

Overview of 2017 Accountability

The 2016–17 school year is the final year of the current state accountability rating system. It is anticipated that the 2017 rating system will be relatively unchanged from 2016, except for the performance index targets that will be set by the commissioner in February 2017. This document outlines the key areas of the 2017 system that need to be reviewed and recommendations made by the ATAC.

I. 2017 System Rigor

The overall design of the accountability system will remain the same, evaluating performance according to four indices:

- Index 1: Student Achievement
- Index 2: Student Progress
- Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps
- Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness

▪ Changes Affecting Performance Indices

- **ELL Inclusion in Index 3 and 4, STAAR Alternate 2 in Index 4** The committee asked to see what 2016 results would have been if ELLs had been included in Index 3 and Index 4, noting that including STAAR A in those indices and excluding STAAR L seems inconsistent. The committee also asked how including STAAR Alternate 2 in Index 4 would affect district and campus results. Indices 3 and 4 have been modeled to include these assessments.

Rationale for adjustment: Beginning with the March 2017 administrations, the STAAR Online Testing Platform will include embedded accommodations and other accessibility features. These enhancements eliminate the need for separate STAAR A and STAAR L test forms.

- **Required Improvement** Adjustments by the commissioner to the current accountability system in its final year will be limited to target determination. There are no plans to incorporate an improvement component in the current system in 2017.

2. Accountability Ratings Criteria and Targets

- **Ratings Criteria** Performance targets will be set for each index. In order to receive a *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating, districts and campuses must meet the performance index target on the following indices if they have performance data for evaluation:

Index 1 OR Index 2 AND Index 3 AND Index 4

Rationale: This option used in 2015 and 2016 accountability reflects the original intent when the index framework was developed. This addresses the concern with the limited availability of progress measures on the EOC assessments for use in Index 2 for high schools and K–12 campuses and districts.

Overview of 2017 Accountability

- 2016 Performance Index Targets and Modeled 2017 Index Targets** The performance index targets for 2016 are shown on the table on the following pages. The commissioner will set the 2017 targets in February 2017 based on recommendations developed by the ATAC and APAC during their meetings in December 2016 and January 2017. The modeled 2017 targets are for informational purposes only.

Index Targets for Non-AEA Districts and Campuses

	2016 Index Targets					Modeled 2017 Index Targets				
	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4		Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
			All Components	STAAR Component Only				All Components	STAAR Component Only	
Districts	60	22	28	60	13	65	24	30	65	15
Campuses										
Elementary	60	32	28	n/a	12	65	34	30	n/a	14
Middle		30	26	n/a	13		32	28	n/a	15
High School/ K-12		17	30	60	21		19	32	65	23

Index Targets for AEA Charter Districts and Campuses

	2016 Index Targets					Modeled 2017 Index Targets				
	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4		Index 1	Index 2	Index 3	Index 4	
			Both Components	Graduation /Dropout Rate Only				Both Components	Graduation Dropout Rate Only	
AEA Charter Districts	35	8	13	33	45	40	10	15	35	47
AEA Campuses										

Overview of 2017 Accountability

- **Rating Labels.** The 2017 rating labels remain the same as those issued for 2016 accountability.
 - *Met Standard* – met the required performance index targets and other accountability rating criteria
 - *Improvement Required* – did not meet the required performance index targets or other accountability rating criteria
 - *Met Alternative Standard* – assigned to charter operators and alternative education campuses evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions that met the required performance index targets and other accountability rating criteria
 - *Not Rated* – under certain circumstances, districts or campuses may not receive a rating

3. Performance Indices

The original design of each performance index remains the same as the prior year.

Index 1: Student Achievement. Provides a snapshot of performance across subjects, on both general and alternative assessments, at the satisfactory performance standard.

Index 2: Student Progress. Measures student progress and provides an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for improving student performance independent of overall student achievement.

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps. Emphasizes the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students and the two lowest-performing racial/ethnic student groups.

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness. Emphasizes the role of elementary and middle schools in preparing students for the rigors of high school, and the importance of earning a high school diploma that provides students with the foundation necessary for success in college, the workforce, job training programs, or the military. Alternative procedures are provided for Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) campuses and charter districts serving at-risk students in alternative education programs.

Graduation Plan

- **Graduation Plan Component and Foundation High School Plan (FHSP) Transition** For 2017 accountability, as was the case in 2016, two diploma-plan rates will be calculated as shown below; the one that gives the district or campus the most points for the graduation plan component of Index 4 will be used.

Rationale: The Foundation High School Program (FHSP) will replace the Minimum (MHSP), Recommended (RHSP), and Distinguished Achievement (DAP) High School Programs for students who began grade 9 in 2014–15. Beginning with the class of 2018, all students will be required to select the FHSP. Until then, students may earn an MHSP, RHSP, or DAP diploma. During this transition period, this approach addresses the varying degrees to which FHSP graduation plans have been implemented across districts.

Overview of 2017 Accountability

Calculation that Excludes FHSP Students

(RHSP + DAP)

(MHSP + RHSP + DAP)

Calculation that Includes FHSP Students

(RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP-E + FHSP-DLA)

(MHSP + RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP + FHSP-E + FHSP-DLA)

Notes:

FHSP: Foundation High School Program (FHSP) without endorsement

FHSP-E: FHSP with endorsement and no Distinguished Level of Achievement

FHSP-DLA: FHSP with endorsement and Distinguished Level of Achievement

Texas Success Initiative

- **TSI portion of postsecondary component** will continue to include the results of the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) assessment in the postsecondary component and give credit for every student who
 - meets the TSI requirement in reading on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT
and
 - meets the TSI requirement in mathematics on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT

A student must meet the TSI requirement for both reading and mathematics but does not necessarily need to meet them on the same assessment.

The postsecondary component evaluated in 2017 accountability for the 2015–16 graduates is as shown below:

graduates meeting TSI criteria in both ELA/reading and mathematics (TSI, SAT, or ACT)	or	graduates who completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual-credit courses in the current or prior school year	or	graduates who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses as part of a four-year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits
---	-----------	---	-----------	---

Number of annual graduates

Overview of 2017 Accountability

Rationale: The 2013–14 annual graduates were the last graduating class with TAKS results that could have been used in the college-readiness indicator of the postsecondary component. Beginning with the graduates from the 2014–15 school year, the postsecondary component will incorporate the results from the TSI assessment and continue to credit students who meet the TSI criteria on either the SAT or ACT assessments.

4. Distinction Designations

Addition of Early College High School (ECHS) Student Percentage to Campus

Comparison Group Formula Committee members expressed concerns regarding the equity of including campuses of choice (early college high schools and charters, for example) in campus comparison groups with traditional districts and campuses that do not have the option to select students.

Rationale for Added ECHS Percentage: Adding the ECHS percentage to the campus comparison group formula adds an additional layer of refinement to the 40 campuses determination. Campuses with lower percentages of ECHS students, and their associated high performance values, are more likely to be grouped with other ECHS campuses.