

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on October 28, 2020

The objective of the October 28, 2020 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) and Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) meeting was to solicit feedback on 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 reviewed 2021 accountability system context and considerations.
 - Incomplete data
 - Pandemic-influenced data
 - Stifled continuous improvement efforts
 - Remote learning implications
 - Questions
 - Is there current data on what percentage of students are remote learners by district and campus? **The Research and Analysis Division is currently compiling this data and may release it to stakeholders later this year. In addition, this data will be collected through TSDS PEIMS attendance codes, but will not be available until fall 2021 after ratings are released.**
 - Suggestions
 - It would be useful to see the remote learner and in-person percentages by demographic group.
- The committee reviewed potential 2021 accountability system adjustments.
 - STAAR Components
 - Questions
 - Will the commissioner waive high stakes testing for end-of-course (EOC) assessments? **No. The commissioner does not have the authority to waive graduation requirements.**
 - How many students took the beginning of year (BOY) assessments? **Approximately 685,000 students were registered for BOY assessments.**
 - How does adjusting cut points based on the All Students group accurately reflect the impact on our student population when we know that the students learning remotely are more likely to be minorities and students that are economically disadvantaged? **In the current draft proposal, the cut points would be adjusted based off all students who test.**
 - Suggestions

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on October 28, 2020

- Continue state testing. The information and data are important to students, families, schools, and districts.
- College, Career, and Military (CCMR) Readiness Components
 - Questions
 - If a district relies on small number analysis for CCMR, how would that be analyzed? **In the current draft proposal, if a district or campus does not meet the minimum size requirements for the Class of 2019 or 2020, we'd use the class that did. We can consider alternatives to address this concern.**
 - Can we utilize to Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) scores as a military readiness indicator? **TEA does not currently have access to that data. CCMP staff provided follow up after the meeting that the military will not release ASVAB scores with state agencies.**
 - Is the half point Career Technical Education (CTE) option under consideration for the class of 2020? **Possibly. There is concern about the comparability of the class of 2019 and 2020 if one includes the half point and the other does not.**
 - Concerns
 - Small campuses and districts sometimes rely heavily on the CCMR component, and small numbers implications could negatively impact small K–12 campuses.
 - Suggestions
 - ASVAB and Fitnessgram results should be considered for military readiness.
 - For the Class of 2020, TEA should allow military enlistment to be self-reported.
 - Allow CCMR points for students who are coded as CTE completers.
 - The agency needs to get a group of stakeholders together to brainstorm better options for military enlistment.
 - Move Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) into CTE or consider it as part of the criteria for military readiness.
- Graduation Rate
- Academic Growth
 - Questions
 - Why is 80% the minimum consistency rate for a two-year growth measure? **This is an industry standard provided by**

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees Summary of Meeting on October 28, 2020

psychometricians and accountability experts. This is a consistency standard across the industry, not solely for growth measures.

- Academic Growth modeling does not take the COVID slide into account. How can we account for the COVID slide when calculating growth? **We cannot account for a COVID slide until we have one year of data.**
- If a two-year growth measure does not benefit our campus or district, can we still see the data? **Yes. In the current draft proposal, data used in the accountability system but not publicly released would still be available to campuses and districts through the TEAL Accountability application.**
- Will a two-year growth measure truly measure student growth? **It will not give us the same information that a growth measure traditionally would.**
- Concerns
 - The absence of growth scores from English I to English II would significantly impact high schools.
 - The data that analyzes the consistency rate between a one-year and two-year progress measure cannot account for the COVID slide. The consistency rate, reliability, and validity of this data could differ from what was modeled. This could result in artificially high and/or low domain outcomes.
 - Challenges related to reliable and valid growth calculations will also affect the 2022 accountability system.
- Relative Performance
 - Questions
 - Can economically disadvantaged rates from 2020–21 be appealed? **Currently, no. However, Performance Reporting needs to thoroughly analyze the data in February 2021.**
 - Concerns
 - Families are not completing free/reduced lunch forms and districts are seeing significant decreases in the percentage of students they can report as economically disadvantaged.
- Closing the Gaps
 - Questions
 - Are Closing the Gaps scaling formulas subject to revisions? **Possibly. Performance Reporting needs to analyze this data before making scaling decisions.**
 - Can we see the affect COVID will have on high school growth? **We will not have this data until after state testing.**

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on October 28, 2020

- Participation
 - Concerns
 - If we receive a waiver for the participation rate, we remove the motivation for districts to ensure students are present for testing.
- Other
 - Questions
 - Is TEA following how other states are handling disruptions to accountability? Have you considered that the United States Department of Education (USDE) may have different leadership and priorities come January? **Yes. We are working with the Chief Council of State School Officers (CCSSO) and are monitoring the plans of other states. Currently, the USDE has communicated that states are required to complete state testing this year and is offering states the opportunity to submit waivers, addendums, and amendments to their legacy accountability systems to accommodate for interruptions due to COVID.**
 - Has a *Met Standard/Improvement Required* accountability system been considered for 2020–21? **Yes, this option has been discussed.**
 - Is there a possibility of 2020–21 being a report-only year? **We have considered this option. Currently, there is no federal or state guidance that waives accountability requirements.**
 - Concerns
 - Fifty percent of APAC and ATAC respondents reported their remote learning rates at 41% or greater.
 - Remote instruction is correlated with economically disadvantaged and minority groups. These populations will be disproportionately affected by COVID-19 when compared to their peers, and they may not come in-person for STAAR.
 - Enrollment declines across the state should be considered.
 - ATAC and APAC members expressed significant concern regarding the reliability and validity of data used in accountability and assigning ratings based off potentially flawed, incomplete data.
 - The 2020–21 accountability system should provide opportunities for identified schools to exit their school improvement status.
 - STAAR and reported accountability data are needed to establish high academic standards and to ensure students are on track. However, it may not be reasonable to issue accountability ratings this year.

The committee reviewed the timeline for decision making.