

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on October 27, 2021

The objective of the October 27, 2021, Accountability Technical and Policy Advisory Committee meeting was to discuss the 2023 accountability rating system reset. TEA responses to questions and concerns are provided in *italics*. Some questions require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the meeting.

- Welcome, Meeting Norms, and Agenda
- Targets, Cut Points, and Scaling
- Reset Big Picture Goals
- Student Achievement Reset Ideas
 - Questions
 - We will use cut points from 2022, but we will not have reading/language arts (RLA) redesign until 2023, so will we have to readjust again? *We will have field test data that we can use, but yes, we can go back and reexamine cut points if we need to after looking at 2023 data.*
 - Will industry-based certifications be removed from the current approved list? *That would be up to College, Career, and Military Prep. We will use the list that they approve.*
 - Has there been any discussion about how to account for small numbers? *That is something we can look at. Is ten the number we would want to keep, or do we want to increase it to 15? When we discuss scaling and cut points, we can decide to make a change.*
 - For the programs of study inclusion, would it start with our current seniors (class of 2022) to be included in 2023 accountability? *That is what is on the table with CCMP right now. They will work to nail down programs of study and IBCs. Any changes would be implemented with the 2023 reset with Class of 2022.*
 - Will programs of study be included as 1 point or ½ point? *We have not received any other information other than what we shared with you all in a previous meeting. CCMP is working on that methodology. We will come back to this in the spring.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - 2022 College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) scores will be limited since we still don't have military enlistment and we will not have program of study inclusion. *Military had a small impact across the board. If you have a campus that relied heavily on the half point for career and technology education (CTE) coherent sequence, then they will need to be prepared for a lower score.*
- School Progress Reset Ideas
 - Questions
 - If I am at the lowest level for third grade Approaches and then the lowest level for fourth grade Approaches, how do I not get a full point for gains? *We can make decisions about the points students get based on growth. The chart included in the presentation is for illustrative purposes only.*
 - What constitutes the high versus low for each performance level? *There are no high- or low-cut points set yet. We can work to figure that out.*
 - When will we be able to look at the data? *Once we can model the data.*

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on October 27, 2021

- The low, medium, and high could be differentiated by one scaled score point. It really comes down to where they are sitting at in each level (low, medium, high). How do we account for a point that makes it go from one level to the other? *The loss of granularity is one of the cons of the model.*
- Do you see a scenario where you could break it down by looking at a student (particularly a special education or economically disadvantaged student) and making a big jump could earn bonus points? *Whatever we decide, we will have to use a hybrid model. We, as a state, have focused our goal on Meets. What I did like about student growth percentiles was rewarding students within a group that made significant gains.*
- How would this look for a student who is in grade 3, was not identified as special education, but during fourth grade became identified as a special education student? The same thing for a student with the economically disadvantaged student or English learners? *We would have to figure out what data points we would have to look at and at what point during the school year we would like to capture that data.*
- Can we get data on relative performance for synchronous vs. asynchronous students? *Yes, we can provide that data.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - I like the idea of making the methodology easy for educators to understand and learn.
 - The raw score conversion tables will need to reflect this if we go this way.
 - I really like the ease of understanding.
 - For going from 7th grade math to Algebra I, those students do not always get growth. While this is easy to understand initially, it is susceptible to a number of exceptions and caveats. Also, I do not believe we should have the same number of levels at the Masters level as we do for the non-passer level. *We will look at circumstances and consider all data from districts/campuses.*
- Closing the Gaps Reset Ideas
 - Questions
 - Is there a way that if they are meeting the interim and long-term targets they can get bonus points? *That is why we have a method with four points. We can set the system so that campuses that meet interim are not harmed, but campuses that meet the long-term can earn more points. This is just an example methodology.*
 - With our long-term goal in the year 2032-33, do you see moving the long-term goal further out? *We will likely model targets out in 5-year chunks based on 2022 data.*
 - Have you modeled 2021 data to see if we show an increase in any of the student groups from the 2017 data? *You can find this data in the state Closing the Gaps report. You can see some groups have grown while others have regressed from 2017. Every state is having to rethink ESSA targets and goals with their data, and this is the perfect time to do that.*
 - When would the chronic absenteeism targets be set? I would caution using 2021 to set targets. *We would need to run it, model it, analyze it,*

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on October 27, 2021

report it, and then incorporate it. I think we need to get away from COVID before this is adopted.

- What are some of the things we could look at that are more like survey data? *We have not received great feedback on that idea because of the potential of an unhappy parent leaving a negative comment/review.*
- Is there a way to track or acknowledge that graduates included in graduation rates and CCMR could have earned a diploma or CCMR indicator based on another campus/district's efforts or lack of effort? *We could revisit this when we rethink distinction designations.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - The best way to handle surveys is to triangulate them. If all the arrows are pointing in the same the direction, then it points to x, y, and z. I want to caution you that one piece of data does not tell you everything. You need multiple pieces of data.
 - I am using the fact that TEA financially incentivizes districts to participate in a certain TEA approved program (TCLAS) to improve outcomes. Considering this is a financial incentive based on someone's belief that TCLAS will improve outcomes, could the same belief system be applied to incentivizing districts who do things that are considered to be best practices? Instead of receiving money, a school/district receives a "point" or credit for doing the things considered to be best practices.
 - Other states have success indicators and weight it by 10%. Studies indicate student success has a direct correlation to extracurricular participation.
 - In previous years, substitute assessments were included at the Meets level. Now, that is not the case. They do not count towards anything. If they also do not take the designated EOC, then we are hit in participation in Closing the Gaps. *That is correct. There is a disconnect between the state graduation requirements and the federal assessment requirement that sees those students as opting out of the test. Districts that allow opt outs receive a penalty under federal participation requirements.*
- District Ratings
 - Questions
 - Is it possible for outcomes to go in both directions? I want to make sure that this methodology could get result in higher ratings as well as lower. *There are fewer positive shifts than negative.*
 - It wouldn't fix the whole thing, but would a simpler method be that a district's rating couldn't be higher than its highest rated campus? *We will look into this.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - We had some concerns about enrollment being the main drive for the rating. If there is a way for the district to not have a rating, but to have a summary report of the schools in that district, especially being able to show the growth of some campus ratings, that would be ideal. *ESSA does not require a rating. Texas Education Code does require a district rating, but we could work on summing campuses into districts in an*

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on October 27, 2021

updated way. District and campus indicators do not have to mirror each other. We can create separate district indicators to align with what is required under statute.

- We really put the emphasis on CCMR when we were developing the district rating methodology because postsecondary was the focus at the time. There is a focus on STAAR in the middle and elementary schools, so we are seeing them perform lower. *Some states have completely different rating system for districts, and some states have no district ratings.*
- An executive summary would make the most sense. The proportional weighting method would create some issues with parents and other constituents. If the general community wants to know how that district is doing, they should look at the students that have been there the longest.
- If the district had its own indicator set, we could look at finance, training of district personnel, etc.
- We were on the fence with the proportionality weighting because of how much it hurts districts. Why shouldn't high schools or districts that are working on getting more students CCMR get that credit? A small fix would be not allowing a district to be rated higher than its highest performing campus.
- We do not think proportional weighting will have a positive impact because of how many districts would drop in ratings. I like the idea of not having a district grade, but instead having a summary report and getting some sort of district rating from the campus summary data.
- Final Questions/Comments
 - I would like to see what it would look like if you just take which rating occurred the most and make that the district rating. This would work better for larger districts.
 - What is it we want our community to understand when we talk about a district? How do we help paint that story better?
 - If the campuses are already rated on their courses, the district is a big picture of what is going on in those schools. A high school focus is getting students ready for CCMR meanwhile an elementary focus is getting students ready for middle school. I do think it is more favorable to have a sort of district profile.
 - I think an unintended consequence is confusing the public if we have so many metrics. They will struggle to understand.