

## 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

The objective for the first meeting of the 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) was to review the preliminary 2017 accountability results, discuss topics related to 2018 accountability, and consider options for the implementation of the A–F system established by House Bill (HB) 22. TEA responses to questions and concerns are given during the meeting are provided in red. Some questions will require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting

- TEA presented new department leadership and organizational structures.
- TEA presented the 2017 accountability ratings and results.
  - ◆ Concerns
    - The priority and focus schools lists were released unexpectedly.
    - There is dissonance between that list and accountability results, such as a case in which a focus school earns distinctions.
- TEA updated the committee on the 2017 accountability ratings appeals process.
  - ◆ Questions
    - Do the Harvey-affected campuses need to be within the disaster counties or just the districts within those counties to qualify for an extended appeals deadline? [Any district with a campus in the affected counties or campus in the affected counties will have until the October 2nd deadline to submit its appeal.]
    - Will campuses and districts be able to appeal ratings other than F under the new system? [No decision has been made.]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - The appeals process presents many learning opportunities for districts, but the results of the appeals and lessons learned are not shared widely. [TEA staff agreed to research the possibility of releasing summaries of appeals by campus type.]
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability School Progress, Part A (Student Growth) domain. The Student Growth portion of this domain measures the percentage of students who met the standard for improvement.
  - ◆ Concerns
    - As proposed, this domain does not appropriately measure success for students who skip a grade.
    - Measuring growth in high school is a challenge with limited tests and many students taking Algebra I in middle school.
    - The Planned Growth Model Matrix challenges campuses with lower-achieving students by not awarding them one point for maintaining performance at the Approaches Grade Level standard.

## 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

- ◆ Suggestions
  - Retester data could be used to show progress.
  - Performance of prior-year non-proficient students could also be used.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability School Progress, Part B (Relative Performance) domain. The Relative Performance portion of this domain measures overall student performance compared to similar districts and campuses.
  - ◆ Questions
    - Is it possible to use comparison groups here? [It's possible, but would we use 40 similar campuses, or should the number be larger? The larger the comparison group, the less similar the campuses will be.]
    - Will economically disadvantaged be determined using only testing grades or the entire student body? [TEA staff will model Part B using the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 1–12.]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - Schools of choice could be outliers on the regression chart if they serve high-achieving, economically disadvantaged students.
    - This chart is not measuring progress. It is showing performance goals set against bands set over five years.
  - ◆ Suggestions
    - Regression line should have a floor and a ceiling: schools with 0% to 10% economically disadvantaged should have the same cut score. Schools with 90% to 100% economically disadvantaged should have the same cut score. For schools with 11% to 89% economically disadvantaged would have separate cut scores based on percentage of economically disadvantaged.
- TEA presented requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The ESSA state plan opened for public comment on July 31, 2017.
  - ◆ Questions
    - After the first year of A–F, how will Title I schools be identified if Fs are assigned to less than 5 percent of campuses? [The current plan is to add the lowest-performing D campuses.]
    - Is it conceivable that a Title I school could have stronger performance in the Closing the Gaps domain but be brought down by the Student Achievement and School Progress domains? [Yes]

## 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

- Mike Morath, Commissioner of Education, addressed the committee with a focus on local accountability systems.
  - ◆ Questions
    - How will campuses with local accountability plans coordinate with TEA to produce ratings in a timely manner? [This has yet to be determined.]
    - Will campuses be tied to their local accountability system? [No decision has been made yet. This is still under discussion.]
    - Will it be possible for the local accountability system to lower a grade? [It's conceivable. Whether it could actually happen, though, depends on when in an accountability year a district must commit to its local accountability plan.]
    - Will elementary schools be eligible for rating under AEA? [Not at this time]
  - ◆ Concern
    - TEA needs to set timelines for implementation of local accountability plans for the first and second years of A–F.
- Local Accountability Plans subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
  - ◆ Concerns
    - The clarity and rigor of these plans are continuing concerns.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Closing the Gaps domain. This domain measures achievement differentials among students, including differentials among students from different racial and ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds and other factors including students formerly receiving special education services, continuously enrolled students, and students who are mobile.
- Closing the Gaps domain subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
  - ◆ Concerns
    - There is a challenge with former special education student populations meeting minimum size requirements.
  - ◆ Suggestions
    - This indicator should not be structured to incentivize removing students from special education services.
    - This indicator should be report only.

## 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Student Achievement domain. This domain measures student achievement across all grades and subjects at the Approaches Grade Level, Meets Grade Level, and Masters Grade Level standards on STAAR. For high schools and districts, it also includes indicators of college, career, and military readiness.
  - ◆ Questions
    - What will the military enlistment documentation look like? [This is not something TEA will create. Districts should use their own discretion when it comes to this documentation but should at a minimum keep the enlistment or intent to enlist with the student's record.]
    - Who is sharing information about OnRamps? [OnRamps outreach programs and word of mouth]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - The TSI postsecondary ready indicator as proposed only counts if the student meets the target in both reading and mathematics. It would be better if it were reading OR mathematics.
    - Graduation plan rate is no longer in accountability
    - Modelling with 60 as the cut point for an A shows that very few campuses will earn an A.
    - The removal of CTE Coherent is a big concern especially since, at present, there is not equivalent indicator.
- Student Achievement domain subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
  - ◆ Questions
    - What is the solution for identifying masters level performance for substitute assessments? [TEA is working to address this concern. Cut points identifying masters level performance for each substitute assessment will need to be established as well as a method for reporting performance levels for substitute assessments.]
    - In the absence of CTE credit, how can special education students achieve postsecondary readiness?
    - Why use the most recent SAT/ACT score instead of the highest? [We only receive the most recent record from the College Board and ACT.]
    - Why is passing a dual credit course by itself not sufficient to achieve postsecondary readiness? They need 9 hours of credit to count. [Why not nine hours of any AP course or three hours of core (English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies) AP courses.]

## 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

- ◆ Concerns
  - CCMR is the least reliable indicator of the three for high schools regarding what it purports to measure.
  - Regarding the distribution of grades curve, schools of choice will fill up the top levels pushing more campuses to lower grades.
- ◆ Suggestions
  - There should be better coordination with Performance-Based Monitoring in coding students properly for substitute assessments.
  - The committee unanimously prefers equal weights for the three components of the Student Achievement domain: STAAR, CCMR, and graduation rate.
- Distinctions/Badges subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
  - ◆ Concern
    - Take care not to water down distinctions.
- The committee briefly discussed calculating the overall ratings in 2018.

The next ATAC meeting will take place in November. TEA staff agreed to have someone from School Improvement and Support available at the November meeting.