 2016-2017
  - Exemplary
  - Satisfactory
  - Acceptable
  - Unacceptable
- Districts submit overall CASE Rating
- Districts indicate statutory reporting and policy compliance

Data for SY 17-18
- Districts Indicate internet website link to CASE Ratings
- Districts Indicate internet website link to CASE Ratings
- Districts indicate 1st, 2nd, 3rd CASE Choice

Districts Report Ratings on Website

TEA Reports ratings publicly
CASE Domain V Timeline for 2017-2018

June 22/July 20 2017 TSDS Submission

Districts indicate 1st, 2nd, 3rd CASE Choice

May 4, 2018 TSDS Submission

Districts submit 8 categories Ratings
- Exemplary
- Satisfactory
- Acceptable
- Unacceptable

No later than August 8, 2018

Districts Report Ratings on Website

No later than October 1, 2018

TEA Reports ratings publicly

Districts submit overall CASE Rating

Districts indicate statutory reporting and policy compliance

TEA assigns A-F on district-selected three categories

Districts Indicate internet website link to CASE Ratings

Districts Indicate internet website link to CASE Ratings
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Selecting Domain V CASE Ratings Example: *District*

June 22/July 20 TSDS Submission for 2017-2018 School Year

Texas ISD has selected the following three categories to be part of its accountability ratings for the following school year:

- FINE-ARTS-CATEGORY-CODE (E1531)
- COMMUNITY-AND-PARENTAL-INVOLVEMENT-CATEGORY-CODE (E1533)
- SECOND-LANG-ACQUISITION-PMG-CATEGORY-CODE (E1535)

Texas ISD would report the following data to represent its choices in the LocalEducationAgencyExtension Complex Type Complex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas ISD</td>
<td>01 Fine Arts Category Code</td>
<td>03 Community and Parental Involvement Category Code</td>
<td>05 Second Language Acquisition Program Category Code</td>
<td><a href="http://www.texasisd/districtratingscriteria.com">www.texasisd/districtratingscriteria.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Sample(s):**

PEIMS - Local Education Agency Dashboard - Local Education Agency
Selecting Domain V CASE Ratings: *Campus* and *District*

June 22/July 20 TSDS Submission For 2017-2018 School Year

These three selections can be different for the LEA and each of the campuses.

After districts report 3 selected CASE Ratings in Submission 3, no changes can be made to the CASE Ratings that were selected.

New selections cannot be made at the end of the Year for the following school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>E1576 - First Case Choice</th>
<th>E1576 - Second Case Choice</th>
<th>E1577 - Third Case Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas Middle School</td>
<td>Principal B</td>
<td>COMMUNITY-AND-PARENTAL-INVOLEMENT-CATEGORY-CODE</td>
<td>WELLNESS-AND-PHYSICAL-EDUC-CATEGORY-CODE</td>
<td>FINE-ARTS-CATEGORY-CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Elementary</td>
<td>Principal C</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL-EDUC-PGM-FOR-GT-STUDENTS-CATEGORY-CODE</td>
<td>SECOND-LANG-ACQUISITION-PGM-CATEGORY-CODE</td>
<td>DIGITAL-LEARNING-ENVIRONMENT-CATEGORY-CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas DAEP</td>
<td>Principal D</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas JJAEP</td>
<td>Principal D</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assigning Domain V CASE Ratings: *Campus* and *District*

TEA Assigns A-F Rating based on District Self-Assigned Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Table ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>XML Name</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Date Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C198</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE-RATING-CODE</td>
<td>TX-PerformanceRatingIndicatorType</td>
<td>12/1/2013</td>
<td>12/1/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Exemplary OR an overall domain performance rating of A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Recognized OR an overall domain performance rating of B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Acceptable OR an overall domain performance rating of C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Unacceptable OR an overall domain performance rating of D or F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domain IV and V: Key Considerations
Roundtable Discussions
Quality Framework for Continuous Learning System Improvement

Tier I
Comprehensive PD for Content Mastery Support

Tier II
Comprehensive PD for Pedagogy and Diverse Learners Support

Tier III
Developing Turn-Around Leadership Competencies

Tier IV
Implementing Comprehensive Learning Designs
Domain Framework
A-F Academic Accountability System: Moving Forward
Key Caveats

• The TEA Preliminary A–F Domain Ratings Report:
  ➢ Does not include additional indicators that the commissioner may consider for augmenting A or B ratings for respective Elementary, Middle School, and High School (A to A+, B to B+)
  ➢ Does not include required improvement options that augment letter ratings of D or F to C or D.
  ➢ Does not include Domain III options that augment Domain I letter ratings of B or C to A or B.
  ➢ Does not include the statutory constraint that a district cannot earn a rating of A in a domain if one of its campuses earns a D or F in that domain. This statutory constraint will be applied to the 2017-2018 ratings.
2017-18 Accountability Development Timeline

- **House Bill 2804 became law**
  - June 2015

- **APAC meeting**
  - October 2015

- **ATAC meeting**
  - January 2016

- **TCNAA meeting**
  - February 2016

- **ITF meeting**
  - March 2016

- **Data Standards published in 2016-17 TEDS**
  - April 2016

- **Essa became law**
  - May 2016

- **ATAC meeting**
  - June 2016

- **TCNAA meeting**
  - July 2016

- **Comments on Proposed Regs for ESSA due**
  - August 2016

- **TCNAA report to governor & Texas Legislature**
  - September 2016

- **ITF meeting**
  - October 2016

- **APAC meeting**
  - November 2016

- **ESSA stakeholder meeting**
  - December 2016

- **Final Regs for ESSA**
  - November/December 2016

- **PCFEI meeting**
  - November/December 2016

- **Data Governance Board meeting**
  - November/December 2016

---

*When new data standards are published, districts and vendors update their data collection systems in time for the first required collection.*

---

2015-16 A-F Ratings: A Report to the 85th Texas Legislature
2017–18 Accountability Development Timeline

**2017**
- **January 2017**: TEA issues Provisional A–F Ratings Report
- **February 2017**: Commissioner’s final decisions for 2017 accountability
- **July 2017**: Addendum to the 2017–19 TEDS*
- **August 2017**: TEA issues accountability ratings for the 2016–17 school year

**2018**
- **Spring 2018**: Districts & campuses assign to themselves A–F for Domain V
- **August 2018**: TEA issues A–F ratings for the 2017–18 school year

*When new data standards are published, districts and vendors update their data collection systems in time for the first required collection.

APAC=Accountability Policy Advisory Committee
ATAC=Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
CaSE=Community and Student Engagement
ESSA=Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015
ITF=Information Task Force
PCPEI=Policy Committee on Public Education Information
TCNGAA=Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability
TEDS=Texas Education Data Standards
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Division of Instructional, School Improvement, and College Readiness Support

Dr. Eduardo Cancino, Deputy Director
956-984-6022
ecancino@esc1.net

Belinda S. Gorena, Administrator
School Improvement, Accountability and Compliance
956-984-6173
bgorena@esc1.net

Carmen Garcia, Director
Brownsville Extension Office
956-984-6231
cagarcia@esc1.net

Kelly K. VanHee, Administrator
Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment
956-984-6151
kkvanhee@esc1.net

Darlene M. Rogers, Director
Laredo Extension Office
956-795-0000
drogers@esc1.net