

# 2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee

## Summary of Meeting on January 22, 2016

### Meeting Objective

The objective for the second meeting of the 2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) was to prepare final recommendations to the commissioner for the accountability rating system for 2016 and continue working on the implementation of HB 2804.

### Welcome and Introduction

Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff welcomed APAC members and explained the purpose of the meeting. Staff also presented brief overviews of the December Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) meeting and the initial meeting of the Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability.

### ATAC Recommendations for 2016 Rating Criteria and Targets

APAC members reviewed ATAC's December meeting summary and the 2016 Accountability Performance Index Review and Decision Points. Some members expressed reservations about the recommendation to include STAAR A in Index 3 and Index 4. Members discussed inclusion of STAAR A in a later year, after the students have been on a grade-level curriculum. TEA staff encouraged the committee to consider this recommendation in the full context of all recommendations.

TEA staff presented ATAC's recommendations for ratings criteria and index targets for non-AEA and AEA districts and campuses. The committee unanimously agreed with ATAC proposal to require meeting only three indices to earn a *Met Standard* or *Met Alternative Standard* rating: Index 1 or Index 2 and Index 3 and Index 4.

Turning their attention to the Index targets, APAC members noted that the non-AEA Index 1 target recommendation for 2016 is 55 compared to the 2015 target of 60. Though the intent was to offset the effect of including STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2, some believed that lower target would not be acceptable.

Following a unanimous vote to include STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 in Index 1, APAC members voted on the ATAC proposal to lower the target for Index 1 to 55 for 2016. There were 14 votes in favor of a target of 55 versus 4 votes in favor of a target of 60.

Because 2016 accountability will have new progress measures for STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and STAAR grades 3–8 mathematics, APAC unanimously agreed with the ATAC recommendation to set the performance target for Index 2 at about the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile by campus type.

Discussion shifted to Index 3 and the recommendation to include STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 and set the performance target at about the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile by campus type. Committee members stated that by excluding STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2, a better, more consistent

## 2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on January 22, 2016

measure of year-over-year performance would be possible because these assessments were excluded in 2015.

APAC members considered the ATAC proposal to include STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 in Index 3. There were 10 votes in favor of exclusion and eight votes in favor of inclusion.

Discussion continued on the topic of setting the performance target for Index 3 at about the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile by campus type. Setting a percentile offsets the unknown that results from the new phase-in passing standard and the inclusion of STAAR A, STAAR Alt 2, and STAAR grades 3–8 mathematics, but setting the performance target at the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile would cause approximately five percent of campuses and districts to be rated *Improvement Required*.

APAC members discussed whether to set the performance target for Index 3 at the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile. There were 11 members in favor and eight members who voted to keep the target the same as in 2015.

APAC members then voted on whether to include STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 in Index 4. The vote was 10 in favor of exclusion and 9 in favor of inclusion.

APAC members then voted on where to set the targets for Index 4. By a vote of 10 to 8, APAC members supported the ATAC recommendations, as shown in the table below.

### Index 4 Target Recommendations for Non-AEA Districts and Campuses

	Index 4	
	All Components	STAAR Component Only
Districts	60	12
Campuses		
Elementary	n/a	12
Middle	n/a	12
High School/K-12 and Elementary/Secondary	60	12

### Index 4 Target Recommendations for AEA Charter Districts and Campuses

	Index 4	
	Both Components	Graduation/Dropout Rate Only
AEA Charter Districts	33	45
AEA Campuses		

## 2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on January 22, 2016

APAC members voted on the inclusion of ELLs. Members unanimously agreed with the ATAC recommendations, as shown in the tables below.

Years in U.S. Schools	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3	Index 4
<b>ELLs With Parental Denials for Instructional Services or ELLs without an ELL Progress Measure due to Years in U.S. Schools Exceeding ELL Plan Year</b>				
<b>First year of enrollment in U.S. schools</b>	<i>Not Included</i>	<i>Not Included</i>	<i>Not Included</i>	<i>Not Included</i>
<b>Second year or more of enrollment in U.S. schools</b>	STAAR 2016 Level II Standard	Student Progress Measure	STAAR 2016 Level II Standard and Level III	STAAR Final Level II

\* Index 2 includes the appropriate student progress measure for which the ELL student was eligible, either the STAAR progress measure, ELL progress measure, or Spanish to English transition proxy calculation, where applicable

Years in U.S. Schools	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3	Index 4
<b>ELLs Taking STAAR Alternate 2</b>				
<b>First year of enrollment in U.S. schools</b>	STAAR 2016 Level II Standard	Student Progress Measure	STAAR 2016 Level II Standard and Level III**	<i>Not Included</i>
<b>Second year or more of enrollment in U.S. schools</b>				

\* Index 2 includes the appropriate student progress measure for which the ELL student was eligible, either the STAAR progress measure, ELL progress measure, or Spanish to English transition proxy calculation, where applicable.

\*\* ELL's taking STAAR Alt 2 will be included in Index 3 only if the final decision is to take ATAC's recommendation and include STAAR Alt 2 in Index 3

## 2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on January 22, 2016

APAC unanimously agreed with the ATAC recommendations for the graduation plan component of Index 4.

For the graduation plan component of Index 4, the accountability system will calculate two diploma plan rates and use the one that gives the district or campus the most points.

### Calculation that Excludes FHSP Students

$$(RHSP + DAP)$$

---

$$(MHSP + RHSP + DAP)$$

### Calculation that Includes FHSP Students

$$(RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP-E + FHSP-DLA)$$

---

$$(MHSP + RHSP + DAP) + (FHSP + FHSP-E + FHSP-DLA)$$

Notes:

FHSP: Foundation High School Program (FHSP) without endorsement

FHSP-E: FHSP with endorsement, and no distinguished level of achievement

FHSP-DLA: FHSP with endorsement and Distinguished Level of Achievement

## 2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on January 22, 2016

APAC unanimously agreed with the ATAC recommendations for the TSI portion of the postsecondary component of Index 4.

The TSI portion of the postsecondary component will include the results of the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) assessment and give credit for every student who

- meets the TSI requirement in reading on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT
- and**
- meets the TSI requirement in mathematics on the TSI assessment, SAT, or ACT.

A student needs to meet the TSI requirement for both reading **and** mathematics, but does not need to meet them all on the same assessment. Meeting the TSI requirement in writing on the TSI assessment or ACT will not be used for accountability in 2016 but will be reported.

With the inclusion of the TSI results, the postsecondary component of Index 4 evaluated in 2016 accountability using the 2014–15 graduates will be calculated as shown here:

graduates meeting TSI criteria in both reading/ELA and mathematics (TSI, SAT, or ACT)	<b>or</b>	graduates who completed and earned credit for at least two advanced/dual enrollment course in the current or prior school year	<b>or</b>	graduates who were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE courses as part of a four- year plan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits*
Number of annual graduates				

## **2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on January 22, 2016**

### **HB 2804 Accountability Domain Methodology and Determining A–F Ratings**

Staff reviewed the domains of indicators and their weights in determining the overall rating and also presented the timeline for implementation of the new accountability system. After reviewing modeling data provided by agency staff, APAC members discussed weighting the two components of Domain I: performance at the satisfactory standard and performance at the college-readiness standard. Eight members voted to weight the satisfactory standard 90% and the college-readiness standard 10%. Twelve members voted to weight the satisfactory standard 75% and the college-readiness standard 25%.

Discussion turned to assigning A–F ratings. TEA staff presented a matrix model discussed at the previous ATAC meeting. This model has cut scores that determine an initial letter grade and a resolved letter grade based on performance among a comparison group. APAC members agreed that this model is worthy of continued exploration.

TEA staff turned the discussion to Domain IV. APAC reviewed ATAC's responses to the list of possible indicators for this domain. Members recommended exploring indicators for high school credit before grade 9 as well as participation in language instruction, including computer languages. All members noted the challenge of making this domain work for elementary schools. The concern that some of these indicators will be harder on schools and districts of limited resources was also voiced. APAC members considered a few other indicators including attendance rate, class size averages, availability of tutorials, and class size waivers. There were no definitive recommendations for additional indicators for Domain IV. TEA staff agreed to provide a report showing the correlation of class size waivers and accountability ratings at a future meeting.

The last topic considered was the individual weights among Domains I, II and III. By law Domains I, II, and III must sum to 55 percent of the overall accountability rating. TEA staff prepared an example where Domain II is worth 25 percentage points and Domains I and III are worth 15 percentage points each. APAC reviewed the example. No decisions were made.

### **Next Steps**

By a vote of 11 to 9, the members set the next APAC meeting date for Tuesday, April 26, 2016. The next meeting will focus on the implementation of HB 2804.