

2021 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on April 28, 2021

The objective of the April 28, 2021 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) and Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) meeting was to solicit feedback on solutions to address the unique challenges due to COVID-19 and discuss ideas for the 2023 accountability system reset. 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 the accountability reset timeline and the impact of COVID-19.
 - Timeline
 - The accountability system reset framework will be released in May 2022 for implementation in the 2022–23 school year.
 - Targets will likely be released fall 2022 after processing 2022 STAAR data.
 - COVID-19 Impact
 - Missing STAAR data may limit modeling to 2021 and 2022 results.
 - Low 2021 participation rates may limit our ability to model small student groups.
 - TEA will only have one year (2021 to 2022) of data to use for growth modeling, which may be impacted by low 2021 participation rates.
 - Class of 2020 and 2021 CCMR and graduation data may be impacted by COVID-19.
 - Questions
 - Will campuses and districts earn the same letter grade in 2022 as they did in 2019? **No. The goal is to maintain the current system with as few changes as possible for 2022.**
 - Can we calculate growth differently for 2022, until the reset occurs? **We will discuss 2022 accountability after we have processed 2021 accountability data.**
 - What is the plan for 2022 accountability? **We'll have to evaluate the data once it is available before making decisions about 2022.**
 - Concerns
 - The impact of COVID-19 on end-of-course (EOC) exemptions will need to be considered when targets are set.
 - Using current rules and targets to make high stakes decisions does not seem fair or helpful. We should do something significant to adjust for or modify the 2022 accountability system and how that impacts labels and interventions.
 - We need to think about the impact that COVID-19 has had on staff.
 - TEA flexibility should be a possibility as we continue to help students and teachers through the pandemic recovery.

2021 Accountability Advisory Committees Summary of Meeting on April 28, 2021

- The committee reviewed potential Closing the Gaps reset ideas.
 - Gradated outcomes for student group targets. This could allow districts to demonstrate growth to the target.
 - Develop new baselines for student group targets, due to COVID-19.
 - Develop unique student group targets for dropout prevention and recovery schools (DPRS).
 - Questions
 - Why was the 0-4 points idea suggested? TEA wants to increase the accountability system’s ability to differentiate among campuses and provide campuses additional opportunities to demonstrate improvement (growth, meeting an interim target).
 - How would schools be identified for improvement with a 0–4-point system? If we implemented the 0–4 point system, the process for identifying schools for improvement would be reworked. Performance Reporting would welcome recommendations from APAC and ATAC on identifying campuses for interventions.
 - Can you provide what each point would represent? This has not been decided yet.
 - Can districts and campuses earn full points for hitting the growth target? This would likely not be approved by the USDE.
 - Can we reduce the number of student groups in the federal and state system to the minimum number of student groups required to comply with the federal system? Unlikely. If a student group meets minimum size, we are required to include it. We already exclude continuously enrolled, non-continuously enrolled, and former special education for the federal system. We are open to exploring the “supergrouping” option for smaller groups.
 - Is TEA considering changing the weighting for College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) in each domain? No.
 - What if we find the original targets are too high? We cannot evaluate pre-COVID targets until we receive post-COVID data. We will have this data in August 2021.
 - Can we weigh the economically disadvantaged student group outcomes more heavily in Closing the Gaps than the race/ethnicity? We can consider this.
 - Is it possible for us to self-report local norm-referenced growth data? There are a few challenges with this idea—timing of data collections as well as federal requirements, such as national recognition and comparability. It is something we can explore for the future, though.
 - Concerns

2021 Accountability Advisory Committees Summary of Meeting on April 28, 2021

- 2019 targets should be used with the expectation that campuses and districts work towards performing at those levels again post-COVID.
- Targets should be lowered or maintained until more data is available.
- New item types on STAAR may impact results.
- Using one year of outcomes to set targets is not ideal.
- Current exit criteria makes exiting school improvement status more difficult than entering.
- We do not know what the academic landscape looks like for 2022.
- We need to try to account for the unique challenges that districts and campuses are facing.
- The degree of poverty should be evaluated in regards to COVID impact and resetting targets.
- The committee reviewed Closing the Gaps reset ideas for elementary and middle schools.
 - Incorporating a non-STAAR School Quality/Student Success (SQSS) indicator.
 - Questions
 - Do we know the overlap of mobility and chronic absenteeism in Texas? **We can provide this data. In Texas, we define mobility independently of absenteeism. If we used chronic absenteeism, we would establish minimum inclusion requirements.**
 - In which domain would chronic absenteeism be placed? **Chronic absenteeism would be a school quality and student success indicator within Closing the Gaps.**
 - What programs are states using to support chronic absenteeism improvement? **Some states have done innovative things to improve student attendance (texting parents, educating parents, district-wide campaigns, engaging with community partners). We also recommend [attendanceworks.org](https://www.attendanceworks.org) if you are curious about what other districts have done.**
 - Concerns
 - Chronic absenteeism would reidentify schools that are already identified.
 - Parents control attendance, not schools.
 - Chronic absenteeism needs to be a carrot and not a stick. The most successful student attendance programs are reward/incentive based.
 - We need to consider how remote learning has impacted chronic absenteeism rates.
 - In some cases, the inputs that lead to better outcomes merit credit in the accountability system. It takes time for inputs to create measurable changes. In the meantime, inputs should be valued.
- The committee reviewed School Progress reset ideas.

2021 Accountability Advisory Committees Summary of Meeting on April 28, 2021

- Academic Growth
- Questions
 - Can we explore a value-add model? **We can explore it as an option. We'll just want to keep the complexity in mind for explanatory purposes.**
- Concerns
 - Our current growth model may need to be revised to a more flexible model such as a student growth percentile.
 - Due to the unique circumstances for districts and the difficulties with properly accounting for COVID-impacted data, we may want to consider treating 2022 as a transitional year.
- Relative Performance
- The committee reviewed legislative updates from the 87th legislative session.
 - Academic accountability is not a large focus.
 - No significant changes to the system.
 - Noteworthy bills regard the following:
 - Alternative education accountability
 - Additional CCMR indicators
 - *Not Rated* labels for declared disasters
 - Remote learning programs
 - Removing various assessments
- The committee reviewed the timeline for a follow up meeting this summer.