## Accountability Changes Part One

Looking at 2022 Accountability through a New Lens


## District Accountability Calculation OLD METHOD



## NEW

PROPORTIONALITY METHOD


| Campus | \# of <br> Students | \% of District <br> Enrollment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IES | 213 | $\mathbf{2 5 . 1 \%}$ |
| IMS | 269 | $\mathbf{3 1 . 7 \%}$ |
| ITM | 367 | $\mathbf{4 3 . 2 \%}$ |
| IISD | 849 | $100 \%$ |

## District Accountability Calculation NEW METHOD

## Student Achievement Domain

IES: 25.1\%
IMS: 31.7\%
ITM: 43.2\%

## School Progress <br> Domain

Part A: Academic Growth
IES: 25.1\%, IMS: 31.7\%, ITM, 43.2\%
-OR-
Part B: Relative
Performance
IES: 25.1\%, IMS: 31.7\%, ITM, 43.2\%

Closing the Gaps

IES: 25.1\%
IMS: 31.7\%
ITM: 43.2\%

## OLD METHOD

## Domain 1: Student Achievement

| Student <br> Achievement <br> Component | Score | Weight | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STAAR | 87 | $40 \%$ | 34.8 |
| CCMR | 97 |  | $40 \%$ |
| Grade Rate | 100 |  | $20 \%$ |
| District Domain 1 Score |  |  |  |

## What was an $A$, is now a $B$.

## Domain 1: Student Achievement

| Campus | Student Achievement <br> Domain Score | Weight | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IES | 86 | $25.1 \%$ | 21.6 |
| IMS | 85 | $31.7 \%$ | 26.9 |
| ITM | 93 | $43.2 \%$ | 40.2 |
| District Domain 1 Score |  |  | 88.7 |

## OLD METHOD

| School Progress <br> Component | Score | Weight | Grade | Domain 2: <br> School |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part 2A: Academic <br> Growth | 80 | $100 \%$ | 80 | SrogresS <br> Prosen |
| Part 2B: Relative <br> Performance | 94 | $100 \%$ | 94 |  |
| District Domain 2 Score |  |  |  | 94 |


| School Progress Component | Score | Weight | Points | $\text { from a } 94$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part 2A: Academic Growth |  |  |  | $\text { to a } 91$ |
| IES | 74 | 25.1\% | 18.6 |  |
| IMS | 77 | 31.7\% | 24.4 |  |
| ITM | 80 | 43.2\% | 34.6 | Domain 2: |
| What was a $B$, is now a $C$. | District Part 2A Score |  | 77.6 | School Progress |
| Part 2B: Relative Performance |  |  |  |  |
| IES | 90 | 25.1\% | 22.6 |  |
| IMS | 90 | 31.7\% | 28.5 |  |
| ITM | 92 | 43.2\% | 39.7 |  |
|  | District Part 2B Score |  | 90.8 |  |
| Overall District Domain 2 Score |  |  | 91 |  |

## OLD METHOD

## Domain 3: <br> Closing the Gaps

| Closing the <br> Gaps <br> Component | Score | Weight | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic <br> Achievement | 100 | $50 \%$ | 50 |
| Graduation Rate | 100 | $10 \%$ | 10 |
| EL Proficiency | 100 | $10 \%$ | 10 |
| School Quality <br> (CCMR) | 100 | $30 \%$ | 30 |
| District Domain 3 Score |  |  | 100 |

## What was a perfect score, is now a mid B.

## Domain 3: Closing the Gaps

| Closing the <br> Gaps <br> Component | Score | Weight | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IES | 79 | $25.1 \%$ | 19.8 |
| IMS | 81 | $31.7 \%$ | 25.7 |
| ITM | 88 | $43.2 \%$ | 38.0 |
| District Domain 3 Score |  |  |  |
| 83.5 |  |  |  |

## District Accountability OLD vs NEW

## Student Achievement Domain

School Progress Domain
Part A: 89. 78
-OR-
Part B:
些 91

The District's domain grades now come directly from weighted scores earned by the campuses.

Across the state, school districts will experience an artificial deflation to their accountability

## Key Takeaways

 ratings.- IISD Example: What was a 96, became an 89.

Just as we adapted to a new system before, we will adapt again.

