2023 Accountability Advisory Committees
Summary of Meeting on October 28, 2021

The objective of the October 28, 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
  - Questions
    - Do you know if Cambium is using machine scoring for STAAR writing portions? Some parents are asking. *As of now, no. Keep in mind that not only is reading/language arts (RLA) significantly changing, but there will also be different types of questions in other subjects that will require human scoring.*

- Reset Big Picture Goals
  - Questions
    - All of our paired campuses are prekindergarten only campuses. They feed to 10+ elementary schools. How will that work if not paired with the district? It can fluctuate year to year because the zones students feed into changes each year. *The district pairing option will likely remain. We are just trying to consider ways to take the burden off districts.*
  - Comments/Concerns
    - Perhaps the problem for aligning state and federal is a flawed Closing the Gaps design.

- Student Achievement Reset Ideas
  - Questions
    - For the reset scaling and cut scores, are we using the 2019 STAAR data or the 2021 STAAR data? *We will use 2022 data to inform scaling, targets, and cut points.*
    - In light of the residual impact of the pandemic, has any thought been given to a phase in model for scaling and/or cut points? *That has not been discussed. That does not mean it cannot be proposed.*
  - Comments/Concerns
    - The major reset needs to be how we define Grade Level proficiency. For state purposes, it is Approaches for graduation purposes and for the feds it is Meets. This makes Closing the Gaps an outlier. It may help to return to clearer and more accurate STAAR performance labels.
    - The last thing school personnel and communities need is a sense that their efforts are not being recognized. People are busting their tails but making up learning loss is going to take time.
    - We are doing all we can with House Bill 4545 tutoring and other interventions, but we are experiencing staff shortages and teachers leaving the profession in droves. In other words, there are other qualitative factors that need to be taken into consideration.

- ▪ The goal posts need to be changed, as the field changed from COVID. *We will be moving the goal post based on 2022 data. We will also revisit the data every year after 2022. It is important we base decisions on actual data not trying to set phase-in targets based on just one year.*
- School Progress Reset Ideas
  - ○ Questions
    - ▪ What about growth for Spanish to English Reading? Campuses should get credit for helping with Spanish to English progress. There are two layers of learning for these learners. We must be careful to not do harm. *That would work with this model. As well as Grade 8 to English I. Texas will have to add intricate situations such as Spanish to English Reading to growth model matrixes.*
    - ▪ Is there any potential to take the concept of whether a student is performing at grade level and include more broad measures beyond the STAAR (like student grades, performance on local tests, etc.) *Schools can use Local Accountability, which allows for other measures. The state accountability system cannot take local measures into account.*
    - ▪ Have we thought anything at all about having something different for growth for high school? *I think that is a larger question we need to ask ourselves. Most states do not measure growth for high school; we threw this idea out a few years ago and the consensus was to keep the growth for high school. As a reminder, very few campuses used growth as their highest domain in 2019 and those who did were elementary and middle schools.*
    - ▪ I recall ATAC & APAC recommended a higher weight placed on graduation rates. Is TEA and/or the commissioner open to revising the weighting? *Currently, no. That is not under discussion.*
  - ○ Comments/Concerns
    - ▪ Grade bands at Meets and Masters are rather narrow. *We may decide to slice Did Not Meet into three sections and leave Masters as one section.*
    - ▪ Measuring language and academic progress are two different things, however, there is progress for both skills. It's just too bad that the work being completed can't be reflected here in some way.
    - ▪ Many low-income schools don't have funding for as many languages as others. So, I am not sure how to incorporate that without punishing low-income schools. The work that schools are doing with English as a Second Language should be recognized. Maybe we can go back to the bonus points for additional languages.
    - ▪ In a transition, prior year test format is different and needs to be considered when determining growth.
    - ▪ One problem we have found with Academic Growth is that it scales in a negative direction. This may be why you see better outcomes for Relative Performance. For example, if they get a 60 as their raw score, it scales to a 58 which makes them an *F. We will consider and discuss this issue.*
- Closing the Gaps Reset Ideas
  - ○ Questions

- How do some schools go down with this new model? *The previous method only looked at interim targets. This new system will also award points for hitting long-term targets. So, some campuses only met the interim targets and did not meet long term targets, which in this model made them go down. We will reset scaling and targets.*
- Where would the baseline data come from? F*rom 2022 outcomes.*
- Will state average be the baseline or individual campus data? *At this point, we will use the state average.*
- If the baseline is the 2022 state average and you are setting a separate interim target, wouldn't the target be higher than the baseline? *The first set of interim targets would be the baseline.*
- What would be the purpose of removing the all students group from the score? Smaller campuses don't usually have very many targets that they are eligible for based on minimum size criteria. *We've heard concerns about students counting in multiple subgroups and the all students group. There have also been concerns from homogeneous campuses. Removing the all students group from the scored indicators would remedy the issue. We would absolutely have to adjust minimum size for the individual student groups.*
- A climate survey has been mentioned in several prior meetings. Is that still under consideration? *It remains a suggestion. We have received both highly positive and highly negative responses on that suggestion.*

o Comments/Concerns
- The 0-4 methodology is fine if the new 4 is the same as the old Y (met interim).
- The 0-4 methodology would allow us to help identify the campuses that truly need interventions.
- The 0-4 methodology would lower outcomes for mid-performing campuses and districts.
- I think the 0-4 methodology might be a better way to see who is closing achievement gaps. This gives a little credit to those almost at the goal, but not quite there yet.
- A shift to the 0-4 methodology will require a good communication plan.
- I think the data on a climate survey could be manipulated if folks know the significance of it in accountability.
- A 2016 survey conducted by TEA found that 29,000 respondents' top choice for school quality was measuring engagement, school climate, and safety.
- We would be strongly supportive of a well-crafted climate survey. The learning environment is critical to success, and it seems that it should be measured particularly when we're looking for indicators at the elementary level.
- When we do climate surveys that involve feedback from parents, the participation rate is skewed by economic level.
- The challenge is we need to measure outputs, not inputs.

- My fear is that by having lower targets for subgroups we may institutionalize lower standards that some groups still cannot achieve. *Another suggestion is to set targets by campus type. We are setting unique targets for Dropout Recovery Schools.*
- I would like to see one target for all student groups. Schools will react to groups who do not meet their target. I do like the different targets for different campus types.
- I share the concern that we have an exhausted and demoralized staff in far too many schools. We are getting an outrageous number of calls from teachers who want to resign.

- District Ratings
  - Questions
    - What is the real goal that K–12 is supposed to focus on? Is it assessment performance or is it graduating students? My only concern is that the focus will shift to just STAAR instead of graduating students. *I would say it is both.*
    - What did the groups from yesterday suggest about district ratings? *The main topic yesterday with this was asking if we are required to rate districts and if we are, then can we set up different indicators for the district. A snapshot/overview of the district was favored yesterday. They suggested providing more district data so that stakeholders can see an overview of what is happening at the campuses in that district.*
    - Do you anticipate this accountability reset is going to require legislative changes? Are you gearing up to recommend statutory changes? *Off the top of my head, I cannot think of any changes in statute that need to be reviewed except for statute regarding military enlistment.*
  - Comments/Concerns:
    - I agree, there is a danger of even furthering the focus on STAAR. If you change this, it will be even more important to diversify the accountability system for elementaries.
    - I agree with weighting changes, but do not make college, career, and military readiness (CCMR) harder to achieve. Equity of measure for elementary and middle schools is important.
    - Adjustments may not be needed if the disconnect is an issue for a few districts across the state. We only see three examples. *This is the case for approximately 30 percent of the districts.*
    - This would be a great opportunity (before the reset) to seek input from the community about what they want out of public education.
    - Every district (for the most part) has more elementaries. The question is why do elementaries underperform? Rating elementaries the same as middle schools is not right. Another issue is the STAAR standard for elementary is higher compared to middle or high schools.
    - If you are going to grade the "system" then make the rubric more focused on the end state.
    - I think we agreed proportional weighting is fair, but elementaries are not rated fairly. Scaling for elementaries is different as well, so if we can

adjust that, that would be fairer. Our focus needs to be on the end game, meaning what are students leaving with at the high school level.

- We agreed about the end game. What is the goal of the district and does the outcome rating reflect that?
- Maybe the solution is simple. If we change the rating system for elementaries, then that will fix district ratings.