

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 8, 2022

The objective of the February 8, 2022, Accountability Technical and Policy Advisory Committee meeting was to discuss minor updates to the 2022 accountability rating system and the 2023 accountability rating system reset. TEA responses to questions and concerns are provided in *italics*. Some questions require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the meeting.

- Welcome, Meeting Norms, and Agenda
- 2022 Accountability System, Federal Identification Updates
 - Questions
 - Why are we identifying more than 320 campuses? *This is due to ties with scaled scores and campus reidentifications that make the count exceed 320. Several campuses are tied at the 5% scaled score cutoff. Also, many of these campuses are reidentified following their initial 2018 identification.*
 - A campus will have up to 6 years before they will be escalated to comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) based on additional targeted support (ATS), correct? *Yes. Three years to become TSI and then three years as ATS.*
 - To clarify, does the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) require identifying the lowest 5% by school type or just lowest 5% of all Title I campuses? *ESSA requires 5% of all Title I campuses.*
 - What is happening to those historical ATS campuses? *As part of our ESSA amendment we will request that campuses identified as ATS in 2022, 2023, and 2024 would then will be escalated to CSI in 2024. We want to drop 2018 and 2019 because they are pre-COVID.*
 - Will this change the school improvement requirements for additional targeted? *That is a question for School Improvement.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - The changes to the ATS methodology are welcome.
 - ATS has a much better methodology. This will identify the lowest campuses whereas with the old methodology we had some of our B and C campuses as ATS.
- 2023 Accountability System, Closing the Gaps: Targets by Campus Type
 - Questions
 - Will Texas be requesting additional changes to our ESSA plan pursuant to the draft USDE revised federal rules that encourage things like considering high stakes of assessments and modifying indicators, for example, eliminating a summative rating? *No. There will be no D or F ratings in Closing the Gaps domain or overall and since we have data to evaluate all parts of the Closing the Gaps domain, we will be able to run the federal system and allow campuses the opportunity to exit school improvement status.*
 - We need targets by campus type because STAAR standards for lower grades are much higher than for upper grades. Will TEA be addressing the STAAR standards disparity across grades? *This is something the agency can investigate.*

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 8, 2022

- Will we also have varying targets for economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged? *No, the USDE will not approve that. What we can do is utilize the concept of a “supergroup” of students, where we have All Students and the supergroup, which consists of economically disadvantaged, special education, and emergent bilingual students/English learners. The issue with supergrouping in Texas is that 26.6% of campuses would have a 90–100% overlap between All Students and the supergroup. 77.7% of campuses would have an overlap of at least 50%.*
- How many states set their Academic Achievement targets at the college readiness standards? *All states are required to set their standards at proficiency level. STAAR Meets Grade Level standards are proficiency and aligned to postsecondary readiness standards. In our initial submission to the USDE, the state plan included Approaches. The USDE denied the use of Approaches and required Meets.*
- Which state has the greatest number of economically disadvantaged students? *New Mexico and Mississippi are incredibly high. Top 10 childhood poverty states in decreasing order: MS, NM, LA, AR, WV, AL, KY, SC, TN, OK, TX*
- Is the long-term target going to earn 4 points in the Closing the Gaps domain? *Yes, the long-term target will be the 4 points.*
- What is the difference between a 0 and a 1? *Zero is no growth. A 1 would be at least 0.1 percent increase from the previous year.*
- Where does Texas fall across the nation in terms of college readiness? *It depends on what you define as college ready. We do well on some tests and average or below average on others.*
- Are there a lot of districts asking for differentiation? *A number of districts have approached the commissioner and other TEA staff noting that they want recognition for growth toward the target. Districts set board goals based on Closing the Gaps data.*
- How tied are we to the name “Closing the Gaps”? *Domain 3 is already confusing to school boards, etc. and it is very different from what the public considers closing the achievement gaps. Closing the Gaps is named in statute.*
- Some Texas Tier 1 Universities are not requiring ACT and SAT scores as an entrance requirement. Do we need to revisit what colleges want, and what is “college ready”? *This is true; however, Texas public universities still require incoming students to meet the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) standards before taking college-level courses.*
- Why are we resetting the targets now? *My concern is we are acting like COVID never happened. We have to set long-term and interim targets per the USDE. With everything going on with COVID and the STAAR redesign we are trying to make sure that we consider fairness while meeting the USDE requirements. We cannot have the targets set to where we were 5 years ago. We can consider them as interim targets, but*

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 8, 2022

we need to have an aspirational target per the commissioner and legislature. Targets should be reasonable and aspirational.

- Comments/Concerns
 - I think we also need to take the STAAR redesign into consideration, especially with the shift in reading/writing. *We will as soon as the field test data comes to the agency this summer. Also, as a reminder, our psychometric team will equate, scale, and standard set the RLA to align outcomes with the previous STAAR outcomes.*
 - I think part of the variation in the campus outcomes is the lack of foundational instruction the elementary students have had due to COVID. Middle school students had several years of foundational instruction prior to the COVID interruptions.
 - Our biggest issue continues to be the high target for the Asian subgroup since the majority, if not all, of our Asian students are asylees/refugees. *Incorporating the growth credit in a 0–4 system will account for missing the target if they are improving. If they are growing toward the target, they will be awarded credit in the system.*
 - The standards in Texas at the Meets Grade Level are higher than other states who are trying to meet a proficiency level. While this is noble, it currently creates a system that provides many strikes against campuses.
 - Anytime you use the state average to create targets that are then applied to Title I schools, it creates problems. Can we set targets for Title I and non-Title I? *75% of campuses in Texas are Title I with nearly all elementaries. It would not provide a significant differentiation.*
 - The 60x30 plan is the “north star” for guiding standards in Texas. Given COVID, that 2030 timeline may need to be adjusted, and if so, we need to adjust our long-term targets.
 - I don’t think we can set long-term targets right now without seeing data for the next few years. Let’s just set interim goals and then come back in two years and set long-term targets.
 - Our recommendation is to pull back the long-term goals for growth by campus type because this hits the campuses with the K–3 grade level since they do not have growth.
 - I think differentiation in the system with the 4 points is a great idea, as long as the grading scale is set within reason of campuses earning 2s and 3s.
- Growth: Transition Table Options
 - Questions
 - Do you have this data for economically and non-economically disadvantaged students? *Yes, we modeled the data and economically disadvantaged did not show as much growth.*
 - Why not a Masters Low to Master High band? *The scale score band is too small in the Meets/Masters Grade Level to divide into two. It is also unreasonable to create bands within Meets and Masters because our tests are getting shorter and shorter. We found this especially true in the tests for higher grade levels.*

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 8, 2022

- We used to award points for successful transition from Spanish to English reading and math. Will we be resuming that? *With this proposed methodology, that would be possible. We did not continue the previous Spanish to English proxy because it was a net negative statewide.*
- Why would the inclusion of the Spanish to English proxy be a net negative for the state? *It wasn't only for successful transitions. Results were included in the denominator without regard to if they were awarded points in the numerator.*
- For students in the “chance” area, how are they included in this transition table? *Just one question better than chance will make a student in “Did Not Meet Low” to “Did Not Meet Low”.*
- Would accelerated learning only be for reading and mathematics? If a student failed 8th grade mathematics and/or reading would they be a part of this component since the next test is in high school? *Yes, only reading and mathematics and we would only have this for up to grade 8.*
- Do we know how Texas ranks in terms of child poverty? *Top 10 childhood poverty states in decreasing order: MS, NM, LA, AR, WV, AL, KY, SC, TN, OK, TX.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - I think we should award points for maintenance.
 - I am not sure on the issue of awarding zero points for maintaining Masters Grade Level and receiving a half point. I feel if they stay at Masters, then it should automatically be a 1 point like it is in the current system. *Our goal is to show growth. Making this change may increase the correlation between performance and growth.*
 - It is difficult to maintain students at Masters Grade Level.
 - Staying at Meets and Masters should be rewarded more than staying at Did Not Meet High, etc.
 - We have been telling districts to maintain Masters in order to get 1 point for growth. I think if we do not have that option for maintaining Masters, then we are setting ourselves up at having some upset districts and charters.
 - It might be easier to show growth in the next few years as opposed to years from now. We are not sure how the pandemic will affect instruction moving forward.
- School Quality/Student Success: Accelerated Learning Component
 - Questions
 - We are adding another STAAR based measure? *No, this is a proposed replacement for the current STAAR component for elementaries and middle schools.*
 - Are climate or learning condition surveys still under consideration as a non-STAAR indicator? *We have discussed surveys for a number of years and the feedback is very mixed.*
 - If we are rethinking our ESSA plan, how do we engage with the options for non-STAAR measures that are allowed? *We continue to work toward*

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 8, 2022

- that. Most states use chronic absenteeism, which COVID has thrown a wrench into.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - I'd like more info on the Extra/Cocurricular Advisory Committee. What it is and what they are charged with? *Additional information is available at the following [link](#).*
 - I think a supergroup would be needed for the accelerated learning indicator. *Agreed. Racial/ethnic groups limited to only prior year non-passers will create a small numbers issue.*
 - If the idea is another way to get growth into Closing the Gaps, this accelerated learning component seems like a solid plan. I also like the suggestion that was brought up about making this a separate distinction designation.
 - I would like to see us include some non-STAAR measures. *We are open to ideas but need to make sure the data is gathered for all campuses/districts, is available to the agency, it is valid, and reliable.*
 - Distinction Designations and Badges
 - Questions
 - What's the difference between a distinction and a badge? *Distinctions are in statute and awarded based on performance on the top 25% of your campus comparison group. Badges do not use campus comparison groups and are similar to Blue Ribbon School designations. We can award badges to campuses based on exemplar performance irrespective of the comparison group.*
 - Does the public know the difference between a distinction and a badge? *Right now, no. Defining and delineating distinctions and badges will be a task for the subcommittee.*
 - Not sure on the "participation on agency initiatives" for a badge. They can participate but are they performing well on those? *This is something we need to discuss with the commissioner and the subcommittee.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - Small districts might have issues with the fine arts badges.
 - I would like to see badges for workforce certifications and for completing Programs of Study.
 - Final Questions/Comments
 - Is the change to the district rating methodology no longer being discussed? *That is still an issue we're working on. While we can create a district rating based off the campuses' grades using proportional weighting, it gets much more difficult to do that at the domain level. We've been told by our legal staff that if we update the methodology at the overall level, we must do the same at the domain level and that is much harder to do since not all campuses are rated in every domain within a district.*