



Accountability Brunch & Learn with Experts

RDA / A-F Integration Taskforce Feedback

Round 1

February 14, 2025

2023 Ratings Are Different

State law requires updates to standards to continuously improve student performance and ensure Texas is a national leader in preparing students for postsecondary success. Prior to 2017, accountability standards and cut points were raised each year. A–F enables apples-to-apples comparisons by updating standards less frequently. However, this results in larger changes when the updates occur. This year is different with the updated standards. Therefore, 2022 and 2023 ratings cannot be compared side-by-side. It is possible that a campus with an A in 2022 may improve in 2023 and yet receive a B.

Improvement in College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) Points Needed to Raise the Bar to Meet Texas's Definition of Excellence

- In 2017, cut points for CCMR were set for the first time under A–F. District and stakeholder feedback five years ago recommended a cut point of over 90 percent as the percentage of CCMR graduates that represented excellence and should generate an A. However, very few campuses performed at that level in 2017 (average performance was 47 percent), so the cut point was set at 60 percent.
- CCMR performance has skyrocketed, with average performance now at 65 percent. Given these improvements, and the statutory objective of A–F to make Texas a national leader in preparing students for postsecondary success, the cut point for an A has been adjusted to 88 percent. This raises the bar to begin to meet Texas's definition of excellence for CCMR.

Final Refresh Changes For more information, see 2023 Accountability Manual

Student Achievement Domain

CCMR Component:

- Phase-in programs of study, in alignment with industry-based certification (IBC) updates.
- Work towards improved validity requirements for college prep courses and IBCs.
- Bring back reliable data collection for military enlistment (both US Armed Forces and TX National Guard) starting with the class of 2023 in 2024 Ratings.

School Progress Domain

Academic Growth Component:

- Use a transition table model to determine growth. Cut points with splits for "Did Not Meet" and "Approaches" into high and low, as well as different point values.
- Incorporate accelerated learning performance into the Academic Growth component calculation.

District Proportional Domain Ratings

- Calculate district domain ratings using a proportionality method to improve the alignment of district overall ratings with campus overall ratings.

Closing the Gaps Domain

Student Group Targets and Points:

- Set federal interim and long-term student group targets by school type.
- Award graded outcomes (0–4 points) for performance and growth to these targets.
- Use super groups to adjust how current groups are categorized, to improve focus on at-risk students whose performance is not potentially reflected in the first two domains.

Unique Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) System

- Focus on achievement and progress outcomes of re-testers.
- Include previous dropouts in CCMR and graduation indicators as a hold-harmless (dropouts are included in the numerator but not the denominator of the calculation).

Other

Expand the 3Fs Gate:

- To align with Senate Bill (SB) 1365, if a campus or district earns three Ds and/or Fs, they cannot earn above 69 on their overall rating.

Closing the Gaps Domain, Part B:

- Add report-only Closing the Gaps, Part B: Results Driven Accountability (RDA) for districts only.

Cut Points:

- Update overall and domain cut scores that correspond to A, B, C, D, and F.

School Improvement:

- Targeted, and additional targeted identification and exit methodologies, will align with 0–4 points and focus on lowest performing groups and campuses.

Distinction Designations and Other Performance Information:

- Refine distinctions and highlight other performance information that recognize district efforts.

Incorporate Extra and Co-curricular Activities:

- Continue data collection and analyses to add an extra/co-curricular student activity indicator pending legislative action for a future accountability cycle.

RDA / A-F Accountability Integration Taskforce

The RDA / A-F Accountability Integration Taskforce is comprised of representatives from local educational agencies (LEAs) and regional education service centers (ESCs) for the purpose of reviewing and refining agency proposals to incorporate RDA within the district-level accountability system while ensuring current federal requirements for RDA are maintained.

The RDA / A-F Taskforce prepares recommendations for the Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) for consideration in the 2028 refreshed A-F Accountability System. For more information, please see materials below.

RDA Integration Task Force Charter
RDA / A-F Taskforce Membership List

Source: <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/accountability/academic-accountability/performance-reporting/accountability-system-development>

Taskforce Participation Expectations



- Bring creative solutions and best practices to the group for discussions.
- Provide both synchronous and asynchronous feedback in a timely manner.
- **Serve as a spokesperson for all Texas school districts and open-enrollment charter schools to provide recommendations to the TEA.**

RDA A-F Integration Taskforce Membership

School District and Charter School Representatives

Kelly Baehren, Chief Academic Officer, Waller ISD

Denise Bell, Director of Accountability Systems and Data Analysis, Waco ISD

Dr. Jacqueline Boney Taylor, Accountability Coordinator & District Testing Coordinator, Advantage Academy

Ashton Booth, Director of Special Education, 504, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, Elgin ISD

James Cureton, Director of Assessments and Data Analysis, Tyler ISD

Melissa DeSimone, Executive Director of Research, Assessment, and Accountability, Northwest ISD

Jennie Good, Director of Accountability and Assessment, New Caney ISD

Jessica Harrison, District Testing & Accountability Administrator, Canutillo ISD

Raul Medellin, Coordinator of Accountability, Ysleta ISD

Jill Morris, Director of Accountability, Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, Bryan ISD

Lisa Nixon, Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, Pearland ISD

Debby Noffsinger, Director of Assessment, Accountability and Compliance, Dickinson ISD

Elizabeth Schrader, Coordinator of Accountability and Assessment HEB ISD

Sheryl Stewart, Director of Accountability & Assessment, Allen ISD

Melissa Sulak, Executive Director of CCMR, Red Oak ISD

Gautier Tirado, Corporate Instructional Officer, Triumph Public High Schools

Courtney Witherell, Senior Director Accountability and Assessment, Comal ISD

Regional Education Service Center Representatives

Chris Griffin, Director of Special Education Services, ESC Region 12

Cliff Kinder, Liaison Special Education, ESC 15

Angel Lozano, Strategic Data Performance Coach, Region 4

RDA / A-F Integration Taskforce Membership

Source: <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/accountability/academic-accountability/performance-reporting/accountability-system-development>

Presenters – RDA Taskforce (& TSA) Members



Dr. James Cureton
Tyler ISD

Director, Assessment &
Data Analysis



Liz Schrader
Hurst-Euless-Bedford ISD

Coordinator, Accountability &
Assessment

Agenda:

- Welcome
- RDA / A-F Integration:
 - Part I - Why Now? and Initial Feedback
 - Part II - Diving into Proposal Details
- Closing Remarks

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

THE WHY



Aligned Accountability: Integrating Results Driven Accountability (RDA) with A-F ratings allows Texas to create a streamlined system, reducing redundancy and improving clarity for schools and districts.



Comprehensive Performance View: Merging RDA with A-F ratings provides a more holistic view of school performance, combining academic achievement with specialized support for special education and federally required student subgroups, enabling targeted and inclusive improvement strategies.



Consistency in Policy and Stakeholder Transparency: An integrated system fosters transparency by ensuring stakeholders understand how performance across diverse student groups impacts overall ratings, making the accountability framework more understandable and actionable for educators, families, and communities.

We must ensure districts no longer have two “ratings” or differing “versions” of how they are serving their students in special populations.

TEA will develop a **“REPORT ONLY”** version of Closing the Gaps that includes Part A and Part B, where Part B reflects much of what is currently in RDA.

This would not impact A-F ratings during this 5-year cycle but would be finalized to do so in the next 5-year A-F cycle (**starting in 2028**).

[Chapter 12—Results Driven Accountability](#)

[Appendix K—Results Driven Accountability](#)

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

Domain I
Academic
Achievement

Domain II
Post-Secondary
Readiness

Domain III
Disproportionate
Analysis

BE/ESL/EL

OSP

SPED

12
Indicators

6
Indicators

18
Indicators

Proposed 2025 RDA

- **Three previously Report-Only indicators will be assigned a Performance Level (PL).**
 - BE/ESL/EB Indicator: TELPAS Composite Rating Levels for Students in U.S. Schools Multiple Years (New! PL Assignment)
 - SPED Indicator: SPED OSS and Expulsion >10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21) (New! PL Assignment)
 - SPED Indicator: SPED ISS >10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21) (New! PL Assignment)
- **Seven previously Report-Only indicators will no longer be reported through RDA.**
 - BE/ESL/EB Indicator: EB Dyslexia STAAR 3-8 Reading Language Arts Passing Rate
 - BE/ESL/EB Indicator: EB Dyslexia Representation (Ages 6-21)
 - OSP Indicator: OSP Dyslexia STAAR 3-8 Reading Language Arts Passing Rate
 - OSP Indicator: OSP Dyslexia Representation (Ages 6-21)
 - SPED Indicator: SPED Dyslexia STAAR 3-8 Reading Language Arts Passing Rate
 - SPED Indicator: SPED Dyslexia Representation (school-aged)
 - SPED Indicator: SPED STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Rate
- **Three Report-Only indicators have been clarified as indicators for which future PL assignment is not planned.**
 - SPED Separate Settings Rate (school-aged)
 - SPED OSS and Expulsion ≤10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21)
 - SPED ISS ≤10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21)
- **The Hold Harmless (HH) PL has been discontinued on certain OSP indicators.**

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

BE/ESL/EB Domain 1: Academic Achievement
(Indicators 1-9)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #1 (i-iv)	BE STAAR 3-8 Passing Rate (Report Only; No PL Assigned)	Measures the percent of students served in a standard Bilingual Education (BE) program who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 assessments.
Indicator #2 (i-iv)	ESL STAAR 3-8 Passing Rate (Report Only; No PL Assigned)	Measures the percent of students served in a standard English as a Second Language (ESL) program who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 assessments.
Indicator #3 (i-iv)	ALP STAAR 3-8 Passing Rate (Report Only; No PL Assigned)	Measures the percent of students served in an alternative language program (ALP) rather than served in a standard BE or standard ESL program who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 assessments.
Indicator #4 (i-iv)	EB (Not Served in BE/ESL) STAAR 3-8 Passing Rate (Report Only; No PL Assigned)	Measures the percent of emergent bilingual (EB) students not served in a BE or ESL program who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 assessments.

Indicator #5	EB Dyslexia STAAR 3-8 Reading Language Arts Passing Rate (Report Only; No PL Assigned)	Measures the percent of emergent bilingual (EB) students who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 Reading Language Arts assessment.
Indicator #6 (i-iv)	EB Years-After Reclassification (YsAR) STAAR 3-8 Passing Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of certain former emergent bilingual (EB) students who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 assessments.
Indicator #7 (i-iv)	EB STAAR EOC Passing Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of emergent bilingual (EB) students who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR EOC assessments.
Indicator #8	TELPAS Reading Beginning Proficiency Level Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of emergent bilingual (EB) students tested over two years who performed at the beginning proficiency level on the TELPAS Reading assessment in the current year.
Indicator #9	TELPAS Composite Rating Levels for Students in U.S. Schools Multiple Years (Report Only; No PL Assigned)	Measures the percent of emergent bilingual (EB) students in U.S. schools multiple years who received a TELPAS Composite Rating of Beginning or Intermediate.

Will no longer be reported through RDA

New PL Assignment

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

BE/ESL/EB Domain II: Post-Secondary Readiness (Indicators 10-11)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #10	EB Graduation Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of emergent bilingual (EB) students who graduated with a high school diploma in four years.
Indicator #11	EB Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of emergent bilingual (EB) students in Grades 7-12 who dropped out in a given school year.

BE/ESL/EB Domain III: Disproportionate Analysis (Indicator 12)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #12	EB Dyslexia Representation (Age 6-21) (Report Card PL Assigned)	Reference between the rate of emergent bilingual (EB) students identified with dyslexia and the rate of all students identified with dyslexia.

Will no longer be reported through RDA

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

OSP Domain 1: Academic Achievement
(Indicators 1-3)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #1 (i-iv)	OSP STAAR 3-8 Passing Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students in Foster Care, experiencing homelessness, or Military- Connected (OSP) students who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 assessments.
Indicator #2	OSP Dyslexia STAAR 3-8 Reading Language Arts Passing Rate (Report PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students in Foster Care, experiencing homelessness, or Military- Connected (OSP) students who are also identified with dyslexia and met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 Reading Language Arts assessments.
Indicator #3 (i-iv)	OSP STAAR EOC Passing Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students in Foster Care, experiencing homelessness, or Military- Connected (OSP) students who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR EOC assessments.

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

OSP Domain II: Post-Secondary Readiness (Indicators 4-5)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #4	OSP Graduation Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students ever in Foster Care, ever experiencing homelessness, or ever Military-Connected (OSP) students (nonduplicative count) who graduated with a high school diploma in four years
Indicator #5	OSP Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students in Foster Care, experiencing homelessness, or Military- Connected (OSP) students (nonduplicative count) in Grades 7-12 who dropped out in a given school year.

OSP Domain III: Disproportionate Analysis (Indicator 6)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #6	OSP Disproportionate Analysis (Ages 6-21) (PL Assignment)	Measures the difference in the rate of students in Foster Care, experiencing homelessness, or Military- Connected (OSP) students identified with dyslexia to the rate of students identified with dyslexia in the LEA.

**Will no longer be
reported
through RDA**

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

SPED Domain 1: Academic Achievement
(Indicators 1-5)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #1 (i-iv)	SPED STAAR 3-8 Passing Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students served in special education (SPED) who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 assessments.
Indicator #2	SPED Dynamic STAAR 3-8 Reading Arts Passing Rate (Report Only; No Assignment)	Measures the percent of SPED students identified with disabilities who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 Reading Arts assessment.
Indicator #3 (i-iv)	SPED Year-After-Exit (YAE) STAAR 3-8 Passing Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students formerly served in special education (SPED) who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR 3-8 assessments.
Indicator #4 (i-iv)	SPED STAAR EOC Passing Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students served in special education (SPED) who met the minimum level of satisfactory performance or higher on the STAAR EOC assessments.
Indicator #5 (i-iii)	SPED STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Rate (Report Only; No Assignment)	Measures the percent of all students who were tested on STAAR Alternate 2 in Mathematics (including Algebra I), Reading Language Arts/ELA (including Reading II), or Science (including Biology).

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

SPED Domain II: Post-Secondary Readiness (Indicators 6-7)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #6	SPED Graduation Rate (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students served in special education (SPED) who graduated with a high school diploma in four years.
Indicator #7	SPED Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12) (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students in Grades 7-12 served in special education (SPED) who dropped out in a given school year.

Results Driven Accountability

Background Information

SPED Domain II: Post-Secondary Readiness (Indicators 8-18)

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #8	SPED Dyslexia Representation Rate (school-aged) (Report Only; No PL Assignment)	Measures the difference between the rate of students served in special education identified with dyslexia and the rate of all students with dyslexia in the LEA.
Indicator #9	SPED Regular Early Childhood Program Rate (preschool-aged) (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students ages 3-4, and age 5 not enrolled in kindergarten, served in special education (SPED) who were placed in a regular early childhood program.
Indicator #10	SPED Regular Class ≥80% Rate (school-aged) (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students (school-aged) served in special education (SPED) in the regular class 80% or more of the day.
Indicator #11	SPED Regular Class <40% Rate (school-aged) (PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students (school-aged) served in special education (SPED) in the regular class less than 40% of the day.
Indicator #12	SPED Separate Setting Rate (school-aged) (Report Only; No PL Assignment)	Measures the percent of students (school-aged) served in special education (SPED) in separate setting.
Indicator #13	SPED Representation (Ages 3-21) (Report Only; No PL Assignment)	Measures the disaggregated percent of enrolled students (ages 3-21) who received special education (SPED) services.

Indicator	Description	Definition
Indicator #14	SPED OSS and Expulsion ≤10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21) (Report Only; No PL Assignment)	Measures the disaggregated percent of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED) reported as suspended out-of-school (OSS) or expelled for ten or fewer school days.
Indicator #15	SPED OSS and Expulsion >10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21) (Report Only; No PL Assignment)	Measures the disaggregated percent of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED) reported as suspended out-of-school (OSS) or expelled for more than 10 school days.
Indicator #16	SPED ISS ≤10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21) (Report Only; No PL Assignment)	Measures the disaggregated percent of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED) reported with in-school suspension (ISS) for ten or fewer school days.
Indicator #17	SPED ISS >10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21) (Report Only; No PL Assignment)	Measures the disaggregated percent of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED) reported with in-school suspension (ISS) for more than ten school days.
Indicator #18	SPED Total Disciplinary Removals Rate (Ages 3-21) (PL Assignment)	Measures the disaggregated percent of total disciplinary removals of students ages 3-21 served in special education (SPED).

Proposal as communicated in 2023 Refresh

Domain 3a

- Measures are the current Closing the Gaps domain aligned to the ESSA plan.
- Student dataset is all campuses proportionally weighted for district

Domain 3b (NEW)

- Pulls in those important RDA measures to the A-F rating.
- Student dataset is all district students

Questions/Feedback Time

- What indicators of RDA or A-F have you thought most about integrating (either because they're hard or because they're easy) since this first came up during the 2023 refresh?
- What have you thought a “fourth domain” or Domain 3b look like?

Feedback form-

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScWYoeSn0ac18_7CNPQU2bvlUEzF53JAAOIQiyjpLd_08ZmIA/viewform?usp=dialog

Part II – Diving into Proposal Details

- The proposed accountability subset is different in Domains 1, 2, and 3A (based on campuses subsets) compared to 3B (all district students).
- **Your Turn:** Are there any concerns about these implications? Remember...TAAG tried to get the district rating to be calculated using the whole district subset a few years ago?

Part II – Diving into Proposal Details

- TEA is proposing to use STAAR passing rates for all STAAR + EOCs combined in Domain 3B.
- **Your Turn:** Are we comfortable with just using approaches grade level percentages? Any down sides to combining STAAR + EOC as opposed to reporting them separately?

Part II – Diving into Proposal Details

- Dropout Rate is the only non-TELPAS/STAAR indicator proposed to be included in Domain 3B and Discipline and representation (SPED representation) are **potentially** being **excluded from the calculation of D3B** but will be reported.
- **Your Turn:** Do we have any concerns about adding dropout rate as the only non-TELPAS/STAAR indicator to TELPAS and STAAR with regard to district ratings? Could this reduce the impact of CCMR on district ratings if D3A and D3B are weighted equally?

Your feedback matters!

- Feedback form
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScWYoeSn0ac18_7CNPQU2bvlUEzF53JAAOIQiyjpLd_08ZmIA/viewform?usp=dialog
- Contact James, Liz, Allison, or Dee with questions, scenarios, potential ideas that pertain to your district. We are all here to help! 😊