

Chapter 9 – Responsibilities and Consequences

State Responsibilities

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is responsible for the state accountability system and other statutory requirements related to its implementation. As described in chapters 8 and 9, TEA applies a variety of system safeguards to ensure the integrity of the system. TEA is also charged with taking actions to intervene when conditions warrant.

District Accreditation Status

State statute requires the commissioner of education to determine an accreditation status for districts and charters. Accreditation statuses were first assigned to districts under this statute in 2007. To determine accreditation status and sanctions, TEA takes into account the district's state and financial accountability ratings. There are other factors that may be considered in the determination of accreditation status. These include, but are not limited to, the integrity of assessment or financial data used to measure performance, the reporting of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data, and serious or persistent deficiencies in programs monitored in the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS). Accreditation status can also be lowered as a result of data integrity issues or special accreditation investigations. The four possible accreditation statuses are: *Accredited*, *Accredited-Warned*, *Accredited-Probation*, and *Not Accredited-Revoked*.

Rules that define the procedures for determining a district's accreditation status, as we07. To determine acc

at <http://tea.texas.gov/pmi/> and on the TEA Accreditation Status website at <http://tea.texas.gov/accredstatus/>.

Campus Identification Numbers

In a given year, districts may need to change, delete, or add one or more campus

Examples of locally-defined indicators include but are not limited to

- € level of parent participation,
- € progress on locally-administered assessments,
- € progress on goals identified by campus improvement plans,
- € progress compared to other campuses in the district,
- € progress on professional development goals, and
- € school safety measures.

As a different approach, districts may choose to expand the state-designated accountability ratings. For example, they may wish to further differentiate among campuses rated *Met Standard*.

A third approach might be to examine the accountability indicators that comprise the performance indices, both currently in use and planned for implementation, that fall short of local expectations. Additional performance measures could be constructed to track efforts to improve performance in those areas.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, local accountability systems should be designed to serve the needs of the local community and to improve performance for all students.

This page is intentionally blank.