

## 2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

### Summary of Meeting on June 9, 2020

The objective of the June 2020 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) and Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) meeting was to solicit possible solutions to address the unique challenges facing the 2021 accountability system and beyond, due to COVID-19. TEA responses to questions and concerns are provided in red. Some questions require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting.

- TEA welcomed the committee members to the virtual meeting.
- The committee discussed possibilities for measuring growth considering the lack of assessment results for spring 2020.
  - Questions
    - Are waivers available from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE)? **No. The USDE has indicated that it's too early to release information on a possible waiver process for 2021 accountability.**
    - How are other states measuring growth in 2021? **We are currently collaborating with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to determine feasible solutions for growth calculations**
    - Can districts and campuses receive credit for the work they have done in 2020? For example, can schools be acknowledged for feeding students, providing technology and internet access, and providing learning opportunities? **TEA has not explored incorporating credit for these components. Whether these data points are collected would need to be determined first.**
    - Could TEA provide the committee data models on the potential effects of removing growth calculations for 2021? **We can provide this data.**
  - Concerns
    - If the agency measures growth from 2019 to 2021, campuses that serve grades 3 and 4 would be at a disadvantage.
    - We are receiving survey results from parents regarding returning in the fall. Most students who are not returning are economically disadvantaged and without stable internet access.
    - Districts are already focused on administering assessments at the beginning of the year to diagnose students. Having students take an assessment for accountability at the beginning of the year would provide an additional burden and detract from instruction.
    - If the agency is unable to calculate growth, losing this domain would have a negative impact on the ratings for many campuses.

## 2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

### Summary of Meeting on June 9, 2020

- If one part of the accountability system is not able to be used, stakeholders may question the validity of the rest of the accountability system.
- Suggestions
  - Given the option, districts and charters would prefer flexibility to report growth data to the agency instead of relying on the STAAR progress measures.
  - Develop something similar to the Center for Disease Control Social Vulnerability Index to account for economic loss or the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases.
  - Give districts the option to use locally determined growth measures from national assessments, such as AIMSweb Plus or NWEA MAP. These assessments provide a better measure of growth than the year-to-year progress measure of STAAR.
  - Use a TEA designated beginning-of-year diagnostic assessment and spring STAAR administration results to determine growth.
  - Suspend growth calculations for 2021.
  - Take the “COVID slide” into consideration if/when revising expectations.
- The committee discussed options for calculating the college, career and military readiness (CCMR) component of the 2021 Student Achievement, School Progress and the Closing the Gaps domains given COVID-19 disruptions.
  - Questions
    - When will the agency reset the accountability system given the COVID-19 disruptions? Is the reset meant to address the issues associated with COVID-19? **The accountability reset has two parts. The first relates to the reading/language arts (RLA) redesign scheduled for implementation in 2022; however, due to COVID-19, one year of field-testing data was lost. Ideally, the accountability reset would align with the RLA redesign and address changes related to COVID-19 impact.**
    - When will the agency receive military enlistment data? **The timeline for receipt of military enlistment data is still to be determined. We will share additional information with the committee as it is available.**
    - Is there any update regarding House Bill 3906 relating to STAAR assessments being administered fully online? **The Student Assessment Division is continuing to explore feasible options to transition assessments fully online.**

## 2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

### Summary of Meeting on June 9, 2020

- Can the agency provide data modeling for CCMR outcomes? **Some indicators will not be received until spring 2021.**
- Concerns
  - The disruptions to AP, IB, SAT, and ACT assessments have impacted CCMR for graduates.
- Suggestions
  - Use the best of 2018, 2019, and 2020 CCMR data to calculate CCMR outcomes.
  - CCMR data should be reported but not included as a component of the 2021 accountability system.
  - Extend the half-point credit for career and technical education (CTE) coherent sequence students.
  - Small numbers analysis for rural districts who have fewer than 10 graduates should use 2017, 2018 and 2019 data.
  - There are indicators like AP/IB that districts were unable to fulfill due to COVID-19. CCMR should be calculated for a subset of indicators that are the most valid and reliable. Once calculated, scaling for this indicator should be modified to account for the loss of CCMR opportunities.
- The committee discussed options for the use of an accurate 2020 graduation rate in the 2021 Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.
  - Questions
    - Is using the first four six-weeks attendance rates for distinctions consistent with how the agency calculated funding? **Yes.**
    - For districts that implement split scheduling in the fall, how will that affect attendance rate? **This is to be determined.**
    - Instead of using attendance rates, can the agency use enrollment data and fund them accordingly? **This question should be addressed by the State Funding Division.**
  - Concerns
    - We may see an artificial increase in the Class of 2020 graduation rate due to the use of Individual Graduation Committees (IGC) during COVID-19.
    - There may be an increase in minimum degree plans for 2020 graduates. This could affect distinction designations.
    - COVID-19 may have a greater impact on 2021 graduates than 2020 graduates.

## 2020 Accountability Advisory Committees Summary of Meeting on June 9, 2020

- While graduation rates may not be negatively impacted, annual dropout rates will likely be affected, especially for alternative education campuses.
- Special education students may continue for another year to regain lost instructional time.
- Suggestions
  - The school-start window cutoff date should be extended to the October snapshot date.
- The committee discussed options for accurately calculating the 2021 English Language Proficiency (ELP) component in the Closing the Gaps domain with missing 2020 TELPAS data.
  - Questions
    - If TELPAS data from 2019 and 2021 was utilized, would the expectation be students improve by one proficiency level? **Yes, students would need to improve by one proficiency level or be rated Advanced-High in both years.**
    - Can TEA provide data modeling to compare 2018, 2019, and 2020 TELPAS administrations? **Yes.**
    - Is there an opportunity to have a fall 2020 administration of TELPAS? **This can be proposed as a diagnostic tool but would not be used for accountability purposes. Also, TELPAS assessment will be released for use by districts.**
    - Would the proposal to receive partial points for ELP be for 2021 accountability? **This would likely be implemented with the accountability reset but can be proposed for 2021.**
    - Can TEA provide data on spring 2020 TELPAS participation and outcomes? **Yes.**
  - Suggestions
    - Use data from the 2019 and 2021 TELPAS administrations for the Closing the Gaps ELP component. This would provide consistency in the data.
    - Allow partial points to be awarded for the ELP component in the Closing the Gaps domain.
- The committee discussed additional modifications for consideration when calculating the 2021 Closing the Gaps domain.
  - Questions
    - For elementary campuses, growth accounts for fifty percent of the domain. How will lack of growth affect these campuses? If the agency relies on STAAR performance, scaling for the domain should be adjusted.

## 2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

### Summary of Meeting on June 9, 2020

- Is the Closing the Gaps domain statutorily required to account for thirty percent of the overall rating, or can it account for less? **The thirty percent is defined in statute.**
- Can TEA provide data modeling using 2019 data without the growth component included? **Yes.**
- Can small numbers analysis be used when calculating growth for elementary campuses in the Closing the Gaps domain? **This can be explored.**
- For rural districts, can a growth score be calculated for those that do not meet minimum size? **This can be explored.**
- Can required improvement be used to meet Closing the Gaps targets? **We can revisit this with the USDE.**
- Concerns
  - Lack of growth indicators may dramatically affect the minimum number of indicators requirement and the identification of campuses for improvement.
- Suggestions
  - Use 2021 as a baseline year when setting targets during the accountability reset.
  - In the Closing the Gaps domain, use the better of 2019 or 2020 when calculating the graduation rate.
  - Redo scaling to account for the elimination of growth.
  - Consider small numbers analysis for student groups so that growth isn't lost with decreased numbers.
- Committee members discussed future meeting dates.