2020-2021 ESC Metrics Manual

Texas Education Agency

Division of School Improvement

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – 2020-2021 School Improvement Metrics Overview

About this Manual

The *2020-2021 ESC Metrics Manual* is a technical guide that explains how the Texas Education Agency (TEA) uses data from the accountability system to further continuous improvement efforts of Education Service Centers (ESC) across the state of Texas. The manual describes each formative and summative metric and explains how information from different sources is used to calculate the metrics. An assignment of performance level for each metric is based off individual ESC targets.

The *2020-2021 ESC Metrics Manual* attempts to address all possible scenarios; however, because of the number and diversity of ESCs in Texas, there could be unforeseen circumstances that are not anticipated in the manual. If a data source used to determine an ESCs performance is unintentionally affected by unforeseen circumstances, including natural disasters, the commissioner of education will consider those circumstances and their impact in determining whether or how that data source will be used to assign performance levels. In such instances, the commissioner will interpret the manual as needed to assign the appropriate performance level.

Overview of the 2020-2021 ESC Metrics

The overall design of the *2020-2021 ESC Metrics Manual* evaluates performance according to two subsets of campuses:

1. **Summative Goals and Formative Metrics for Campuses identified Overall A – D in the 2019 Accountability System**
   Evaluates the performance of all Overall A – D campuses in an ESC that meet at least one of the following criteria:
   - opted to receive an Effective Schools Framework Diagnostic,
   - received support from a Vetted Improvement Program (VIP), or
   - regressed from an Overall A – D to an Overall F.

2. **Summative Goals and Formative Metrics for Campuses identified Overall F or Comprehensive Support and Improvement in the 2019 Accountability System**
   Evaluates the performance of all Overall F campuses or campuses that have been identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement in an ESC that meet at least one of the following criteria:
   - received for an Effective Schools Framework Diagnostic,
   - received support from a Vetted Improvement Program (VIP),
   - experienced overall growth and sustained an Overall A – D for multiple years after receiving an Overall F.

Who is rated?

All 20 ESCs will be evaluated on each summative and formative measure throughout the 2020-2021 school year.

Each ESC will be evaluated on campuses within its geographic boundaries and service. ESCs will be given an opportunity to view all campuses for each metric in the *ESC Metrics portal* on the TEA Division of School Improvement website prior to the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year. Any discrepancy will be resolved by the TEA and the affected ESCs.

ESC Metric Targets for Improvement

Each ESC will receive a score for each summative goal and formative metric based on the five quadrants listed below.

ESC metric targets will be individualized; meaning, each ESC in collaboration with TEA will determine a target for improvement based upon its specific context.

Quadrant 0	No Data
Quadrant 1	Does Not Meet Target
Quadrant 2	Approaching Target
Quadrant 3	Meets Target
Quadrant 4	Exceeds Target

Glossary

- **Education Service Center (ESC)** - Twenty Regional Service Centers were established to provide school districts an array of services customized to the regional context. To see a map of counties and districts in each ESC region, use the Texas Education Agency's School District Locator tool. You can also search for ESC staff members statewide using the Texas Education Directory.

- **Effective Schools Framework (ESF) -** The Effective Schools Framework consists of a set of district commitments and, for schools, essential actions. District Commitments describe what local education agencies do to ensure that schools are set up for success. The Essential Actions describe what the most effective schools do to support powerful teaching and learning. For more information visit, TexasESF.org.

- **ESF Eligible Opt-In Campuses** - Campuses in region subtracting campuses that have previously received a Diagnostic, and campuses that are required to get a Diagnostic.

- **Fidelity of Implementation (FOI)** – TEA and the Center for Effective Schools developed a rubric to measure ESF Diagnostic Final Reports and ESF Diagnostic stakeholder survey data.

- **School Improvement Engaged (SI Engaged)** - Campuses that have been identified as Comprehensive Support, have an Overall rating of F, or are implementing a Campus Turnaround Plan.

Chapter 2 - Summative Goals

Overview of Summative Goals

The Summative Goals will cover nine specific summative goals that evaluate multiple data points for the ESCs. The table below provides a description for each goal.

Campus Data	Summative Goal	Description
Overall A-D campuses	1. A-D Vetted Improvement Program (VIP) Participation Scale Score Growth	On average, campuses participating in a VIP service from the ESC will show growth in overall scaled score or Domain 2A compared to the state.
	2. A-D Regression	Percentage of 2019 Overall A-D campuses that receive an F rating in the next accountability year.
Campus Data	**Summative Goal**	**Description**
Overall F or Comprehensive Support campuses	3. Engaged Campus Scale Score Growth (Overall or D2A)	Scale score growth, in either overall score or Domain 2A score, of campuses who are engaged with the Division of School Improvement.
	4. Engaged Campus VIP Participation Scale Score Growth	On average, campuses participating in a VIP service from the ESC will show growth in overall scaled score or Domain 2A compared to the state.
	5. Comprehensive Campus Progression	Percentage of Comprehensive campuses that move from Comprehensive Identified to Comprehensive Progress.
	6. F Campus Long-Term Exits	Percentage of campuses with an F rating that move to a rating of C or better after two years.
	7. Comprehensive Campus Exits	Percentage of campuses rated Comprehensive Progress that meet the criterion to exit Comprehensive status.
	8. Long-Term Turnaround Plan (TAP) Campus Growth	Percentage of campuses that have been implementing a turnaround plan for at least 2 years and have earned a rating of C or better.
	9. F Campus Long-Term Regression Rate	Percentage of campuses with an F rating that receive and maintain a rating of D or better for three years.

Summative Goal #1: A-D Vetted Improvement Program (VIP) Participation Scale Score Growth

Overview

On average, campuses participating in a VIP service from the ESC will show growth in overall scaled score or Domain 2A compared to the state.

Calculation

Highest score of **Two** calculations:

Calculation 1

(VIP Campus 2021 Overall Scale Score Average) – (VIP Campus 2019 Overall Scale Score Average)

-

(State 2021 Overall Scale Score Average) – (State 2019 Overall Scale Score Average)

Calculation 2

(VIP Campus 2021 Domain 2A Scale Score Average) – (VIP Campus 2019 Domain 2A Scale Score Average)

-

(State 2021 Domain 2A Scale Score Average) – (State 2019 Domain 2A Scale Score Average)

Example

Calculation 1

(60-54) - (81-80) = 5

Calculation 2

(75-60) - (74-73) = 14

14 is the higher of the two calculations. On average, the region had a 15-point increase in Domain 2A compared to the state that had a 1-point increase, resulting in a net average gain of 14 points for the region.

Data Sources
- 2019 ESC Submission of VIP Participation List
- 2019 Accountability Results
- 2021 Accountability Results

Summative Goal #2: A-D Regression

Overview

Percentage of 2019 Overall A-D campuses that receive an F rating in the next accountability year.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of 2019 A-D Campuses in Region that Receive an F in 2021}}{\text{Number of 2019 A-D Campuses in Region}} \times 100$$

Example

8 ÷ 64 = 0.08
0.08 x 100 = 8%

The region saw 8% of their A-D campuses receive an F rating in the next accountability year.

Data Sources

- 2019 Accountability Results
- 2021 Accountability Results

Revised 1.8.2021

Summative Goal #3: Engaged Campus Scale Score Growth (Overall or D2A)

Overview

Scale score growth, in either overall score or Domain 2A score, of campuses who are engaged with the Division of School Improvement. Engaged campuses are defined in the glossary on page 5 as campuses that have been identified as Comprehensive Support, have an Overall rating of F, or are implementing a Campus Turnaround Plan.

Calculation

Highest score of **Two** calculations:

Calculation 1:

2021 Engaged Campus Overall Scale Score Average

−

2019 Engaged Campus Overall Scale Score Average

Calculation 2:

2021 Engaged Campus Domain 2A Scale Score Average

−

2019 Engaged Campus Domain 2A Scale Score Average

Example

Calculation 1

63-55= 8

Calculation 2

71-66= 5

8 is the higher of the two calculations. Overall scale scores rose in the region by 8 points at campuses that were engaged in school improvement interventions.

Data Sources
- 2019 Accountability Results
- 2021 Accountability Results

9

Revised 1.8.2021

Summative Goal #4: Engaged Campus VIP Participation Scale Score Growth

Overview

On average, SI engaged campuses participating in a VIP service from the ESC will show growth in overall scaled score or Domain 2A compared to the state.

Calculation

Highest score of **Two** calculations:

Calculation 1

(VIP Campus 2021 Overall Scale Score Average) - (VIP Campus 2019 Overall Scale Score Average)

—

(State 2021 Overall Scale Score Average) - (State 2019 Overall Scale Score Average)

Calculation 2

(VIP Campus 2021 Domain 2A Scale Score Average) - (VIP Campus 2019 Domain 2A Scale Score Average)

—

(State 2021 Domain 2A Scale Score Average) - (State 2019 Domain 2A Scale Score Average)

Example

Calculation 1

(60-64) – (71-66) = -9

Calculation 2

(70-60) – (65-56) = 1

1 is the higher of the two calculations. In Domain 2A, campuses that participated in an ESC VIP program showed an increase of 10 points compared to a state average increase of 9 points, resulting in a net increase for the region of 1 point.

Data Sources
- 2019 ESC Submission of VIP Participation List
- 2019 Accountability Results
- 2021 Accountability Results

10

Summative Goal #5: Comprehensive Campus Progression

Overview

Percentage of Comprehensive campuses that move from Comprehensive Identified to Comprehensive Progress.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of 2021 Campuses Labeled Comprehensive Progress}}{\text{Number of 2020 Campuses labeled Comprehensive Identified}} \times 100$$

Example

5 ÷ 20 = 0.25

0.25 x 100 = 25%

25% of Comprehensive Identified campuses in the region moved to Comprehensive Progress status.

Data Sources
- 2020 Accountability Results
- 2021 Accountability Results

11

Overview

Percentage of campuses with an Overall F rating that move to a rating of an Overall C or better after two years.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of 2018 Campuses Rated IR that are ALSO Rated C or Better in 2021}}{\text{Number of 2018 Campuses Rated IR}} \quad \textbf{x 100}$$

Example

6 ÷ 7 = 0.86

0.86 x 100 = 86%

86% campuses in the region that were rated Improvement Required (F) gained a rating of A, B, or C after two years.

Data Sources
- 2018 Accountability Results
- 2021 Accountability Results

Revised 1.8.2021

Summative Goal #7: Comprehensive Campus Exits

Overview

Percentage of campuses rated Comprehensive Progress that meet the criterion to exit Comprehensive status.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of 2021 Campuses that Exit Comprehensive Status}}{\text{Number of 2019 Campuses Rated Comprehensive Progress}} \times 100$$

Example

3 ÷ 11 = 0.27

0.27 x 100 = 27%

27% campuses in the region identified as Comprehensive Progress were able to exit Comprehensive status.

Data Sources
- 2019 Accountability Results
- 2021 Accountability Results

13

Overview

Percentage of campuses that have been implementing a turnaround plan for at least 2 years and have earned a rating of C or better.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of 2021 Campuses Implementing a TAP for at least 2 years with a C or Better Rating}}{\text{Number of 2021 Campuses Implementing a TAP for at least 2 years}} \times 100$$

Example

15 ÷ 34 = 0.44

0.44 x 100 = 44%

44% of campuses in the region that were implementing a TAP for at least 2 years earned a rating of A, B, or C.

Data Sources

- Campuses required to implement a TAP for at least 2 years
- 2021 Accountability Results

14

Summative Goal #9: F Campus Long-Term Regression Rate

Overview

Percentage of campuses with an F rating that receive and maintain a rating of D or better for three years.

Calculation

Number of 2017 Campuses Rated IR that are ALSO in 2018 Rated Met Standard ALSO 2019 Rated D or Higher ALSO 2021 D or Higher

$$\frac{\text{Number of 2017 Campuses Rated IR that are ALSO in 2018 Rated Met Standard ALSO 2019 Rated D or Higher ALSO 2021 D or Higher}}{\text{Number 2017 Campuses Rated IR}} \times 100$$

Example

8 ÷ 25 = 0.32

0.32 x 100 = 32%

32% of the campuses in the region that were rated Improvement Required in 2017 maintained a D or Higher (Met Standard) in the three following years.

Data Sources

- 2017 Accountability Results
- 2018 Accountability Results
- 2019 Accountability Results
- 2021 Accountability Results

15

Chapter 3 – Formative Metrics

Overview of Formative Metrics

The Formative Metrics will cover seven specific formative metrics that evaluate multiple data points for the ESCs. The table below provides a description for each goal.

Campus Data	Formative Metric	Description
Overall A – D campuses	1. Effective Schools Framework (ESF) Diagnostic Participation Rate	Percentage of A-D campuses opting to receive an ESF Diagnostic Visit.
	2. Vetted Improvement Program (VIP) Service Participation Rate	Percentage of A-D Campuses that participate in a VIP service from the ESC.
Campus Data	Formative Metric	Description
All Campuses	3. Action Step Mastery Rate	Percentage of educators participating in a Vetted Improvement Program (VIP) service that have shown mastery of an action step.
Campus Data	Formative Metric	Description
Overall F or Comprehensive Support campuses	4. Fidelity of Implementation (FOI) Rate	Overall FOI score of 90%- 100% for ESC ESF Facilitators as determined by the ESFF FOI rubric
	5. Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) Submission Quality Rate	Percentage of Comprehensive and/or F rated campuses whose TIP submission received sufficient scores based on quality rubrics for initial and progress submissions.
	6. Turnaround Plan (TAP) Approval Rate	Percentage of Comprehensive and F rated campuses required to submit a Turnaround Plan that do not need to modify the plan after the initial Spring TEA review.
	7. ESF-required Campus VIP Participation Rate	Percentage of Comprehensive and/or F rated SI Engaged Campuses who participate in a VIP service after receiving an ESF Diagnostic visit.

Formative Metric #1: Effective Schools Framework (ESF) Diagnostic Participation Rate

Overview

Percentage of A-D campuses opting to receive an ESF Diagnostic Visit.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of A-D Campuses Completing an ESF Diagnostic Visit in 2021}}{\text{Number of ESF Eligible Opt-In Campuses}} \times 100$$

Example

36 ÷ 92 = 0.39

0.39 x 100 = 39%

39% of campuses in the region that were rated A, B, C or D and were eligible to receive an ESF Diagnostic visit chose to do so.

Data Sources

- 2019 Accountability Results
- Region ESF Diagnostic Visit Historical Data
- Region ESF Diagnostic Signup Data

Note: Campus rated Overall D and Comprehensive Support do not apply to this metric. These campuses are not considered "opt-ins" they are required to participate in the ESF Diagnostic process.

Formative Metric #2: Vetted Improvement Program (VIP) Service Participation Rate

Overview

Percentage of A-D Campuses that participate in a VIP service from the ESC.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of A-D Campuses Participating in VIP Service}}{\text{Number of A-D Campuses in Region Eligible for VIP Service}} \times 100$$

Example

4 ÷ 92 = 0.04

0.04 x 100 = 4%

4% of campuses in the region that were rated A, B, C or D chose to participate in VIP services with the ESC.

Data Sources

- 2019 Accountability Results
- Region VIP Signup Data

Formative Metric #3: Action Step Mastery Rate

Overview

Percentage of educators participating in a Vetted Improvement Program (VIP) service that have shown mastery of an action step.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of educators showing mastery of an action step}}{\text{Number of educators receiving coaching in VIP cohort}} \times \textbf{100}$$

Example

3 ÷ 4 = 0.75

0.75 x 100 = 75%

75% of educators in the region that participated in VIP services with the ESC showed mastery of an action step.

Data Sources

- 2020 TIL coaching Tracker
- Region VIP Signup Data

Revised 1.8.2021

Formative Metric #4: Fidelity of Implementation (FOI) Rate

Overview

Overall FOI score of 90% - 100% for ESC ESF Facilitators as determined by the ESF Diagnostic FOI rubric

Calculation

Average of ESF Diagnostic Stakeholder Survey Data + Average Score on FOI Rubric for Final Reports

_____

2

Example

98 + 90 = 188

188 ÷ 2 = 94

ESC ESF Facilitators scored a 94 on the ESF Diagnostic FOI rubric, which averages stakeholder survey data and accuracy of the ESF Diagnostic final report.

Data Sources

- ESF Diagnostic stakeholder survey
- ESF Diagnostic FOI rubric

Formative Metric #5: Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) Submission Quality Rate

Overview

Percentage of Comprehensive and/or F rated campuses whose TIP submission received proficient scores based on quality rubrics for initial and progress submissions.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of Campuses meeting Proficiency target on TIP submission}}{\text{Number of Comprehensive and/or F Campuses in the Region}} \times 100$$

Example

18 ÷ 25 = 0.72

0.72 x 100 = 72%

72% of Comprehensive and F rated campuses in the region received a proficient score based on TIP rubric.

Data Sources

- 2021 TIP Submission Rubric

Formative Metric #6: Turnaround Plan (TAP) Approval Rate

Overview

Percentage of Comprehensive and F rated campuses required to submit a Turnaround Plan that do not need to modify the plan after the initial Spring TEA review.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of Campuses Submitting TAP that DO NOT Have Modifications Requested}}{\text{Number of Campuses Submitted TAP}} \times 100$$

Example

1 ÷ 3 = 0.33

0.33 x 100 = 33%

33% of F rated campuses in the region that were required to submit a TAP, were not asked to make modifications to their plan.

Data Sources

- 2019 Accountability Results
- 2019 TAP Campuses
- 2019 TAP Modification Request List

Revised 1.8.2021

Formative Metric #7: ESF-required Campus Vetted Improvement Program (VIP) Participation Rate

Overview

Percentage of Comprehensive and/or F rated SI Engaged Campuses who participate in a VIP service after receiving an ESF Diagnostic visit.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{Number of SI Engaged Campuses Receiving an ESF Diagnostic Visit in SY 2019-20 ALSO Participating in VIP Service}}{\text{Number of SI Engaged Campuses Receiving an ESF Diagnostic Visit in SY 2019-20}} \times 100$$

Note: By special request, an ESC may add campuses that received an ESF Diagnostic Visit in 2020-2021 to this metric so they may be included in the calculation.

Example
2 ÷ 3 = 0.66

0.66 x 100 = 66

66% of F rated campuses in the region that were engaged with the School Improvement Division chose to participate in VIP services with the ESC after receiving their ESF Diagnostic Visit.

Data Sources

- 2019 Accountability Results
- 2019-20 School Year (SY) ESF Diagnostic Visit Signup
- 2019, 2020 and 2021 VIP Service Signup

Revised 1.8.2021

Chapter 4 – ESC Metric Calendar

ESC Metric Portal Update Calendar

Month	Activity	Due Date
July	- ESC accesses ESC portal on the Performance Metrics website to review campuses - ESC signs acknowledgement of campuses served for each metric	July 31, 2020
August	ESC accesses ESC portal to review baseline data for Summative goals	
September	Submit data for *Summative Goals* 1 and 4 and *Formative Metrics* 2 and 7 via the Qualtrics link through the ESC portal on the Performance Metrics website	September 25, 2020
December	Submit data for *Summative Goals* 1 and 4 and *Formative Metrics* 1, 2, 3, and 7 via the Qualtrics link through the ESC portal on the Performance Metrics website	December 18, 2020
April	Submit data for *Formative Metrics* 1, 2, 3, and 7 via the Qualtrics link through the ESC portal on the Performance Metrics website	April 30, 2021
June	ESC signs acknowledgement to verify that all data submitted is accurate	June 1, 2021

Metric Submission Tool

ESC metrics data should be submitted via Qualtrics by 11:59 pm on the date specified in the Metric Submission calendar. The link to the submission tool may be found on the Performance Metric webpage specific to each ESC region https://siperformancegoals.tea.texas.gov/.