2016 State Accountability

ATAC Recommendations
September 28-29, 2015
2016 ATAC Topics of Discussion

- State Ratings
- Transition to New Accountability System
- 2016
- Assessments
- Index 4 Postsecondary Readiness
Key Discussion Topics

Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

1. ATAC Feedback on Performance Index Framework and Distinctions
2. Changes to the Assessment Program
3. State Assessments in the Performance Index Framework
4. **Recommendations for 2016 Targets**
5. Index 4: FSHP and TSI Transition
6. Review of HB 2804
7. New Indicators and Data Collection
8. Transition Issues to New Accountability System

Key Topic of ATAC Meeting in December
2016 Accountability Ratings

ATAC Recommendations
To attain a *Met Standard* rating, district and campuses must meet the target on the following indexes for which it has performance data in 2016.
Inclusion of 2016 STAAR Assessments

ATAC Recommendations
Inclusion of State Assessments

*Students with Disabilities*

**Index 1**
- STAAR
- STAAR A
- STAAR Alt. 2

**Index 2**
- STAAR
- STAAR A
- STAAR Alt. 2

**Index 3**
- STAAR
- **STAAR A**
- STAAR Alt. 2

**Index 4**
- STAAR
- **STAAR A**
- STAAR Alt. 2 NA

**Recommendation**
Recommendation is to exclude **STAAR A** from index 3 and 4.

**STAAR Alt. 2**
STAAR Alt. 2 is available in Index 1-3. Where will it be included?
Inclusion of State Assessments

English Language Learners

**Index 4**

2015 Accountability

- **Not Included**
  - **Spanish** STAAR Final Level II (Spanish test versions on any subject)
  - **English** (Not tested on any Spanish versions) **Not Included**
  - STAAR Final Level II

---

**2016 ATAC Recommendation**

- **ELL Students**
  - **Parental Denials**
    - Included in Index 4 After 1st year of enrollment in U.S. School
  - **Exceed Number of Years in ELL Plan**
    - Included in Index 4 After 1st Year of enrollment in U.S. schools
  - **STAAR L Students with no progress measure**
    - Included at the appropriate STAAR standard for each index
Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

ATAC Topics for 2016
**2016 Longitudinal Graduation Rate**  
*Based on 2015 ESEA Waiver*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Five Year Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State wide Goal</td>
<td>Annual Target</td>
<td>Growth Target</td>
<td>Annual Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0 percent</td>
<td>88.0 percent</td>
<td>10.0 percent decrease</td>
<td>90.0 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher Federal/State Targets

Texas is required to use the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition and federal graduation rate calculation.
Alternative Methods of Graduation

*Senate Bill 149*

Students who graduate at the recommendation of an individual Graduation Committee (IGC) would be counted as graduates for the purpose of accountability.
Impact of HB 1867 on Accountability

Exclusions to Longitudinal Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HB 1867</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students 18 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Satisfied graduation requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not completed the IEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enrolled and receiving IEP services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lagging Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Captured for 2016 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used in 2017 Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outstanding Issue: Modify PEIMS reporting requirement.
Graduation Plans

2015 Accountability

Graduation Diploma Plans

DAP
RHSP
MHSP
FHSP

2016 Accountability

Graduation Diploma Plans

DAP
RHSP
FHSP-DLA
with one or more endorsements & DLA
FHSP-E
with one or more endorsements
MHSP

Plans Included in the Numerator
Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

2016 Preliminary Options

Graduates Meeting criteria in reading, mathematics, or writing on the ACT, SAT or TSI assessments taken while in high school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met College Ready In Both ELA &amp; Math</th>
<th>Two or More Advanced Courses</th>
<th>CTE Coherent Sequence</th>
<th>College &amp; Career Ready Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Achievement
Distinctions Designations

ATAC Recommendations
ATAC Recommendation

Academic Achievement Distinction Designations

Remove student attendance rates as an indicator.
Schools and districts will be assigned a rating for each domain and an overall rating using the specified weights. Evaluation rules will ensure that unacceptable ratings in one domain cannot be masked by acceptable performance in other domains. Letter grades must be used by 2017-18.
House Bill 2804

Student Assessments: 55%

Domain 1
- Differentiate College Readiness from Progress towards College Readiness

Domain 2
- Differentiate College Readiness at next Level II phase in and Level III

Domain 3
- Addressing closing gaps
- Giving credit for growth

Domain 4
- Data Collection
- Additional Elementary/Middle School Indicators

Domain 5
- Campus may choose a different indicator than the district

Academic Attainment: 35%
Community Student Engagement: 10%

Weighting of Domains 1-3

Key Issues in Transition
## A-F Ratings Considerations

### Preliminary Options

### Key Considerations to Determine the Accountability Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Evaluation</th>
<th>System Safeguards</th>
<th>Distinctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Number of Indexes Met</td>
<td>• Number of System Safeguards Met</td>
<td>• Number of Distinctions Earned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **APAC Committee Recommended in January 2015** that a [transition over time](#) *approach* be used to determine rating.
2. **Transition Issue:** Using an A-F rating system may diminish the value of distinctions.
### Option 1 – Performance Indexes

**Example:** To earn an A, a district that is rated on all four indexes must meet all four indexes; there are no requirements for safeguards or distinctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Index Criteria</th>
<th>Safeguards Met</th>
<th>Distinctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count of Indexes Evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Index met | Index not met | No rating available
**ATAC Discussion for A-F Ratings for Districts**  
February 23, 2015

**Option 2 – Performance Indexes and System Safeguards**

**Example:** To earn an **A**, a district that is rated on all four indexes must meet all four indexes and meet at least 90% of system safeguards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Index Target</th>
<th>Safeguards Met</th>
<th>Distinctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>*****  ***</td>
<td>≥ 90%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>****  ***</td>
<td>70%–89%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>****  ***</td>
<td>50%–69%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>****  *</td>
<td>≥ 50%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>****  *</td>
<td>≥ 50%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>****  *</td>
<td>≥ 50%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ooooo  oooo</td>
<td>&lt; 50%</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Index met | o Index not met | – No rating available

*Additional variations could permit a rating of **B** or **C** despite missing one or more indexes.
## Option 3 – Performance Indexes, System Safeguards, and Distinction Designations

**Example:** To earn an A, a district that is rated on all four indexes must meet all four indexes, meet 100% of system safeguards, and earn at least one distinction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Index Target</th>
<th>Safeguards Met</th>
<th>Distinctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count of Indexes Evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count of Distinctions Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>00000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Index met | Index not met | – No rating available
The table below describes how Option 3 could be applied at the campus-level if A-F labels were also required to be assigned to campuses.

Example: To earn an A, a campus must meet all indexes evaluated, meet 100% of system safeguards, and earn at least two campus-level distinctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Index Target</th>
<th>Safeguards Met</th>
<th>Distinctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count of Indexes Evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count of Distinctions Earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4 ●●●●</td>
<td>3 ●●●</td>
<td>2 ●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4 ●●●●</td>
<td>3 ●●●</td>
<td>2 ●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4 ●●○○</td>
<td>3 ●●●</td>
<td>2 ●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4 ●●●○</td>
<td>3 ●●●</td>
<td>2 ●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 ●●●●</td>
<td>3 ●●●</td>
<td>2 ●●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● Index met | ○ Index not met | – No rating available
2016 Accountability Timeline

**ATAC**
- September 28-29, 2015
- December 2-3, 2015
- March 2016 (TBD)

**APAC**
- October 26, 2015
- January 2016 (TBD)
- April 2016 (TBD)

**Commissioner**
- Typically April 2016
Resources


Contacts

Division of Instructional, School Improvement, and College Readiness Support

Office of School Improvement, Accountability and Compliance

Dr. Eduardo Cancino, Deputy Director
956 984-6021
ecancino@esc1.net

Dr. Tina McIntyre, Administrator
956 984-6027
tmcintyre@esc1.net

Belinda S. Gorena, Coordinator
956 984-6173
bgorena@esc1.net

Ruben Degollado, Specialist
956 984-6185
rdegollado@esc1.net

Benjamin Macias, Evaluation and Assessment Specialist
956 984-6234
bmacias@esc1.net

Kelly VanHee, Specialist
956 984-6190
kkvanhee@esc1.net