

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 15–16, 2018

The objective for the first meeting of the 2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) was to review 2018 accountability results and recommend improvements for the 2019 accountability system and beyond. 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 new members.
- Committee members reviewed results from the 2018 accountability cycle.
 - ♦ Questions
 - What is the difference between the *F* and *Improvement Required* ratings for districts? [Single campus districts were not assigned A–F ratings in 2018. An *Improvement Required* rating for a single campus district in the district summary table would correspond to an *F* rating.]
 - Where did the “three out of four” failure rule come from? [This step was incorporated into the 2018 Accountability Manual in response to a public comment received during the rule adoption process.]
 - How many of the 349 *Improvement Required* campuses received their rating because of this rule? [See page 20 of 20 in the 2018–19 Accountability System Development Document. Three districts and 57 campuses had their overall scaled scores capped at 59 because of this rule.]
 - How will this “three out of four” rule integrate with the rule that multiple *D* ratings will result in an *F* rating for 2019 accountability? [This is TBD.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - Most of the “three out of four” *F* schools would have received *D*s. The accountability system already has punitive monitoring measures for *D*s. Labeling them *F*s seems excessive.
 - ♦ Suggestions
 - Consider waiving the “three out of four” failure rule if the campus meets the target in the Student Achievement domain.
 - In distinction designations, the indicator is defined as “Algebra I by Grade 8 – Participation,” but it’s measured by students taking the EOC. This should be adjusted so the system measures what it claims to be measuring. This is especially relevant when substitute assessments are used in lieu of the Algebra I EOC.
- Committee members reviewed a summary of accountability rating appeals.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Why would a district rated an *A* appeal? [They may have appealed in hopes of receiving a higher scaled score.]

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 15–16, 2018

- What kind of intra-agency conversations is Performance Reporting having with the Student Assessment Division regarding the problems with online testing? [There are ongoing discussions. Online testing problems are not acceptable.]
- Can the agency provide ATAC a list of appeals that have been granted and denied? [Yes. We can provide a summary of granted and denied appeals along with the appeal reason.]
- Can districts appeal based on graduates that should have qualified for CCMR credit in codes 54 or 55 but were assigned something else? [Districts can appeal for any reason. The onus would be on the district to provide documentation that the graduate met all of the requirements to receive one of these specific graduation type codes.]
- ♦ Concerns
 - Agency data collection on online testing interruptions does not capture the scope of the problem.
 - It is difficult to justify excluding a successful assessment result because of online testing interruptions.
 - Districts need better access to TSIA results, particularly when students test at a community college.
 - Districts are not using TSDS PEIMS code 54 or 55 for graduates when it could be appropriate and earn them CCMR credit. The process of recoding them is arduous.
 - There is a larger problem of TSDS PEIMS people and accountability people not speaking the same language at the state and district level.
- ♦ Suggestions
 - Figure out how to award CCMR credit for TSIA exempt students who have been admitted to college. Perhaps an admissions letter can be used as documentation.
 - Allow more time to confirm a graduate's CCMR status after graduation.
- Committee members reviewed the structure of the Closing the Gaps domain and related School Improvement issues.
 - ♦ Questions
 - What are the consequences of being a comprehensive support school every year? [School Improvement can address any questions about multi-year intervention consequences.]
 - Why can't the system use a 6-year graduation rate for AEAs in the Closing the Gaps domain? [This would require a change in our ESSA plan and USDE's approval via an ESSA plan amendment.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - Some AEA campuses are likely to never achieve their accountability targets.

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 15–16, 2018

- ◆ Suggestions
 - Consider bringing back bonus points for AEAs.
- ◆ Recommendation
 - The committee recommended allowing bonus points for the overall rating (up to 10 scaled points) and adjusting the Closing the Gaps graduation rate methodology for AEAs.
- Lizette Ridgeway, Director of the Division of School Improvement, addressed the committee regarding additional targeted, targeted, and comprehensive support and improvement.
 - ◆ Questions
 - When will the agency release the three years of Closing the Gaps data used to identify targeted campuses? [2017 Closing the Gaps domain data tables will be released to districts via TEASE in November.]
 - Will the effective schools framework replace the Texas Accountability Intervention System process? [Yes, some districts are piloting the transition now.]
 - Was there discussion of or change in the documentation that schools are required to submit?
 - Is there any way to merge plans into already required campus improvement plans?
 - What is the timeline for converting campuses?
 - Is there a website where stakeholder input is available?
 - Can service centers receive data at the same time as districts?
 - What will replace PSPs?
 - ◆ Concerns
 - Many districts want to do the right thing, but they know their staff won't engage until they know their status for sure. This dialog needs to be occurring in May or June. Budgeting for the next year starts in January, long before they know their status.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - There should be some sort of early warning system perhaps based on preliminary data released in TEASE.
- The committee reviewed anticipated development of the accountability system for 2019 and beyond.
 - ◆ Questions
 - Who will pay for the higher rigor mathematics assessment in high school for students who took Algebra I in middle school? [Currently there are no state funds to provide to districts to cover these costs.]
 - What happens if students do not take a higher rigor assessment in high school? [TBD, but more than likely the state and/or LEA would be subject to a "lack of compliance" finding.]

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 15–16, 2018

- ◆ Concerns
 - There is very little time to respond to the ESSA requirement that students taking Algebra I before 9th grade take a higher rigor assessment in high school. This will be difficult to implement for 2019 accountability.
 - With no reading progress measure for students transitioning from STAAR in Spanish to English, there is an incentive to hold students back from exiting.
 - There's a potential problem for OnRamps if receiving college credit is a requirement for CCMR credit. Some students reject the college credit after successfully completing the course.
- ◆ Suggestions
 - State statute should be amended to allow the use of Algebra II and English III STAAR EOC results to meet the ESSA requirement.
 - Consider requesting a one-year waiver to the USDE for advanced testers.
 - Including substitute assessments at the Meets Grade Level standard puts parents and schools at odds. It's better to include them at Masters and keep everyone happy.
 - Treat OnRamps as we treat AP.
 - Award CCMR credit for course completion.
 - Get the course data directly from OnRamps rather than from TSDS PEIMS.
 - Change the name for the EL progress measure, as it is easily confused with the STAAR progress measure.
- ◆ Recommendation
 - Award CCMR credit consistently by requiring the completion of one college-level course of three hours whether OnRamps or dual credit, regardless of subject.
 - Follow the same methodology for EL progress measure as last year. Year 1 students excluded, year 2 included.
- Heather Justice, Director of the College, Career, and Military Preparation Division, addressed the committee regarding the pathway of courses and industry-based certifications CCMR components. Also discussed post-secondary certificates, and how they could be included in 2019 accountability if we can get the data.
 - ◆ Questions
 - Will the list of required coursework that leads to the certifications be updated with the approved industry-based certifications list? [The CTE transition plan that awards one-half point credit for CTE coherent sequence graduates with aligned coursework will need to be updated to align with the new adoption and updated timeline for industry-based certifications.]

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 15–16, 2018

- Sara Kohn, Manager of School Financial Performance, addressed the committee regarding financial reporting.
 - ◆ Concerns
 - Charter schools and districts do not belong in the same financial comparison group.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - The TXschools.org reports should somehow account for recapture dollars when presenting annual financial data.

- Michele Stahl, Director of Local Accountability Systems in the Division of Performance Reporting, addressed the committee.
 - ◆ Questions
 - Is there a report available that shows what these LAS proposals look like? [Resources are available [here](#). As plans are finalized, these resources will be updated.]
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - Consider delivering a LAS TETN for prospective districts.

- The committee reviewed accountability reports and data presented on the TXschools.org website and discussed proposed changes to both for 2019 accountability.
 - ◆ Concerns
 - The raw scores are not sufficiently explained in context on the performance pages.
 - Having the scaled score for graduation rate top out at 95 suggests there are five points missing somewhere.
 - The Closing the Gaps targets suggest more homogeneity in student groups than actually exists in reality.
 - It is possible for a single group of students to determine a campus rating according to three sets of Closing the Gaps targets. Consider a campus with 100 percent economically disadvantaged Hispanic students.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - Consider rescaling the system so graduation rate converted scores max out at 100.
 - Consider adding more prominent notice when a district is restricted to a *B* grade by a single *Improvement Required* campus.
 - Consider adding more prominent notice when a campus rating is reduced by the “three out of four” rule.