

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

Meeting Objective

The objective for the second meeting of the 2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) was to finalize recommendations for 2016 accountability and continue discussing topics related to the implementation of HB 2804.

Welcome

TEA staff reviewed the agenda and the purpose of the meeting. Staff also explained the purpose of the Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability and reviewed the updated 2016 accountability development calendar.

2016 Accountability—Options for Setting 2016 Index Targets

ATAC members reviewed the decision points for the 2016 performance indices. Staff explained that mathematics, grades 3–8, would be included in accountability in 2016.

ATAC members reviewed tables showing the gradual increase in the STAAR performance standards from 2016 to 2022. They also reviewed the index performance targets and corresponding percentiles over the past three years. Staff provided models of what district and campus results would have been in 2015 (using most recent data not available at the September meeting) if mathematics, grades 3–8, STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 (STAAR Alt 2) had been included. The models showed index scores for districts and campuses broken down according to geographic and demographic information.

ATAC members began with discussing how to integrate STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 into accountability in 2016. Some members expressed concern about including these two assessments in Index 3. Some members said that the assessments should be included eventually, but that this year is too soon. Others asked if it were possible to develop a progress measure specifically for these assessments. Staff said that it might be possible in the future, but it could not happen this year.

Members then turned their attention to the inclusion of ELLs in accountability. For ELLs with parental denials and those who have graduated from an ELL progress measure plan, the members decided to stay with their September recommendation, as shown on the next page.

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

Years in U.S. Schools	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3	Index 4
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				
First year of enrollment in U.S. schools	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included
Second year or more of enrollment in U.S. schools	STAAR Phase-in I Level II	Student Progress Measure	STAAR Phase-in I Level II 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

For ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2, the members decided to stay with their September recommendation. ELLs taking STAAR Alternate 2 will be included in accountability, regardless of their number of years in U.S. schools. For ELLs who take STAAR L and do not have a progress measure, the members decided to continue to exclude these students' assessment results from accountability.

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

For the graduation plan component of Index 4, the members initially decided to continue excluding FHSP students and to integrate them beginning with the class of 2016 for 2017 accountability. However, after input from members regarding the varying degrees to which FHSP graduation plans have been implemented across districts, the members decided to recommend performing both calculations shown here and using the one that gives a 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

For the TSI portion of the postsecondary component of Index 4, the consensus among the members was to use only mathematics and reading results for accountability and to only report writing results.

For distinction designations, TEA staff expressed concern about the ATAC's recommendation from their September meeting to remove attendance rate as an indicator in subject-area distinction designations. TEA staff noted that HB 2804 required that attendance rates be evaluated in Domain IV for elementary and middle schools beginning in 2017-18. The committee agreed to leave the attendance rate indicator in the subject-area distinction designations in 2016 and 2017 and plan to remove it in 2018, when attendance rates will become part of Domain IV in the new accountability system.

2016 Accountability—Final Recommendations for 2016 Index Targets

TEA staff presented and explained frequency distributions of scores for each of the four indices. ATAC members reviewed target tables for each index and discussed their final recommendations for the 2016 targets. Their consensus recommendation was to allow districts and campuses to earn a Met Standard or Met Alternative Standard rating in 2016 by meeting Index 1 or Index 2 and Index 3 and Index 4.

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

The committee members noted that this recommendation is more in line with their original intent when the index framework was developed. Given the progress measures will be reported for the first time on the STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 assessments in 2016, it is difficult to anticipate how these new progress measures will affect the Index 2 outcomes. This recommendation also addresses the concern with the limited availability of progress measures on the EOC assessments for high schools and K–12 campuses and districts.

Index 1 – For 2016, set target at 55, in recognition of the increase in the STAAR satisfactory standard and the inclusion of STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2. This target may be set back to 60 in 2017. The vote was 21 members in favor with 3 voting to maintain the target at 60 in 2016. The recommended target for AEAs is 30.

Index 2 – By unanimous vote, members decided to set targets at the 5th percentile by campus type based on 2016 performance. Members mentioned that a change in grade 4 and 7 writing assessments in 2016 could lead to lack of STAAR progress measures for grade 7 writing. They also recommended that the ELL progress measure for grades 4 and 7 writing not be included in the Index 2 results if there are no corresponding STAAR progress measure available for grades 4 and 7 writing. Following the meeting, TEA staff confirmed that the STAAR progress measure will not be reported for grade 7 writing in 2016.

Index 3 – By a vote of 15 to 10, members decided to include STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 in Index 3. With 20 members in favor, the committee decided to set the target at the 5th percentile by campus type based on 2016 performance.

Index 4 – By a vote of 16 to 6, the committee decided to include STAAR A in Index 4. The committee also voted to increase the target for districts and high school/K–12 campuses rated on all four components. This vote passed with 11 members in favor, 9 voting to slightly lower the target due to the inclusion of STAAR A, and 2 voting to make no change from 2015 accountability. The committee initially voted to increase the target to 65 for all four components, but ultimately recommended a target of 60. The committee also agreed to set one target for all campuses and districts that have only the STAAR component for Index 4. By a vote of 17 to 6, the committee recommended a target of 12.

ATAC's recommended index targets for 2016 accountability are shown in the tables on the following page.

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

2016: Non-AEA Districts and Campuses

	Index Target				
	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3*	Index 4	
			All Components	STAAR Component Only	
Districts	55	5 th percentile	5 th percentile	60	12
Campuses					
Elementary	55	5 th percentile	5 th percentile	n/a	12
Middle		5 th percentile	5 th percentile	n/a	12
High School, K–12, and Elementary/ Secondary		5 th percentile	5 th percentile	60	12

* Index 2 and Index 3 targets for non-AEA campuses will be set at about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance by campus type. Targets for non-AEA districts corresponded to about the fifth percentile of non-AEA 2016 campus performance across all campus types.

2016: AEA Charter Districts and Campuses

	Index Target				
	Index 1	Index 2*	Index 3*	Index 4	
			Both Components	Graduation/ Dropout Rate Component Only	
AEA Charter Districts	30	5 th percentile	5 th percentile	33	45
AEA Campuses					

* Index 2 and Index 3 targets for both AEA charter districts and campuses are set at about the fifth percentile of AEA 2016 campus performance.

HB 2804 Accountability—Summary of October 26, 2015, APAC Meeting

ATAC reviewed the summary of the October 26, 2015, APAC meeting and two documents summarizing HB 2804 and its domains of indicators. TEA staff reviewed the indicator options for Domain IV that APAC agreed upon.

HB 2804 Accountability—Indicators Proposed by APAC

Members engaged in a wide-ranging discussion about the indicators that could be used in Domain IV. Some expressed concern that the indicators being proposed would disadvantage low-income districts that do not have the resources to offer those programs. Others suggested that common definitions be developed for the indicators to ensure that they can be measured consistently across districts and campuses, while others questioned whether ELL students would be counted in the “language instruction” indicator.

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

Members discussed the difficulty inherent in assessing elementary campuses for Domain IV. Since STAAR results cannot be used in Domain IV, it is difficult to identify college and career readiness indicators for elementary school students. The committee discussed a student survey that would require extensive psychometric work and would have to be administered by TEA to ensure consistent measurement across all districts and campuses.

The members agreed with the APAC that an indicator that awards credit to campuses for its students that take high school courses by grade 8 would be an effective measure of postsecondary readiness.

HB 2804 Accountability—Options for Domain I Methodology

TEA staff presented a document for discussion that modeled different options for calculating a numerical score for Domain I. The models build on previous calculations used in the current four-index accountability model. Working together in groups, committee members discussed the options.

Option 1 is similar to how the score for Index 2 is currently calculated. It gives one point for each percentage of tests at the satisfactory standard and two points for each percentage of tests at the college-readiness standard and adds the two together before dividing by the total number of possible points. Option 2 is similar to how the score for Index 4 is currently calculated and gives one point for each percentage of tests at the satisfactory standard and one point for each percentage of tests at the college-readiness. These two are then averaged using weights.

Members discussed a third option: adding the percentage of tests at the satisfactory standard to the percentage of tests at the college-readiness standard. This option was discarded, though, because it could result in a score greater than 100, making the scores unintuitive.

By a vote of 18 to 6, the committee recommended option 2 and weighting that score as follows: 90% for satisfactory standard and 10% to college-readiness standard.

Discussion shifted to the question of how to assign letter grades. TEA staff presented three models for consideration.

ATAC members discussed tables showing two options:

Option 1: A campus would receive an A if it meets a certain target or if it is in the top 10 percent of its campus comparison group.

Option 2: A campus would receive an A if it meets a certain target. A campus that misses the target could still receive an A if it meets the target for a B and is in the top 10 percent of its campus comparison group, essentially receiving a one-letter-grade increase for being in the top 10 percent of its campus comparison group. Campuses

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

with letter grades below an A but in the top ten percent can have a one-letter-grade increase as well (e.g. a C can become a B or a D can become a C.)

Members discussed a third option that would allow a campus to receive a two-letter-grade increase for being in the top 10 percent of its campus comparison group.

Members voted 19 to 5 for the one-letter-grade increase method. This would apply to Domains I, II, and III.

ATAC members discussed the appropriateness of assigning any district or campus an F during the first year of implementation. Members proposed reserving the F rating for a district or campus that receives a D in one year and fails to improve the following year.

Discussion continued on the topic of how this can be applied to a district comprised of campuses with a variety of letter grades. Should a 3,000 student campus with a B rating contribute more than a 900 student campus with an A in that calculation? Furthermore, can ratings be finer than A, B, C, D, and F? Is A- or B+ allowable under current statute, for example? Committee members voted on two options. Option 1 uses district targets with a district getting additional points for each campus that receives a one-letter-grade increase for a Domain. Option 2 used a straight resolved average similar to a grade-point average calculation. Option 1 received 3 votes versus 19 for Option 2.

HB 2804 Accountability—Options for Domain III Methodology

TEA staff introduced a document from the Albert Shanker Institute titled “Rethinking the Use of Simple Achievement Gap Measures in School Accountability Systems.” ATAC members commented on the need to capture not just passing numbers but also growth data. Other ideas were discussed, but none were voted on. Four members agreed to form on a workgroup to research the possibilities for Domain III: Annette Villerot, Lisa Diserens, Susanne Carroll, and Darrell Brown.

HB 2804 Accountability—Options for Assigning A–F Ratings

TEA staff presented a proposal using sample weights and cut points that can be used to determine letter grades. There was discussion about the implications of weighting Domain II more than Domains I and III. ATAC unanimously agreed with the proposal as shown in the table on the next page but expressed a desire to have the numerical values more intuitive: an A is a 95; a B is an 85; etc. The final weights assigned to Domains I–III and cut points for each letter grade for Domains I–IV will be determined at a later date.

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

Overall A–F Example

		Cut Points				
Weights ¹		A	B	C	D	F
15%	Domain I	68	56	37	32	0
25%	Domain II	60	50	40	30	20
15%	Domain III	40	35	30	25	20
35%	Domain IV	80	70	60	50	40
10%	Domain V	District assigns letter grade				
	A–F Scores ²	100	89	79	69	59
	Overall	90	80	70	60	<60

1. Weights for Domains I through III can be any combination that sums to 55.
2. In this example, A–F Scores are assigned the highest numerical score possible to quantify the domain letter grades.

Example 1*	Example 2**
58 B 89	58 A 100
55 B 89	55 B 89
33 C 79	33 C 79
79 B 89	79 B 89
A 100	A 100
Weighted average= 88.6	Weighted average= 90.3
Overall Rating: B	Overall Rating: A

* No letter grade bump applied.

** Letter grade for Domain I resolved to an A as a result of a Q1 bump.

Next Steps

The committee members agreed to a meeting in March to develop preliminary recommendations for the implementation of HB 2804. The date for that meeting has not yet been set.