

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on October 19, 2022

The objective of the October 19th TAAG meeting is to continue providing the commissioner of education with recommendations related to the academic accountability system refresh. TEA will respond to questions/comments that require a response in *italics*. Some questions require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the meeting.

- Welcome
- Revisiting Lingered Topics: Alternative to College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) Adjustment discussed on October 7.
 - Questions
 - If a student meets CCMR criteria for reading in SAT but does college prep in math would that count towards the cap? *No*
 - If a student meets ACT, SAT or TSI criteria in any subject and they take the college prep class in the subject they didn't meet they still would not count as CCMR ready? *They are considered CCMR ready, but they would not count towards the cap. They would get a CCMR credit.*
 - The class of 2022 is already locked into their path in so what is the rationale for capping? *This is a suggested replacement to CCMR adjustment in the previous TAAG meeting. Feedback from TAAG suggested we need to be adjusting indicators and not the overall score. While CCMR allows for multiple indicators, we have heard feedback that it may be a problem if campuses are only preparing their students for career and not college, or only meeting CCMR through indicators that may not be as predictive of postsecondary success, such as sunseting IBCs.*
 - Can you give us an example CCMR cap scenario? *Yes. If you had 100 graduates and the cap is 20% then you cannot have more than 20% of graduates receive the credit from college prep in math and reading alone. If a student receives credit from college prep in math and reading and another indicator, they would not count in the cap. If the cap is 20% but you have 25% of your students meet CCMR through math and reading from college prep alone, then 5% would not count.*
 - When would the cap start? *It could start as early as the class of 2022.*
 - Is the point of this change to encourage districts to focus on college readiness as well as career readiness? *The point is to better align CCMR indicators with postsecondary success.*
 - How would CCMR capping for the IBC's impact the AEA campuses? *We are discussing excluding DRS.*
 - Would this eliminate the part about needing one (Class of 2023) aligned course for some of the sunseting IBC's? *We would have to run this by the CCMP Division as they oversee these programs.*
 - Are most of the districts that used only the College Prep classes for CCMR criteria small or rural districts? *We are conducting additional analysis that will answer this.*
 - What percentage of campuses that will be affected by the cap are economically disadvantaged and what size are they? *We are conducting additional analysis that will answer this.*
 - Comments/Concerns

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on October 19, 2022

- If the cap is implemented, it should start with the class of 2023. Districts are working a year ahead for CCMR and to change the rules after the graduates are gone feels like a penalty.
- This option is clearer than the CCMR adjustment.
- Not all college prep classes are equal. Let's have approved college prep courses which are predictive of persistence.
- We need to make sure that the accountability system focuses on indicators that correlate with higher persistence.
- We implemented Texas College Bridge because our college prep courses were not strong. This will negatively impact those who have rigorous courses.
- Regardless of cap percentage, any sunseting of IBCs needs to be based on the incoming freshman class. This really takes some planning on the part of campuses and districts because freshman come in with a plan of study for 4 years.
- This cap wouldn't really change the number of A's.
- If the core of the problem is the inconsistent rigor of college prep classes, then we should discuss how to fix that rather than capping.
- No cap is needed for IBCs. For college prep, it would be preferred to start with the class of 2024 since many of those decisions have been made for our current seniors.
- Revisiting Lingering Topics: Improving the School Progress Domain
 - Questions
 - Was the legislative intent to make the A–F system to be just like a letter grade? *HB 22 just wanted to inform the public not make the system just like student grades.*
 - Is this looking at 2022 or 2019 modeling? *The modeling looked at both years.*
 - Who did we receive feedback from that the ratings are misleading? *A multitude of stakeholders.*
 - Does the commissioner have a preference on either of these options? *He wants your feedback.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - Growth and performance should be equally rated.
 - The issue is in Relative Performance.
 - There is already a cap of 89. Adding a 2nd cap doesn't seem fair. Everyone deserves a chance of an A or B.
 - We celebrate progress. If we didn't celebrate progress, it would be hard for us to keep our teachers motivated about the work. This does not align with high poverty areas and is not fair.
 - The public sees that progress is important, but they also realize the goal is that the students be ready for a meaningful life.
 - One of the things I like about the "best of" allows a low performing group to grow first. Progress precedes performance.
 - Committee prefers no changes.

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on October 19, 2022

- D1 should have two parts. It should have Student Achievement and Relative Performance. D2 should just have 2a. This would fix the issues. *Can't do this per statute.*
- Fast growth districts are seeing changes that will impact performance. Economically disadvantaged numbers are going up at a high rate, Emergent Bilingual rates are growing fast, Special Ed/504 rates are skyrocketing. The push for years has been that students need to be growing and this is accomplished through teaching grade level TEKS, ensuring that high performing students are still growing; that low performing students are growing. If we re-focus on performance, then are we shifting back to focusing only on our passers and letting our low performers stay low for the sake of growing only the "bubble students" to get the performance number up. In the example the district's overall rating mirrors their growth rating. Is it the best scenario? Maybe not, but it is reflecting of what is happening as we recover from the pandemic.
- The ratings do allow for nuance through distinctions and badges. So, the rating may reflect other things than just the letter grade.
- Recognize Accelerated Instruction
 - Questions
 - In option 1: a student that was Did Not Meet to Accelerated would count twice in the numerator and twice in the denominator? *Yes.*
 - Could accelerated growth be a distinction for math/reading instead? *We could, but there is a strong desire to add into accountability.*
 - Did the definition of accelerated instruction change? *We are open to discussion on this definition.*
 - Would this replace the 'Closing the Gaps' domain as it currently exists? *Academic Growth changes will flow into Closing the Gaps*
 - Have you run simulations with different adjusted weights? *No*
 - Would this be all tests? Or would students that didn't test last year but were submitted with a score code of "S" be excluded? *They would need a test in the previous year and the current year to be included.*
 - Can you run a scenario with both and share it with us at the next meeting? *Yes*
 - Why are we putting this in two tables? *It is to call out the accelerated instruction and create two raw scores with meaningful interpretations.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - There is concern with funding options to help with accelerated instruction and if it will continue. I would be more amenable to this if we knew the long-term funding would remain.
 - What does acceleration mean? If a student is declining, they will not be passing in the future.
 - Option 2 is interesting. The 75% and 25% idea is interesting.
 - We need to see more modeling on this one.
 - I like the ability to be open to bonus points on this.
 - I am intrigued but would like to see some modeling.
- Closing the Gaps: Target Setting

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on October 19, 2022

- Questions
 - The targets for option 3 are higher than 2017? *Yes*
 - Could we set the targets for reading and math differently? *We try to keep the calculation simple and consistent.*
 - Because of the wide variation in the data, would it make more sense to use the Median? How would this change the conversation/target? *We need to do more modeling.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - This approach seems to work better with reading than math. The students are not recovering as fast in mathematics.
 - Love setting the targets by grade spans. Thank you
 - I think Option 3 makes the most sense of the two available
 - The poll concluded 100% in favor of option 3.
- Closing the Gaps: Super Groups
 - Questions
 - For a new campus who does not have prior year data, which groups would you use? *We would like feedback from you.*
 - Follow up: *The two lowest-performing racial/ethnic groups from the prior year will be determined by averaging the Academic Achievement RLA and mathematics indicators. For a new campus, the prior year two lowest-performing racial/ethnic groups at the state-level will be evaluated. If a campus only has one racial/ethnic group that meets minimum size, that group will be evaluated.*
 - Is the reason you are proposing super groups to have less calculations? *The reason is to have more students evaluated statewide. You currently need 25 tests (or graduates) to be evaluated. This would narrow focus on equity in all our campuses, making sure underserved students are evaluated.*
 - Will the super group be reported out individually? *Yes, you will still be able to view the 14 groups and their data individually.*
 - Why is continuously enrolled separated out? *Its statewide performance is too different than the other groups to combine them.*
 - Will the High Focus group mask low performance? *No, will continue to report out all 14 groups and their data individually.*
 - Was there any discussion about lowering our n-size amounts from 25? *Yes, we will be shrinking them to 10.*
 - Is there a scenario where a campus could be ATS/TSI based on Student Group A, but they are not scored on that group in 2023 because it wasn't one of the two lowest performing groups? *Yes, it could.*
 - Is n-size of 10 the norm for other states? *Yes, only a handful of states, including us, have one larger than 10.*
 - Will the Targeted and Additional Targeted use all groups? *Yes, they will use all the groups individually.*
 - Could we set targets for campuses with 70% economically disadvantaged students? *No, the Federal Government wants us to have the same bar for*

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on October 19, 2022

- and will not allow an additional target setting process based on campus poverty.*
- If a student is in multiple groups should that student carry more weight since they are in a more challenging situation? *We want the High Focus group to highlight those students who need the most intensive intervention.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - The High Focus helps. We still have an issue with All Students group targets. It will help to set targets by campus type.
 - I think it will be helpful to have 2 different slides for communication in the framework for 10/31 - one for state accountability and one for federal school improvement.
 - The communication piece for what's used in calculations vs used for interventions may take a little clarification if it rolls out this way.
 - Closing the Gaps: Graduated Points
 - Questions
 - How will this impact schools who "met" each year but maybe will not have a score of 4? *The campus will still do well. Scaling takes into account statewide performance.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - For schools who are bringing up the rear, to break out the scale is very helpful.
 - Scaling Lesson
 - Questions
 - Why does the Commission think that 78 is average? *It was based on feedback he gathered.*
 - Does the scale follow a normal distribution? *Somewhat, A is often defined based on statewide goals. The rest of the scale is initially set using a baseline from previous years' data to follow a normal distribution. The years the scale is applied do not apply a distribution.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - A "targeted distribution" sounds like a forced distribution....very difficult to get it across that it is not. *The original cut points are set using a distribution of modeled data. The five years the cut points are applied do not force or create a distribution.*
 - Is scaling appropriate for economically disadvantaged campuses? Is it fair?
 - *Texas has high rates of economic disadvantaged campuses (37% of campuses are \geq 80% EcoDis and 72% of campuses are \geq 50% EcoDis.)These data are incorporated into the scaling.*
 - Upcoming Meetings
 - Questions
 - Can we have time to review the revised framework at meeting 3? Yes