

§ 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

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

Provides a snapshot of performance across subjects, on both general and alternative assessments, at the satisfactory performance standard.

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

Emphasizes the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students and the two lowest-performing racial/ethnic student groups.

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.

§ 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.

(RHSP + DAP)

(MHSP + RHSP + DAP)

(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

§ 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
- 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)	graduates who completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual-credit courses in the current or prior school year	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
<hr/>		
Number of annual graduates		

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.

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.