NEW TIMELINE FOR PBMAS:

On November 4, 2016  Notification of Staging in TEASE Accountability Application

By November 18, 2016  Required Intervention Activities Identified in ISAM Application

By December 9, 2016  Required submission of Corrective Action Plan only for districts identified with noncompliance on State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators 11, 12, and/or 13 (Sept. 30 LEA Compliance Report) [ALL LEAs in Region 20 were at 100% Compliance!!!]

By December 16, 2016  Completion of Targeted Improvement Plan with submission to TEA. Districts required to submit plans are IR districts, and those districts assigned a stage 3 or 4 in any program area.
The preliminary 2015-16 Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPR) and the TAPR Glossary are now available at: https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/2016/index.html.

The TAPR combines academic performance, financial reports, and information about students, staff, and programs for each campus and district in Texas.

NOTE: The cover page of the preliminary TAPR does not include the final state academic accountability rating, distinction designations, or special education determination status.

The final 2015-16 TAPR is scheduled to be released by December 2, 2016, and the cover page will be updated to include special education determination status, as well as the additional final components.
16-17 Staging Framework

What’s the same?

(1) districts with one or more indicators with a PL 3 or higher* are staged for interventions; and

(2) interventions for those districts are differentiated across four stages to ensure that TEA’s engagement and support are focused on the districts with the most significant student performance and program effectiveness concerns.

*In the special education program, this includes the federally required elements (FREs), but it does not include the special education representation indicator 10.
16-17 Staging Framework

What’s different?

Uniformity across PBMAS program areas: Intervention staging for districts with one or more PL 3s or higher is implemented based on a 90%/10% distribution, with 90% of the districts staged at either Stage 1 or 2 and 10% of the districts staged at either Stages 3 or 4. This distribution applies to all four PBMAS program areas.

More standardization across districts: Districts with one or more PBMAS indicators or FREs with a PL 3 or higher are not all the same. Some districts have many indicators with PL 3; others have a combination of PL 3s and 4s; some have only PL 4s; some are evaluated on almost all the indicators within a program area, while others are evaluated on a smaller number of indicators within a program area. To address these variations, the interventions staging process considers (a) the number of PBMAS indicators on which a district is evaluated within each program area; and (b) its performance level on each of those PBMAS indicators.
16-17 Staging Framework

Calculating Mean

\[
PBMAS\ PROGRAM\ AREA\ MEAN = \frac{SUM(VALUE\ of\ PL\ 0\ [RI,SA]\ to\ 4\ [SA])}{\#\ RATED}
\]

*Each PL’s value is equal to its level, i.e. PL 3=3.*
16-17 Staging Framework

**How are Differentiated Interventions Stages Determined?**

Districts with one or more PBMAS indicators or FREs with a PL 3* or higher will participate in PBMAS interventions. Of that group, the 10% of districts with the highest PBMAS program area means will be in Stages 3 or 4. The remaining 90% of districts will be in Stages 1 or 2.

*In the special education program area, this does not include any PL 3s on the special education representation indicator.
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**Important to note-**

➢ In SPED, if a district meets the criteria for staging eligibility based solely on its FRE PLs, it may have a mean that is lower than the Stage 1 mean. Nonetheless, because of the FRE=PL 3, it will be staged at a Stage 1.

➢ No district’s assigned intervention stage was increased by the inclusion of the special education representation indicator 10 in the mean.
16-17 Staging Framework

819 districts were originally identified as eligible for interventions staging in the SPED program.

10 of those districts will not be staged because the only indicator that made them eligible for staging was the SPED representation rate indicator.

Of the 809 remaining districts:

• 771 (95%) have mean values that do not result in a different intervention level, regardless of whether the SPED representation rate indicator in included in the mean calculation.
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Mean Ranges by Program Area for a 90%/10% Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>BE/ESL</th>
<th>CTE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>SPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2 – 1.0</td>
<td>0.2 – 0.8</td>
<td>0.2 – 0.9</td>
<td>0.2 – 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1 – 1.6</td>
<td>0.9 – 1.1</td>
<td>1.0 – 1.5</td>
<td>1.4 – 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7 – 1.9</td>
<td>1.2 – 1.4</td>
<td>1.6 – 2.2</td>
<td>1.6 – 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0 – 3.0</td>
<td>1.5 – 2.1</td>
<td>2.3 – 3.0</td>
<td>1.9 – 2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The 10% of districts at Stage 3 and Stage 4 will generally represent 6% at Stage 3 and 4% at Stage 4. The 90% of districts at Stage 1 and Stage 2 will generally represent 60% at Stage 1 and 30% at Stage 2. However, there will be some variations of that distribution across the four PBMAS program areas. This is because each PBMAS program area has a different number of indicators, a different numbers of districts with at least one PBMAS indicator or FRE with a PL 3 or higher, and different overall program performance.**
Example

A district is rated on the following 15 SPED indicators:

#1(i) = PL 2
#1(iii) = PL 3
#3(iii) = PL 0
#4 = PL 2
#5 = PL 0
#6 = PL 2

#7 = PL 0
#8 = PL 0
#9 = PL 0
#10 = PL 2 (SPED Representation Rate)
#11 = PL 0
#12 = PL 0
#13 = PL 0
#14 = PL 0
#15 = PL 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator:</th>
<th>2 + 3 + 0 + 2 + 0 + 2 + 0 + 0 + 2 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denominator:</td>
<td>Total # of Indicators Rated = 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: \( \frac{11}{15} = 0.7 \) (with Indicator #10)

**Versus**

Mean = \( \frac{9}{14} = 0.6 \) (without Indicator #10)

Stage 1 Mean Range = \( \leq 1.3 \).

The district’s mean range is not affected, and the district remains Stage 1.
35 districts benefit from the SPED representation rate indicator because their performance on it lowers their overall SPED mean, thereby making them eligible for a lower SPED intervention stage. These districts will continue to be staged at the lower intervention stage rather than elevating their intervention stage.
Example
A district is rated on the following 25 SPED indicators:

#1(ii) = PL 3
#1(iii)= PL 3
#1(iv) = PL 1
#1(v) = PL 2
#2(i) = PL 1
#2(ii) = PL 1
#2(iii)= PL 1
#3(i) = PL 2
#3(ii)= PL 2
#3(iii) = PL 1

#4 = PL 2
#5 = PL 1
#6 = PL 2
#7 = PL 1
#8 = PL 3
#9 = PL 3

#10 = PL 1 (SPED Representation Rate)
#11 = PL 1
#12 = PL 1
#13 = PL 2
#14 = PL 2
#15 = PL 3
#16 = PL 3
Numerator: 2+3+3+1+2+1+1+1+2+2+1+2+2+1+3+3+1+1+1+1+2+2+3+3 = 46
Denominator: Total # of Indicators Rated = 25

Mean = 46/25 = 1.8 (with Indicator #10)

Versus

Mean = 45/24 = 1.9 (without Indicator #10)

Stage 4 Mean Range = ≥1.9.
Stage 3 Mean Range = 1.6 – 1.8

The district’s mean range would be adversely affected without Indicator #10’s inclusion in the mean, so the district remains Stage 3.
3 districts do not benefit from the SPED representation rate indicator because their performance on it increases their overall SPED mean, thereby making them eligible for a higher SPED intervention stage. A “hold harmless” provision will be applied to these 3 districts, and the lower intervention stage will be applied.
Example
A district is rated on the following 23 SPED indicators:

#1(i) = PL 0
#1(ii) = PL 0
#1(iii) = PL 3
#1(v) = PL 2
#2(i) = PL 1
#2(iii) = PL 1
#3(i) = PL 2
#3(ii) = PL 2
#3(iii) = PL 1
#3(iv) = PL 2
#4 = PL 2
#5 = PL 2
#6 = PL 2
#7 = PL 2
#8 = PL 2
#9 = PL 0
#10 = PL 2 (SPED Representation Rate)
#11 = PL 1
#12 = PL 2
#13 = PL 1
#14 = PL 2
#15 = PL 2
#16 = PL 2
Numerator: 0\quad0+3+2+1+1+2+2+1+2+2+2+2+0+2+1+2+1+2+2+2 = 36
Denominator: Total # of Indicators Rated = 23

Mean = \frac{36}{23} = 1.6 \text{ (with Indicator #10)}

Versus

Mean = \frac{34}{22} = 1.5 \text{ (without Indicator #10)}

Stage 3 Mean Range = 1.6 - 1.8
Stage 2 Mean Range = 1.4 - 1.5

The district’s mean range is adversely affected with Indicator #10’s inclusion in the mean, so the district is assigned Stage 2.
The purpose of this letter is to notify districts, including charter schools, that 2016-2017 staging identification for the bilingual education/English as a second language, career and technical education, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and special education program areas, were made available on Friday, November 3, 2016, through the Accountability application (PBM Tab) on the Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEASE). Resources and required intervention activities will be available the week of November 14, 2016, through the Intervention, Stage, and Activity Manager (ISAM) application on TEASE.
Districts' interventions staging levels are presented below.

Additional staging information will be available the week of November 14, 2016 through the Intervention, Stage, and Activity Manager (ISAM) on TEASE.

For any other questions about interventions, please visit http://tea.texas.gov/schoolimprovement/ or contact the Division of School Improvement at (512)463-5226 or Sldivision@tea.texas.gov.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION/ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE Stage 2
CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION Stage 1
NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND Not Staged
SPECIAL EDUCATION Stage 1
Guidance for Interventions

Revised version is posted and includes the following addition:

Data Analysis and Developing Problem Statements

Districts assigned an intervention stage or intervention type must analyze data for each PBMAS indicator or FRE with a PL of 2, 3, or 4. It is important that districts identify specific campuses contributing to any areas of low performance or noncompliance and target those campuses for interventions, as appropriate. Districts will use multiple data sources to examine areas that may have an impact on the effectiveness of their programs. In the special education program, the data analysis for the special education representation indicator is a local decision. Review the Texas Accountability Intervention System: Data Analysis Guidance for suggestions of possible data sources for each indicator.
Submission Requirements

A link to the revised submission chart was also included in the TAA.

Changes are:

Oct 31 - DCSI name, contact info, and if new to role, qualifications

Dec 16 - Initial Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP), including corrective action plan, if applicable

Feb 10 – SpEd Compliance Review Summary, if applicable

Mar 31 - Mid-Yr TIP

June 26 - End-of-Yr TIP
ESC-20 PBMAS WORK DAYS

Tuesday, December 6, 2016     8:30-3:30     Connect 20 #: 42442

Thursday, December 15, 2016    12:30-3:30    Connect 20 #: 42445