



ALEDO ISD BOARD MEETING TEMPLATE

MEETING DATE: August 19, 2013

AGENDA ITEM: *2013 Accountability Ratings*

PRESENTER: Denise Dugger, Exec. Director Professional Development/Accountability

ALIGNS TO BOARD GOAL(S): **LEARNING:** The district will provide an aligned, rigorous curriculum, with instructional and technology programs preparing students to meet or exceed all educational standards.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: FEATURES OF THE NEW ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

This is the first time for the state to use an index-based approach to academic accountability. Full details about how the system worked were being provided to Districts as little as two weeks ago, and educators are still learning about all the implications and consequences of the new results. Because ratings are based on multiple aspects of performance and not just simple passing rates, the system is by definition much more complex than what many are used to seeing.

To be rated as “Met Standard,” the District and each campus must meet all applicable index targets: four targets for the District, four targets for most High Schools, and three targets for elementary and middle/junior high schools. If any one or more of the index targets is missed, the rating is “Improvement Required.”

The four indexes address the extent to which 1) scores on all tests in the accountability subset are at or above Level II: Satisfactory (keeping in mind that some students may contribute multiple test scores to the indexes and, for this year only, both TAKS and STAAR scores can be included), 2) performance on each of the tests in the accountability subset meets or exceeds progress expectations across up to 10 student groups, with extra weight given to the scores that exceed progress expectations, 3) scores for economically disadvantaged students and up to the 2 lowest performing groups in 2012 were at or above Level II: Satisfactory in 2013, and 4) students in up to 10 groups graduated on time and students in 8 racial/ethnic groups graduated on the Recommended and Distinguished/Advanced plans.

Among the features of the new system that have potential impact on results are these: minimum size criteria are more stringent (typically as soon as 25 test scores are represented in a group); scores of economically disadvantaged students are always

evaluated on Index 3, even if there is only one such score. Unlike the old system, there is no allowance for exceptions to standards.

Only campuses that are rated as “Met Standard” are eligible to receive Academic Achievement Distinction Designations. A maximum of three such Distinctions are available in 2013, for 1) being grouped in the top 25% on Index 2, 2) high performance in Reading/English Language Arts, and 3) high performance in Mathematics. Each of the three distinctions examines performance relative to a TEA-prepared comparison group of 40 demographically similar campuses from across the state.

The state has advised school districts that the 2013 ratings system is a “stand alone” year, meaning that the system is substantively different from the old accountability system and that it will be substantively different from what is done in 2014, in part due to statutory changes. However, under current state law, ratings from the old system in 2011 and the 2013 ratings must be considered as “consecutive” for purposes of determining District and campus sanctions, if any.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

None – Informational Report

FISCAL NOTE:

None

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATION:

None – Informational Report