

## January Updates to Preliminary 2023 A–F Refresh Framework

The Preliminary 2023 A–F System Framework has continued to develop based on stakeholder feedback since the updated version was released in November 2022.

The updates detailed in this document are based on stakeholder feedback and extensive data modeling. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) will continue to provide feedback opportunities to capture any additional refinements before issuing a proposed rule. Please submit additional feedback using [this form](#) before February 1, 2023. The proposed *2023 Accountability Manual* will be available in spring 2023, and additional feedback will be gathered during the public comment period for the proposed manual.

The A–F cut points and scaling resources and ESSA amendment released in January are based on the [framework released in November](#) and the updates detailed below.

### Update: Scaling, Cut Points, and Student Group Targets

For STAAR-related components, TEA received feedback to use both pre- and post-COVID data. Modeling shows that using pre- and post-COVID data would still raise cut points from those set in 2017. Based on data analyses, the impact of COVID-19, and the upcoming STAAR redesign, TEA proposes no change in cut points for STAAR proficiency from those set in 2017. This same approach would apply to setting STAAR-related student group targets in Closing the Gaps.

In order to maintain STAAR-related cut points in School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance, high schools/K-12s will have two look-up tables: an updated table for CCMR and a STAAR table based on 2017 data. The scaled scores for the two tables would be averaged to calculate a high school/K–12 Relative Performance score. This proposal would maintain the existing even weight of CCMR and STAAR in Relative Performance.

### Update: School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth Calculation

The following proposed calculation was published in the November framework and discussed with the Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG). TEA received feedback from TAAG and other stakeholders to explore how this calculation may impact differing types of campuses. TEA also received feedback that students at Did Not Meet Grade Level in the previous year should not be “double-counted” in the denominator.

	Calculate Separate Raw Scores	Calculate Combined Raw Score	
<b>Annual Growth</b>	Sum of RLA & Mathematics Points Earned Sum of Maximum RLA & Mathematics Points	Sum of Points Earned (Annual + Accelerated)	Convert to Scaled Score
<b>Accelerated Learning</b>	Sum of RLA & Mathematics Points Earned Sum of Maximum RLA & Mathematics Points	Sum of Maximum Points (Annual + Accelerated)	

Based on this feedback, continued modeling, and data analysis, TEA adjusted the proposed calculation to shift Accelerated Learning to a **bonus points methodology** as detailed below.

# January Updates to Preliminary 2023 A-F Refresh Framework

Updated proposal:

Continue to report separate raw scores for Annual Growth and Accelerated Learning to facilitate meaningful interpretation.

<b>Annual Growth</b> <small>(roughly % students that grew a year)</small>	Sum of RLA & Math Points Earned for Annual Growth <hr/> Sum of Maximum RLA & Math Points for Annual Growth
<b>Accelerated Learning</b> <small>(roughly % students that accelerated from DNM to approaches)</small>	Sum of RLA & Math Points Earned for Accelerated Learning <hr/> Sum of Maximum RLA & Math Points for Accelerated learning

To calculate the Academic Growth score, each successfully accelerated test would count as 0.25 “bonus points” in the numerator of the annual growth calculation. The 0.25 bonus point value was determined based on modeling, historical data on learning acceleration, and the commitment to set cut scores to ensure that even if a campus has no students with prior year Did Not Meet Grade Level tests, it can still achieve an A. Campuses would be able to earn a maximum score of 100. Please see page 4 for an example calculation.

$$\frac{\text{Sum of RLA \& Mathematics Points Earned for Annual Growth} + (\text{Sum of RLA \& Mathematics Points Earned for Accelerated Instruction}) \times 0.25}{\text{Sum of Maximum RLA \& Mathematics Points for Annual Growth}}$$

## Update: Industry-Based Certifications (IBC) and Programs of Study Requirements

TEA explored several ways to phase-in requirements to align IBCs and Programs of Study and phase-out sunseting IBCs. Feedback centered around the balance between rigor (ensuring that Texas is a leader in postsecondary success) and fairness (ensuring districts have time to adjust to changes in the system).

Based on feedback and additional data analyses, TEA proposes two updates.

1. **Problem:** TEA conducted additional analyses on high-usage sunseting IBCs and found that a small number of campuses are reporting a disproportionate number of students attaining a sunseting IBC, which may be indicative of students not being provided with varied opportunities to demonstrate College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR). Many of these campuses have large percentages of students meeting CCMR only from a sunseting IBC. For example, there are more than 15 campuses where at least 50 percent of their graduates met CCMR solely through the Google Analytics Individual Qualification. These high CCMR scores rely heavily on sunseting IBCs, which do not meet current statutory rigor requirements for postsecondary success. These high scores also pose a fairness issue as they drive higher CCMR cut scores for all campuses in our modeling. While TEA wants to give campuses time to adjust to

## January Updates to Preliminary 2023 A-F Refresh Framework

the updated IBC list, there exists a need to disincentivize practices misaligned to student interest and that unfairly drive up CCMR cut scores for all campuses.

**Proposed Solution:** For cut point modeling, and beginning with 2023 ratings, limit the percentage of graduates who only meet CCMR criteria via a sunsetting IBC to five graduates, or 20 percent, of graduates, whichever is higher. This limit would be applied within Student Achievement and School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance and would not be applied within Closing the Gaps.

**Example:** Texas High School has 200 graduates. 50 graduates earned ONLY a sunsetting IBC as their CCMR credit. With the limit, Texas High School would receive credit for 40 of these graduates (20 percent), and ten of these graduates would not generate CCMR credit.

2. **Problem:** TEA received feedback about the time it may take districts and campuses to implement aligned Programs of Study.

**Proposed Solution:** TEA proposes pushing back the transition an additional year, so that the requirement to earn an IBC plus an aligned Level 2+ course would apply for the Class of 2024, the concentrator requirement would apply for the Class of 2025, and the completer requirement would apply for the Class of 2026. Based on data analysis and statutory requirements, the transition plan maintains the completer requirement when fully implemented. Analysis shows the concentrator requirement has a minimal impact on wages compared to the completer requirement, which has a positive impact on wages. In addition, completer status is currently required in statute.

# January Updates to Preliminary 2023 A-F Refresh Framework

## Example School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth Calculation

Annual Growth Points Methodology						
Prior Year	Current Year					
	Low Did Not Meet Grade Level	High Did Not Meet Grade Level	Low Approaches Grade Level	High Approaches Grade Level	Meets Grade Level	Masters Grade Level
Low Did Not Meet Grade Level	0	1	1	1	1	1
High Did Not Meet Grade Level	0	1/2	1	1	1	1
Low Approaches Grade Level	0	0	1/2	1	1	1
High Approaches Grade Level	0	0	0	1/2	1	1
Meets Grade Level	0	0	0	0	1	1
Masters Grade Level	0	0	0	0	0	1

Annual Growth (Example)							
Prior Year	Current Year						Total
	Low Did Not Meet Grade Level	High Did Not Meet Grade Level	Low Approaches Grade Level	High Approaches Grade Level	Meets Grade Level	Masters Grade Level	
Low Did Not Meet Grade Level	20	40	10	10	8	2	90
High Did Not Meet Grade Level	5	30	20	10	10	5	80
Low Approaches Grade Level	0	10	20	40	20	10	100
High Approaches Grade Level	2	6	10	30	40	25	113
Meets Grade Level	0	2	2	1	50	45	100
Masters Grade Level	0	0	8	1	12	50	71
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>554</b>

Annual Growth Points		
	Assessments	Points
No Points	79	0.0
One-Half Point	80	40.0
One Point	395	395.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>435.0</b>

Percentage of students who grew at least a year		
Annual Growth %	435.0	79%
	554	

# January Updates to Preliminary 2023 A-F Refresh Framework

Accelerated Learning Points Methodology				
Prior Year	Current Year			
	Did Not Meet Grade Level	Approaches Grade Level	Meets Grade Level	Masters Grade Level
Did Not Meet Grade Level	0	1	1	1

Accelerated Learning (Example)					
Prior Year	Current Year				Total
	Did Not Meet Grade Level	Approaches Grade Level	Meets Grade Level	Masters Grade Level	
Did Not Meet Grade Level	95	50	18	7	170

Accelerated Learning Points		
	Assessments	Points
No Points	95	0.0
One Point	75	75.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>75.0</b>

Percentage of successfully accelerated students		
Accelerated Learning %	75.0	<b>44%</b>
	170	

School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth Sample Calculation			
Annual Growth Points Earned			435.0
Accelerated Learning Bonus Points Earned	75	X 0.25	18.75
Sum Annual Growth Points plus Accelerated Learning Bonus Points			453.75
÷ Total Assessments from Annual Growth			554
School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth Raw Score			<b>82</b>