2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on February 4, 2019

The objective for the second meeting of the 2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) was to recommend improvements for the 2019 accountability system and beyond, primarily regarding alternative education accountability (AEA) campuses and the 3 of 4 *F=F* rule. TEA responses to questions and concerns 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 welcomed the committee and introduced the new member.
- Committee members reviewed AEA and dropout recovery school options.
  - Questions
    - What are the constraints TEA has with working with AEAs? [The modeling does not include adjustments to the Closing the Gaps domain as those would require an amendment to the state ESSA plan.]
    - Could we get rid of the Student Achievement domain for AEAs? [While it is possible to use different methodology for AEAs, it would require a legislative update to statute to specify a separate system for AEA. Federal accountability would not be affected.]
    - Is there anything in statue that would prohibit Closing the Gaps being run and shown with either a) report only or b) no state consequences? [The U.S. Department of Education would not allow that. Labeling must happen for each campus in the state that meets minimum size. Changes to interventions would have to come from the School Improvement Division.]
    - Did the commissioner set a cap for bonus points for AEAs? [It depends on the number of indicators, but we believe it would be limited to 10 points to the overall scaled score or a single letter grade increase.]
    - Where did AEA bonus points originally come from? [The previous accountability system included bonus points for AEAs in Index 4.]
    - Could we use an annual graduation rate that is not cohort specific? 12th graders who graduated over 12th graders in PEIMS? [Statute specifies that the graduation rate used in accountability must be longitudinal.]
    - For AEAs, could the CCMR component be weighted more? [This is possible for the Student Achievement domain but would require a change in targets for AEAs. Closing the Gaps weighting changes would require an amendment to weight AEAs differently than other non-AEA high schools and K-12.]
    - Would it be possible for the Student Achievement domain to only look at Approaches? [Possible, yes. Probable, no. We have already adjusted the targets for AEAs.]
    - Could we adjust the scaling more than it already is? [We could suggest changing the targets, but we want to save changing targets for impacts across the board for five-year adjustments.]
    - Can students expire from the accountability system? [We don't include previous TEAMS, TAAS or TAKS testers in the system. We also

don't include out of school testers or results for students outside of grades 3–12.]

- ◆ Concerns
    - ▪ With bonus points, an AEA might end up with an overall *B*, but they could still have federal interventions and will never be able to meet the exit criteria.
    - ▪ If we only look back one year for prior-year failers, there will be many students who will not get credit.
    - ▪ There is a misalignment between what we measure AEAs on and what their mission is.
    - ▪ It would have to be a separate system to be fair for AEAs.
    - ▪ Some AEAs are going to close campuses and move those students back to their home campuses to avoid an *F* rating.
    - ▪ The Closing the Gaps domain overly identifies AEAs and has inappropriate consequences for those campuses.
- ◆ Suggestions
    - ▪ Focus on the AEA mission, which ATAC defined as:
        - ○ Graduation (EOC + course completion)
        - ○ Productive citizens (CCMR)
        - ○ Continuing (persistence)
    - ▪ Change prior year to prior years. Look back several years as retesters may be retesting for multiple years.
    - ▪ Include earning course credit as a bonus points option.
    - ▪ Use all AEA bonus point indicators listed in the *2017 Accountability Manual* (Chapter 4, page 53).
    - ▪ Set alternative consequences for AEA campuses identified for comprehensive support (i.e. no PSP, no TIP).
    - ▪ Identify ways to give credit to continuers. For example, for each year they accelerate an enrolled grade level or more, they earn a point.
    - ▪ Create a bonus point option based on the number of credits earned vs. the number of possible credits.
    - ▪ Positively impact CCMR, using bonus points or by changing the weights.
    - ▪ Keep failing AEAs from impacting district ratings.
- ◆ Immediate recommendations
    - ▪ AEA Bonus Points for:
        - ○ Prior failers
        - ○ RHSP/DAP FHSP-E/FHSP-DLA
        - ○ Excluded student credit
        - ○ Grade advancement/course completion
    - ▪ AEA outcomes stand alone, don't impact district ratings
    - ▪ Potential scaled score/target adjustments for AEAs
- ◆ Future recommendations
    - ▪ Statutory adjustments to address AEA needs
    - ▪ ESSA amendment to address AEA needs

- TEA will make an adjustment to the graduation rate scaling. A 100 percent graduation rate will scale to 100. A 99.9 percent will still scale to 95.
- Committee members reviewed the Step 10 (3 out of 4 *F*=*F*) rule.
  - TEA proposes three options:
    - Leave the rule as it is.
    - Look specifically at the Student Achievement domain—if a *C* or better, then let the ratings remain.
    - Look specifically at the Student Achievement domain—if a *D* or better, then let the ratings remain.
  - Questions:
    - What was the purpose behind the 3 out of 4 *F* rule? [One of the issues with having the better of Student Achievement or School Progress is that the public may not get the full picture. The desire is to not allow a masking of data. If the school gets a 70 in Student Achievement, they could essentially fail everything else and not fail overall. This aligns with the Agency's mission to improve low-performing schools.]
  - Concerns:
    - *D* schools still have sanctions, why do we need to pull them down to an *F*?
    - The strength of proficiency or growth of the *A*–*F* system is being eliminated by this rule.
    - There is not consistency throughout the system. Three out of four *B*s doesn't make you a *B*. We need to be consistent.
    - There is the potential for extended consequences, as the district could be limited due to this artificial calculation.
    - We have campuses with excellent growth, but the achievement just is not there yet. This rule denies us that credit.
    - This is very deceiving when comparing low-performing schools. A school may be performing better overall, but it is masked due to this rule.
    - We lost transparency when we combined all the grades to give one overall grade.
    - I disagree that this is to help low-performing schools. If that is the case, why didn't we stay with the *Met Standard/Improvement Required* system?
    - If we had a good calculation to start with, we wouldn't need an arbitrary rule applied at the end to sort this out.
    - There are a lot of unintended consequences within this system. It is not a perfect system. This rule is inconsistently impacting districts.
    - If you truly want to "close the gap" you have to have accelerated growth.

- If you are going to say that if Student Achievement is good enough, then you would need to do the same with School Progress: Academic Growth.
- The philosophy behind the *A–F* system is to highlight high performing schools and be transparent to parents. One of the strategic initiatives is to improve low-performing schools, so we should be transparent and show the true grade while helping low-performing schools through interventions.
- ◆ Suggestions:
  - Could we look at the data if we go up to the domain level and do two out of three instead of three out of four?
  - Could we suggest 3 out of 4 results in more intensive interventions, instead of an *F*?
- ◆ Recommendations:
  - The committee voted unanimously to eliminate Step 10: 3 out of 4 *F* rule completely.
    - o If this is not an option, keep 3 out of 4 for interventions only, but allow the accountability data show the true grade.
    - o TEA should go with the option that results in this rule impacting the fewest districts and campuses possible.
- Committee members reviewed identification and exit criteria for comprehensive, targeted, and additional targeted support and improvement.
  - ◆ Questions
    - Would it be possible to run modeling data for 3 and 4 years? [We currently only have two years' worth of data.]
    - Could we count students only in one group instead of including them in all applicable student groups? [The U.S. Department of Education would not allow that. How would we choose which group we put them in?]
    - If you are in the bottom 5 percent for the Closing the Gaps domain, are you guaranteed to be a *D* or an *F*? [No, if everyone is improving, the lowest 5 percent could end up being a 74 eventually.]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - Do people understand the implications the special education student group has on these identifications? Those student groups will never meet the targets.
    - This is extremely discouraging in the field.
    - We are going to have *A* schools that are identified for interventions.
    - A campus can exit out of comprehensive support and get identified that same year for something else.
    - If a Title 1 campus meets all the individual student group targets in School Quality, but they don't hit the all student group target year after year, they may end up labeled as comprehensive.

- As we have race/ethnicity along with the special programs groups the same students are contributing to a campus missing the targets in multiple indicators.
- One of our students counted 37 times throughout the entire system.
- The percentage that you need to hit for additional targeted support is very low, so to the public it looks terrible that you couldn't meet that. It sends mixed messages.

- Suggestions
  - Make a distinction on the chart (provided to committee members) to show after three years Title I moves to comprehensive; if not Title I, they continue to be targeted.
  - Use the number of indicators instead of the percentage.
  - We need to increase the minimum size to 50 and 10 percent.
  - Consecutive years should reset when a student group does not meet minimum size.
  - The placement of the STAAR component could be different on the data table.

- Recommendations
  - Amend the ESSA plan to remove the possibility that a single cell can lead to targeted or additional targeted support identification. Adjust to a proportionality of indicators for targeted identification.
  - Increase minimum size criteria for student groups.
  - When a student falls into multiple student groups, limit the student's impact on the system.
  - Revise the methodology to a campus must meet minimum size and miss the indicator for three consecutive years or the consecutive years restarts.
  - Use only Academic Achievement indicators for targeted support and additional targeted support, if evaluated.
  - Remove the exit criteria of meeting 50 percent of indicators from additional targeted support. Keep the focus on meeting both the Academic Achievement reading and mathematics targets.