

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

This document presents the commissioner of education’s final decisions for 2018 accountability.

2018 System Overview

Rigor The overall design of the accountability system evaluates performance according to three domains:

- Student Achievement
- School Progress
- Closing the Gaps

Domain Construction

Student Achievement Evaluates performance across all subjects for all students, on both general and alternative assessments

Grade Level	Component	Description	Rationale
EL, MS, HS, K–12, and Districts	STAAR (All Grade Levels and Subject Areas)	Percentage at Approaches Grade Level or Above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reward success at all performance levels to encourage administrative focus on all students, rather than just those near the Approaches Grade Level standard. • The average of the three levels is very close to the percentage of students who achieve the Meets Grade Level standard. The Meets Grade Level standard equates to a 60 percent chance of completing one year of college without remediation which seems most appropriate in alignment with 60x30TX. (The higher Masters Grade Level standard, like the SAT/ACT college readiness threshold, equates to a 75 percent chance of completing one year of college without remediation.)
		Percentage at Meets Grade Level or Above	
		Percentage at Masters Grade Level	
HS, K–12, and Districts	College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR)	Meet Reading TSI Criteria on TSIA, ACT, SAT, or Complete and Receive Credit for a College Prep Course in English Language Arts <i>and</i> Meet Mathematics TSI Criteria on TSIA, ACT, SAT, or Complete and Receive Credit for a College Prep Course in Mathematics	Meeting the criteria in both reading and mathematics aligns with Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board’s expectations for college readiness, consistent with 60x30TX.
		Meet Criteria of 3 on AP or 4 on IB Examinations in Any Subject	Research shows a correlation between first year persistence in higher education for students who meet the criteria on an AP/IB examination, consistent with the college ready threshold for SAT/ACT/TSIA. Including any subject area is in response to stakeholder feedback.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

Grade Level	Component	Description	Rationale
HS, K–12, and Districts	College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR)	Earn Three Hours of Dual-Course Credits in ELA/Mathematics or Nine Hours in Any Subject (includes technical courses), down from the 12 hours required by HB 2804 (84th Texas Legislature [2015])	Research shows a correlation between first year persistence in higher education for students who complete three hours of credit in ELA/mathematics. Including nine hours in any subject is in response to stakeholder feedback.
		Enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces	Enlistment standard encompasses academic readiness (ASVAB), physical fitness, and character screening.
		Earn an Approved Industry-Based Certification	Completion of at least one of the 73 industry-based certifications is a strong indicator of meaningful post-graduate employment. List validated via Tri-Agency stakeholder feedback and, where available, employment data.
		Earn an Associate’s Degree while in High School	Automatically met by students meeting dual-credit threshold but highlighted distinctly to showcase postsecondary completion.
		Graduate with Completed IEP and Workforce Readiness (Graduation Type Code of 04, 05, 54, or 55)	Crediting districts and campuses for annual special education graduates who complete workforce or work-skill programs while in high school meets the intent of the statute.
		CTE Coherent Sequence Coursework Completion and Credit Aligned with Approved Industry-Based Certifications (one-half point credit)	<p>Giving partial credit to districts and campuses for CTE coherent sequence students who complete and earn credit for coursework aligned with the approved list of industry-based certifications is in response to stakeholder feedback. Also, phasing out CTE coherent sequence allows districts and campuses to receive credit for efforts already in progress. The following is an overview of the current transition plan from CTE coherent sequence to industry-based certification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For 2018 and 2019, CTE coherent sequence graduates who complete and receive credit for at least one industry-based certification aligned CTE course earn one-half point (see attached list). For 2020 and 2021, CTE coherent sequence graduates who complete and receive credit for a pathway of courses toward an industry-based certification earn one-half point. For 2022 and beyond, only graduates who earn an industry-based certification earn one point.
HS, K–12, and Districts	Graduation Rates	Best of Four-year, Five-year, or Six-year Longitudinal Graduation Rates	Expanded to include six-year rates to help ensure an incentive to support the most struggling students.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

Assessments Evaluated Results are evaluated for grades 3–8 and end-of-course assessments for

- STAAR (with and without accommodations),
- STAAR Alternate 2, and
- substitute assessments (at Meets Grade Level).

Student Groups Evaluated All students, including English learners (ELs) as described below, are evaluated as one group.

Inclusion of English Learners English learners (ELs) in their first year in U.S. schools are excluded from Student Achievement domain calculations unless they were administered STAAR Alternate 2. STAAR Alternate 2 assessments are included in all domains without regard to years in U.S. schools. Furthermore, TEA will seek a waiver from the USDE for ELs in their second year in U.S. schools. If approved, ELs in year two in U.S. schools will be excluded from accountability calculations for 2018.

Asylees, refugees, and students with interrupted formal education (SIFEs) are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

Methodology

STAAR One point is given for each percentage of assessment results that are at or above the following:

- Approaches Grade Level or Above
- Meets Grade Level or Above
- Masters Grade Level

The STAAR component is calculated by dividing the total points (cumulative percentage of assessments at each performance level) by three, resulting in an overall score of 0 to 100.

$$\frac{\begin{aligned} &\text{Percentage of Assessments at Approaches Grade Level or Above} + \\ &\text{Percentage of Assessments at Meets Grade Level or Above} + \\ &\text{Percentage of Assessments at Masters Grade Level} \end{aligned}}{\text{Three}}$$

CCMR One point is given for each annual graduate who accomplishes any one of the CCMR indicators except for CTE coherent sequence graduates who completed coursework aligned to the approved list of industry-based certifications. One-half point will be given for these graduates. The CCMR component is calculated by dividing the total points (cumulative number of CCMR graduates) by the number of annual graduates.

$$\frac{\text{Number of Graduates Who Accomplished Any One of the CCMR Indicators}}{\text{Number of 2017 Annual Graduates}}$$

Graduation Rate High school graduation rates include the four-year, five-year, or six-year longitudinal graduation rate (with state exclusions) or annual dropout rate, if the graduation rate is unavailable.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

Student Achievement Domain Calculation

Campus Type	Component	Weight
Elementary School	STAAR	100%
Middle School	STAAR	100%
HS, K-12, and Districts	STAAR	40%
	CCMR	40%
	Graduation Rate or Annual Dropout Rate	20%

Rationale: The weighting for the Student Achievement domain was chosen in response to stakeholder feedback.

School Progress Measures district and campus outcomes in two parts: the number of students that grew at least one year academically (or are on track) as measured by STAAR results, as well as the achievement of students relative to similar districts or campuses.

School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth Provides an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for STAAR results that either meet the student-level criteria for the STAAR progress measure or maintain proficiency.

Assessments Evaluated Results are evaluated for assessments with eligible STAAR progress measures. Substitute assessments are not included in Part A of the School Progress domain because they have no STAAR progress measures.

Student Groups Evaluated All students, including English learners (ELs) as described below, are evaluated as one group.

Inclusion of English Learners English learners (ELs) in their first year in U.S. schools are excluded from School Progress, Part A domain calculations unless they were administered STAAR Alternate 2. STAAR Alternate 2 assessments are included in all domains without regard to years in U.S. schools. The STAAR progress measure is used for ELs and non-ELs in the School Progress, Part A domain. Furthermore, TEA will seek a waiver from the USDE for ELs in their second year in U.S. schools. If approved, ELs in year two in U.S. schools will be excluded from accountability calculations for 2018.

Asylees, refugees, and SIFEs are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

Methodology School Progress, Part A includes all assessments with a STAAR progress measure. Districts and campuses earn credit for results that maintain proficiency or meet growth expectations on STAAR.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

Methodology

Current-Year Performance on STAAR					
Prior-Year Performance on STAAR		Does Not Meet	Approaches Grade Level	Meets Grade Level	Masters Grade Level
	Does Not Meet	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

Rationale: School Progress, Part A provides an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for STAAR results that either maintain proficiency or meet the student-level criteria for progress. Awarding only one-half point for remaining at Meets Grade Level without meeting progress measure expectations is in response to stakeholder feedback.

Current-Year Performance on STAAR Alternate 2				
Prior-Year Performance on STAAR Alternate 2		Level I: Developing	Level II: Satisfactory	Level III: Accomplished
	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

Rationale: School Progress, Part A provides an opportunity for districts and campuses to receive credit for STAAR Alternate 2 results that either maintain proficiency or meet the student-level criteria for progress.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance Evaluates the achievement of all students relative to districts or campuses with similar socioeconomic statuses.

Assessments Evaluated Results are evaluated for grades 3–8 and end-of-course assessments for

- STAAR (with and without accommodations),
- STAAR Alternate 2, and
- substitute assessments (at Meets Grade Level).

Student Groups Evaluated All students, including English learners (ELs) as described below, are evaluated as one group.

Inclusion of English Learners English learners (ELs) in their first year in U.S. schools are excluded from School Progress, Part B domain calculations unless they were administered STAAR Alternate 2. STAAR Alternate 2 assessments are included in all domains without regard to years in U.S. schools. Furthermore, TEA will seek a waiver from the USDE for ELs in their second year in U.S. schools. If approved, ELs in year two in U.S. schools will be excluded from accountability calculations for 2018.

Asylees, refugees, and SIFEs are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

Methodology

Campus Type	Evaluation
Elementary School	Student Achievement STAAR component results compared to elementary schools with similar percentages of economically disadvantaged students
Middle School	Student Achievement STAAR component results compared to middle schools with similar percentages of economically disadvantaged students
HS, K–12, and Districts with CCMR Component	Student Achievement STAAR component and CCMR component results averaged compared to districts or campuses with similar percentages of economically disadvantaged students
HS, K–12, and Districts without CCMR Component	Student Achievement STAAR component results compared to districts or campuses with similar percentages of economically disadvantaged students
AEA Districts and Campuses	Alternative education accountability (AEA) districts and campuses are not evaluated on School Progress, Part B due to the small number of districts and campuses used for comparison.

Rationale: Comparing relative performance of similar districts and campuses is statutorily required. Research has shown that a student’s socioeconomic status is one of the most accurate predictors of achievement. Highlighting campuses that are the most successful educating students who are economically disadvantaged can help identify best practices.

School Progress Domain Calculation

Step 1: Calculate a scaled score for both School Progress, Part A and Part B.

Step 2: Take the higher scaled score for either School Progress, Part A or Part B. The higher scaled score is used to calculate the School Progress domain rating.

Rationale: Using the better of School Progress, Part A or Part B is in response stakeholder feedback.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

Closing the Gaps Measures achievement differentials among students, including differentials among students from different racial and ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds and other factors including: students formerly receiving special education services, continuously enrolled students, and students who are mobile.

Student Groups Evaluated

- All Students
- African American
- Hispanic
- White
- American Indian
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Two or More Races
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Special Education
- Former Special Education
- Current and Monitored English Learners (through fourth year as allowed by ESSA)
- Continuously Enrolled
- Non-Continuously Enrolled

Inclusion of English Learners English learners (ELs) in their first year in U.S. schools are excluded from Closing the Gaps domain calculations unless they were administered STAAR Alternate 2. STAAR Alternate 2 assessments are included in all domains without regard to years in U.S. schools. Furthermore, TEA will seek a waiver from the USDE for ELs in their second year in U.S. schools. If approved, ELs in year two in U.S. schools will be excluded from accountability calculations for 2018.

Asylees, refugees, and SIFEs are not included in state accountability until their sixth year of enrollment in U.S. schools.

Components

- Academic Achievement (at the Meets Grade Level or above standard) in Reading and Mathematics
- Growth in Reading and Mathematics (School Progress, Part A) for Elementary and Middle Schools
- Four-year Graduation Rate (without state exclusions) for High Schools, K–12s, and Districts with Graduation Rates
- Student Achievement Domain STAAR Component for Elementary and Middle Schools
- College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance for High Schools, K–12s, and Districts

Rationale: The Closing the Gaps domain was designed to meet the federal requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Due to changes to the TELPAS, Texas will request a waiver from the USDE to waive the English Language Proficiency component for 2018 accountability. If granted, the English Language Proficiency component will be evaluated for the first time in 2019.

Closing the Gaps Domain Calculation

Cumulative performance for each component is based on the total number of eligible student groups that meet minimum-size criteria. The maximum number of measures met for each component is totaled and then divided by the total count of eligible measures, resulting in an overall percentage for each of the three domain components. Percentages for each component are then weighted based on the district or campus type to calculate an overall domain score.

Rationale: House Bill 22 requires the use of disaggregated data to demonstrate differentials among racial/ethnic groups, socioeconomic backgrounds, and other factors.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

2018 Accountability Rating Labels

Rating Labels The 2018 rating labels for districts and campuses are as follows. Rating labels are assigned to each domain, and an overall rating is assigned.

Campuses

- *Met Standard*: Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to campuses that meet the required performance targets
- *Improvement Required*: Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to campuses (including AEAs) that do not meet the required performance targets
- *Met Alternative Standard*: Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to alternative education campuses evaluated under alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions that meet the required performance targets
- *Not Rated*: Assigned to campuses that—under certain, specific circumstances—do not receive a rating

Districts

- *A, B, C, or D*: Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to districts that meet the required performance target for the letter grade
- *F*: Assigned for overall performance and for performance in each domain to districts (including AEAs) that do not meet the required performance target to earn at least a *D*
- *Not Rated*: Assigned to districts that—under certain, specific circumstances—do not receive a rating

Rationale: House Bill 22 requires that districts receive domain and overall letter grades of *A–F* and campuses receive domain and overall ratings of *Met Standard*, *Met Alternative Standard*, or *Improvement Required*.

Scaling In order to align letter grades and scores used in the *A–F* academic accountability system to the common conception of letter grades, raw component and domain scores are adjusted to scaled scores.

Weighting of the Overall Rating

Step 1: Determine the better outcome of the Student Achievement and the School Progress domain scaled scores.

Step 2: Weight the better outcome of the Student Achievement or the School Progress domain scaled score at 70 percent.

Step 3: Weight the Closing the Gaps domain scaled score at 30 percent.

Step 4: Total the weighted outcome of the two scaled scores to calculate the overall score.

Overall Rating Targets—Districts In order to receive an overall rating of *A, B, C, or D*, districts must meet the performance target for the letter grade, if they have performance data for evaluation. If a district fails to meet the performance target for at least a *D*, the district receives an *F*. District ratings are assigned based on the following scaled scores: *A*=90–100, *B*=80–89, *C*=70–79, *D*=60–69. Districts will be assigned an *F* if the overall scaled score is less than 60.

Overall Rating Targets—Campuses In order to receive an overall *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating, campuses must meet the performance target, by campus type, if they have performance data for evaluation. Campuses will be assigned a rating of *Met Standard/Met Alternative Standard* based on an overall scaled score of 60–100. Campuses will be assigned an *Improvement Required* rating if the overall scaled score is less than 60.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

2018 Accountability Cut Points

Cut Points The 2018 cut points for districts and campuses will reflect high expectations for student achievement, school progress, and reducing achievement gaps among students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds and different socioeconomic statuses.

An effort is being made to establish A cut points equating high performance consistent with meeting statewide goals for our students. For example, achieving a raw score of 60 in Student Achievement is consistent with the [60x30TX](#) plan and would be used to designate an A (or a 90 out of 100 scaled score) in that domain.

Performance in a domain that was precisely average for campuses in the 2016–17 school year is being used to determine C cut points (specifically, 78 out of 100 for a slightly high C).

Exact cut score levels are informed based on performance achieved last year (the 2016–17 school year). To the extent possible, those cut scores will remain static over five-year intervals, so that as campuses improve statewide, campus ratings also improve. This allows for easier year-over-year performance comparisons and ensures it remains mathematically possible for all campuses to achieve an A, even in the first year of implementation.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

Distinction Designations

Updates to Distinction Designation Indicators Distinction designation indicators are updated to align with the achievement indicators in the 2018 accountability system. The following table shows these updates:

Distinction Designation	Update(s)
All Subject Area Distinction Designations	Advanced/Dual-Credit Course Completion Rate indicator evaluates grades 9–12
Top 25 Percent: Student Progress	Awarded if School Progress, Part A domain scaled score ranks in top 25 percent (Q1) of campuses in campus comparison group
Top 25 Percent: Closing Performance Gaps	Awarded if Closing the Gaps domain scaled score ranks in top 25 percent (Q1) of campuses in campus comparison group
Postsecondary Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of STAAR Results at Meets Grade Level or Above Standard (All Subjects) indicator replaces Index 4–Percentage at STAAR Meets Grade Level Standard College, Career, and Military Ready Graduates indicator added TSI Criteria Graduate indicator replaces College Ready indicator Percentage of Grade 3–8 Results at Meets Grade Level or Above in Both Reading and Mathematics indicator added

Rationale: The updated indicators align more closely with the methodology for similar indicators used in accountability calculations.

Distinction Designation Eligibility Campuses that receive an accountability rating of *Met Standard* are eligible to earn distinction designations. Districts that receive a rating of *A*, *B*, *C*, or *D* are eligible for a distinction designation in postsecondary readiness.

Rationale: House Bill 22 (85th Texas Legislature) defines acceptable performance as an overall or domain performance rating of *A*, *B*, *C*, or *D*.

House Bill 22 2018 Accountability Decisions Framework

Hurricane Harvey Affected Districts and Campuses

Decisions Related to Hurricane Harvey The commissioner will make decisions related to 2018 accountability for districts and campuses impacted by Hurricane Harvey in late spring.

Anticipated Timeline

May 2018—The proposed *2018 Accountability Manual* will be published in the *Texas Register* for public comment.

June 2018—The commissioner will announce accountability decisions related to Hurricane Harvey affected districts and campuses.

June 2018—A proposed appendix to the *2018 Accountability Manual* containing the methodology and data sources used to make decisions related to Hurricane Harvey will be published in the *Texas Register* for public comment.

August 2018—The *2018 Accountability Manual* will be adopted into the Texas Administrative Code.

August 2018—The appendix associated with Hurricane Harvey decisions will be adopted into the Texas Administrative Code.