2023 Accountability Advisory Committees
Summary of Meeting on February 9, 2022

The objective of the February 9, 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 (bottom 5%) and not the bare minimum of what is required for federal accountability? *This methodology does the minimum and does not identify additional campuses beyond what is required. Newly identified campuses are significantly less than the 320 count and we cannot exit campuses yearly, so the 481 total includes scale score ties and reidentified campuses.*
    - Can we break out those number then? Break up the newly identified and the reidentified campuses? *Excluding reidentified/progress campuses, modeling includes 156 total newly identified campuses (123 elementaries, 27 middle schools, 4 high schools, and 2 AECs).*
    - When will campuses that were identified as either comprehensive or comprehensive progress in 2019 be eligible for exit? Will this exit criteria begin in 2022, meaning the earliest exit would be 2024? *CSI exit criteria requires two years of data. If the campus was identified in 2019, then 2023 would be the first potential exit year because of COVID.*
    - Alternative education campuses (AEC) must have 67% graduation rate or they will be identified as comprehensive support and improvement (CSI), is that correct? *Correct, but we updated the graduation rate of 67% from a 4-year rate to a 6-year rate. Also, we will continue to make adjustments for AEAs during the 2023 reset year.*
    - With this change in methodology, would targeted support and improvement (TSI) identified campuses lose out of money? *Title I school improvement funds are provided to those campuses who are CSI, not TSI.*
    - Does the breakdown by campus type create any advantages or disadvantages? *It more evenly identifies campuses across campus types.*
    - How long have we had the methodology that all campuses are compared to all campuses? *Since identification began in 2018. For the reset year, we can talk about not using pre-COVID data for TSI/ATS identification.*
    - Can there be a caveat that states that if your campus is a certain economically disadvantaged percentage and hits the economically disadvantaged target but does not hit the targets within the race/ethnicity groups, that campus will not be identified. *We want to talk later about the policy for setting long-term targets and using a "supergroup".*
  - Comments/Concerns
    - Considering school type when identifying makes more sense.
    - It seems to be that the best solution would be to provide funding and support for these campuses instead of exiting them.

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees
Summary of Meeting on February 9, 2022

- AEA Taskforce Recommendations
  - Questions
    - What would happen to a school if they do not meet the new 60% at ages 16+? What services would they be losing? *Nothing. They are not losing any services. AEC programs are locally run and funded. This is solely an accountability label.*
- Closing the Gaps: Targets by Campus Type
  - Questions
    - Why were the targets not set by campus type initially? *The guidance we originally received from the USDE was that it was not an option. Since that time, other states have been granted that authority and now that is what we are pursuing.*
    - Supergroup combines English Learners (ELs), special education, and economically disadvantaged but does it also remove them from race/ethnicity groups? *In Connecticut for example, they only evaluate two groups of students which are the All Students group and High Needs Group (ELs, special education, and economically disadvantaged). Connecticut reports race/ethnicity data where the students are duplicated but they chose to remove race/ethnicity groups, except for all students, and focus on those two groups for school improvement. As student demographics in Texas are quite different than those in Connecticut, we ran an analysis on the overlap of students who would fall in both the All Students group and the High Needs group. Using 2021 demographic data, 26.6% of campuses would have a 90–100% overlap between All Students and High Needs. 77.7% of campuses would have an overlap of at least 50%. Reducing the evaluation focus down to just these two groups would undoubtedly have an impact on these campuses.*
    - Is there a way to exclude students from racial/ethnic groups if they are included in the economically disadvantaged group? *No.*
    - Have we ever looked at the impact of being emergent bilingual/English learner on STAAR outcomes? *We have. The common denominator is economically disadvantaged status.*
    - Are we adding this extra measure to see if House Bill 4545 is working? *This would replace what we already have in Closing the Gaps for elementary and middle schools. This is the area of ESSA where we have a lot of flexibility and we wanted to think of a way to measure something for which we have data.*
  - Comments/Concerns
    - We like the idea of looking at targets over the next 5 years instead of the next 6–10 years. *As a reminder, we will wait for 2022 data before deciding actual targets. Right now, we want policy ideas.*
    - We like the supergroup idea and how that would benefit rural campuses that have the same students who meet multiple indicators.
    - Until we have data from this year and next year, we don't know what the baseline will be. Short-term targets would be better until a better baseline is established.

- I am reluctant to set targets for 10 years out. Given the unknowns, I am afraid of them not being legitimate. I am fine with setting small range targets, but we need to look at the variables that link to teacher shortages and the changes in STAAR (switching to online administration, RLA redesign, etc.). We do not know the implications of these changes yet, so setting targets is difficult. *We must set long-term targets, but there is nothing that prevents us from creating an amendment to our ESSA to change these targets later on.*
- It does look bad that we have different targets for different races/ethnicities, but taking into consideration the limited resources for economically disadvantaged students seems reasonable.
- Without equity measures, the system is applying the same outcome targets and standards which are resulting in highly correlated outcomes to levels of economically disadvantaged.
- The more complex we make this system, the harder it is going to be to keep teachers. If we can keep this simple so we can easily explain it to teachers and stakeholders, we can better recover from some of these struggles and the more engagement we will have. *We agree, the simpler the system is, the better.*
- It makes me nervous to set targets based on student groups because there is a difference in how rural students perform versus urban or suburban.

- Growth: Transition Table Options
  - Comments/Concerns
    - We feel that Meets Grade Level and Masters Grade Level should be able to get a full point for maintenance.
    - It's a minimum expectation to grow from 3rd to 4th grade, for example, so I feel maintaining a performance level does not show growth.
    - The messaging for this growth says that schools are doing the work to grow students throughout their curriculum vertically. Awarding maintenance points is positive for students, teachers, and the campus. We need all the positives we can get.
    - We agree with one point for Meets Grade Level and Masters Grade Level.
    - I think we should give points for maintenance because of learning loss with COVID. However, looking forward, once we are past COVID I would agree with just focusing on growth and not on maintenance.

- School Quality/Student Success: Accelerated Learning Component
  - Comments/Concerns
    - The supergroup idea has the potential to overlook the performance of racial/ethnic groups, which could be a problem. Also, as we keep adding more and more variables into the accountability system, how can the public understand its complexity.
    - I like the accelerated learning verbiage here. Growth expectation is growing your students as expected in a year, but accelerated growth is

growing your students faster. I think awarding points for this accelerated growth makes sense. The only qualm I have is with the supergrouping. I do not think we should group the special education students in with the emergent bilingual students/ELs and the economically disadvantaged. *The grouping example was from Connecticut. We can create groupings and ask for approval from the USDE as we see fit.*

- In the supergroup it makes sense to group the economically disadvantaged and emergent bilingual students/ELs but it does not make as much sense to include special education students. They're such a different population of students. *The grouping example was from Connecticut. We can create groupings and ask for approval from USDE as we see fit.*

- Distinction Designations and Badges
    - Questions
        - What's the difference between a distinction and a badge? *Distinctions re based 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 and based on exemplar performance irrespective of the comparison group.*
        - Can we award badges and/or distinctions for AEAs? *It's not in statue, but it's something that we're continuing to work on though the AEA taskforce.*
    - Comments/Concerns
        - International Baccalaureate schools and schools with a certain percentage of nationally certified teachers might be good for a badge award.
    - Final Questions/Comments
        - In our district, we have a large number of students who are accelerated testers and factored into our STAAR results. There are questions about the standard setting process and how that was developed to equate STAAR performance levels to SAT/ACT. *The methodology can be found at the following link. Those standards for SAT/ACT were not aligned to STAAR outcomes but instead were aligned to postsecondary readiness benchmarks. Additionally, these standards are not being used as a STAAR proxy but instead used meet an ESSA requirement for accelerated testers taking a higher-level assessment in high school.*
        - To review the 2022 accountability updates, the system is mostly unchanged aside from School Improvement identification, AEA campus identification, and the English Language Proficiency component. Is that correct? *Correct.*