

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on July 27, 2021

The objective of the July 27, 2021, Accountability Technical and Policy Advisory Committee meeting was to discuss the impact of the 87th Texas legislative session as well as the potential inclusion of chronic absenteeism and a revised growth model in future accountability systems. 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.

- TEA welcomed the committee members to the virtual meeting.
- The committee reviewed accountability-related bills from the 87th Texas legislative session.
 - Questions
 - The Senate Bill (SB) 1365 alternative evaluation option must be requested by the district, correct? *Correct.*
 - For SB 1365, will eligible districts be notified by the Agency? *Yes, and we will share this information with ESC support staff.*
- The committee reviewed Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) and transition table growth models for potential future use in accountability.
 - Questions
 - With student growth percentile, is it a sort of norm-referencing of the standards-based assessment? Does this show true growth or group growth? *It shows growth relative to prior-year performance.*
 - When you determine percentile, what is the group? State, comparison group, district, campus? *Students would be compared statewide to students who had the same or very similar scores in the prior year.*
 - Are there many campuses in 2019 that got an A on School Progress, Part A but a B or lower in Student Achievement? *No, there were only 156 campuses statewide.*
 - Are we looking at using one growth model in 2022 and then a different one for reset? *Our thinking is we will continue use the gain score model for 2022 and make any changes in 2023 for the accountability reset.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - Campuses and teachers need to know the target beforehand. It cannot change each year.
 - When setting growth distributions and scaled scores, account for outlier campuses and districts.
 - Some campuses serve a high population of students who had a prior-year Masters Grade Level outcome. These campuses have an advantage in the current system.
 - Districts and campuses should still earn a point if for students who maintain performance.
 - The transition model may be the easiest to understand, but it may not be the best route. The sacrifice of simplicity may be worth it to gain a more precise measure with the SGP method.
 - For districts that give MAP Growth, Conditional Growth Percentile is pretty much the same as SGP. Hundreds of districts and a lot of large districts will be very familiar with the concept.

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on July 27, 2021

- A campus that has high performing students should still get credit for maintaining high performance and credit for growth, but those campuses shouldn't affect the scaling/cut points.
- We can run historical data on SGPs, define what adequate growth is, and build scaling and cut points on "adequate growth."
- The committee reviewed a 0–4 methodology for future use in the Closing the Gaps domain.
 - Questions
 - When you modeled the data, how did 1,246 campuses shift down in a letter grade? Did they not get the full 4 points if they earn a Y in the current system? *No. In order to get the full 4 points, the student group must have met the long-term target. This model shows granularity and is based off the current standards. However, if we choose to implement it, we will need to reset scaling.*
 - Can we redefine what on grade level means? *The TAKS was designed to measure mastery of content, STAAR was put in to place to measure post-secondary readiness, which is why the vertical scale is set to align the Meets Grade Level standard.*
 - How is "baseline" set? *Baseline was actual statewide performance for that student group in 2016–17.*
 - How do we reevaluate the accuracy and reliability of the long-term targets for Closing the Gaps? *As part of the reset, we will reevaluate data and targets. We want AEA-specific student group targets and potentially school-type specific targets.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - Why are we using the long-term target for a 4 in the modeling? *To provide top-end differentiation and to align with ESSA goal-setting.*
 - The accuracy and reliability of the long-term targets for Closing the Gaps should be revisited.
 - This kind of granularity could help with School Improvement focus on the neediest areas.
 - Targets and scaling need to be revisited so that they are fair and reasonable yet challenging.
 - This approach would definitely help dropout recovery schools and school improvement identifications.

The committee reviewed chronic absenteeism for potential future use in the Closing the Gaps domain.

- Questions
 - How would medical absences be accounted for? *We can flag students identified as medically fragile in PEIMS, but we cannot distinguish excused and unexcused absences.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - The federal definition would not work for us.
 - It should be report-only before being included in accountability.

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on July 27, 2021

The committee reviewed the inclusion of career and technical education (CTE) programs of study for future use in accountability.

- Questions
 - Will there be a tracker tool released for students enrolled in programs of study?
Not that we will produce, but you will be able to view auto-coding information through course completion records annually in PEIMS.
- Comments/Concerns
 - If the student did not complete a program of study but did earn an IBC, we may want to consider giving them a full point.
 - The proposal is not in alignment with the spirit of House Bill 773 because it makes it more difficult to earn credit.
 - It should be an either-or option—one point for an IBC or one point for a program of study.