

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

The objective for the second meeting of the 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) was to review accountability models prepared by TEA and continue crafting recommendations for the new A–F accountability system established by House Bill (HB) 22. 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.
- Committee members reviewed concerns and recommendations from previous ATAC and APAC meetings.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Where is the mention of school to work transition for special education students? [We are looking into the possibility of including graduation type codes 04, 05, 54, and 55 into the CCMR for special education students.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - There is push back at the district level regarding the inclusion of OnRamps. It is extremely costly with only limited availability statewide.
- TEA presented staff recommendations.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Will credit for CTE coursework be settled before 2018 ratings? [Yes.]
 - Given that 20 percent of graduates would no longer qualify for CCMR without credit for CTE, how are those students distributed across the state? [Our initial review of the data show that rural districts and campuses or campuses with little if any dual credit, AP/IB options are harder hit by the exclusion of CTE than others.] Which districts are impacted and by how much?
 - Will we want to reset cut points annually as CCMR develops? [The goal is to maintain cut points for five-year increments.]
 - Why not set cut scores for campuses next year since 2018 ratings will still be *Met Standard and Improvement Required*?
 - Can districts appeal any rating? [We are still researching this. It's likely that a district or campus will be able to appeal an overall grade of F, D, C, or B but not individual domain grades if an increase in a domain grade would not change the overall grade.]
 - Can the agency get Accuplacer data? [We are looking into this but initial review is no the agency cannot.]

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

- ◆ Concerns
 - This system is supposed to be static for five years, but we will enter the first year with CCMR indicators still in development. This is a problem.
 - State averages do not represent the diversity of educational settings in this state.
 - TEKS streamlining could affect cut points.
 - Districts do not necessarily know if data errors are corrected by ETS. Not all errors are corrected in the CAF after they are identified by districts.
 - When an appeal is granted, it does not retroactively qualify the campus or district for distinctions since distinctions are already calculated based on CAF data. **[Rerunning distinctions based on rescored data after the CAF is processed would be problematic.]**
- ◆ Suggestions
 - The commissioner should consider applying his authority in areas not defined by statute, particularly in the case of CTE CCMR credit.
 - Consider a five-year transition period for the CCMR component to allow districts to realign their programs. The more abrupt the change to the system, the more likely the Legislature will be pressured to react, which would undermine stability. **[We are looking into this.]**
 - Build in a reporting mechanism that explains why a campus or district failed.
- TEA reviewed previously compiled recommendations and concerns from advisory groups.
 - ◆ Questions
 - How does one document military enlistment for accountability purposes? **[Each district decides how to collect this data. This may be a senior survey, contact with a local recruiter, or any other method. Each district must maintain supporting documentation that the student has enlisted or intends to enlist.]**
 - ◆ Concerns
 - With respect to military enlistment, it seems PEIMS managers and Performance Reporting have different positions on whether documented “intent to enlist” is sufficient to qualify.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Student Achievement domain modeling data.
 - ◆ Questions
 - Must one have the substitute assessment score in hand to use it, or can administrators “bubble in” substitute in anticipation of receiving the test result later? **[Yes, substitute assessment results must be in hand.]**
 - How will the agency calculate growth measures using substitute assessments? **[Substitute assessments will not receive a progress measure.]**
 - Will third and fourth year EL students still be included in the Closing the Gaps domain? **[Yes.]**
 - Will the EL performance measure be mentioned in STAAR report cards where applicable? **[No. The EL performance measure is an accountability measure. It is not an assessment measure used at the student level to determine if a student has met the standard.]**
 - ◆ Concerns
 - AP tests will not be useful for substitute assessments if the results arrive in July.
 - Inclusion of substitute assessments will lead to a huge increase in students who don’t take the STAAR tests.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - TEA should ensure the inclusion of substitute assessment results in the Student Achievement domain does not trigger unnecessary data validation monitoring.
 - AP language tests should not be excluded from CCMR, but if this becomes policy, at least TEA should investigate the effect of excluding AP language tests from CCMR to determine the size of the effect.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability School Progress domain modeling data.
 - ◆ Questions
 - How are EOC retesters included? **[Current modeling includes both successful and unsuccessful EOC retesters.]**
 - For the regression component, how did magnet schools affect the model at 70 percent or higher economically disadvantaged? **[Without a specific definition of “magnet school”, this cannot be determined.]**
 - ◆ Concerns
 - We still need to define progress for students skipping grades.
 - Harvey could have significant effect on economically disadvantaged numbers which would affect campus placement on the regression chart.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - Students who transition from Spanish to English should receive a progress measure.
 - Substitute assessments which have a corresponding STAAR assessment from the prior year should be included and receive a full point.
 - Show the number of campuses above and below the regression line at each interval.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

- Remove outliers at every increment from the line equation to reduce the effect of magnet schools and schools with selective enrollment.
- Evaluate campuses' economically disadvantaged data from previous years to assess the impact of Hurricane Harvey.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Closing the Gaps domain modeling data.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Will safe harbor be recalculated every year or calculated once for a given 5 or 15-year timespan? [Safe Harbor will be recalculated each year. The denominator will remain either 5 or 15 depending on which goal is adopted in the ESSA plan.]
 - If the goal is to highlight contrast due to mobility, why not count all students versus all students in the accountability subset? [Statute requires both continuous and mobile students to be measured.]
 - Is it possible to weight the indicators differently in the final Closing the Gaps calculation? [This is one of many options.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - If the minimum size to include an indicator drops from 25 to 10, there will be an explosion in the number of measurable indicators.
 - If there are not data for at least 10 students, the overall rating could be based on one domain.
- TEA opened a discussion on calculating overall ratings.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Will TEA increment the IR year for IR campuses in 2018 even though the accountability system is drastically changing? [No.]
 - Will the rules about PEG remain the same? [HB 22 updated the PEG methodology. Effective for the 2019–20 school year, a campus will be placed on the PEG List if it is assigned an F in both the Student Achievement and in the School Progress domains.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - The School Progress regression model is based on results with different passing standards. If held constant for five years, we could expect the results to decrease relative to the line as more students are held to higher passing standards.
 - Student Achievement is still a “gimme” for affluent schools, and an A in this domain ensures a campus will never receive an overall grade lower than a B per the proposed grade calculations. They will not feel pressure to improve.
 - ♦ Suggestions
 - Consider running a what-if report based on the old index system. This would be useful for campuses who were rated IR in 2017 to see if they improved or not.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

- Small, struggling *IR* campuses are dealing with multiple divisions in the agency and are greatly taxed by their responsibilities to each. The agency should work to reduce the burden.

TEA opened a discussion about distinctions and badges.

- ♦ Questions
 - Are badges required in the new accountability system? [No.]
 - Can the top third of campuses be awarded a distinction rather than top quartile? [Adjustments can be made if they are deemed appropriate.]
 - Can we weight elements of the campus comparison group distance formula differently? [Adjustments can be made if they are deemed appropriate.]
- ♦ Concerns
 - We don't have a "school of choice" indicator that would make comparison groups more equitable.
 - Who qualifies as "postsecondary ready" is not consistent between the accountability system and the distinction designations.
 - Badges shouldn't be participation trophies.
- ♦ Suggestions
 - Remove the attendance indicator from distinction designation calculations.
 - Use Closing the Gaps indicators met / indicators evaluated to calculate the closing performance gaps distinction.
 - Do not award a + to a grade for earning a badge.
 - Award badges for graduation plan and endorsements and zero PID errors.