

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on July 29, 2021

The objective of the July 29, 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.
- The committee reviewed Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) and transition table growth models for potential future use in accountability.
 - Questions
 - How would SGPs work for accelerated testers? *An SGP could be assigned to an accelerated tester. They would be compared to other accelerated testers.*
 - Could we consider including various characteristics (e.g., homeless, economically disadvantaged, etc.) when establishing peer groups? *We can research whether other states incorporate these characteristics in SGPs.*
 - Would SGPs remedy the exclusion of students taking Spanish reading in the prior year then English reading in current year by looking at prior year Spanish testers? *Yes.*
 - Would this also allow for a measure between 8th grade reading STAAR and English I end-of-course (EOC)? *Yes.*
 - Is it possible to combine SGPs with another model? *Yes.*
 - Are you thinking that SGPs are valuable on a parent basis or more for overall campus/district/state data? *It's valuable information for administrators and parents.*
 - Why are we thinking about changing the growth measure? *The gain score model is not suited for use with the implementation of the reading/language arts assessment redesign or other substantial changes to the STAAR design.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - In the SGP model, the only commonality the students may have from year to year is their test scores. The student's academic peers may have a significantly different life situation.
 - SGP is used to sort kids, which is more valuable in a sales force than a school.
 - We would like to see modeled data for each of the growth measure models to evaluate the impact on schools performing at various levels with varying circumstances.
- The committee reviewed a 0–4 methodology for future use in the Closing the Gaps domain.
 - Questions
 - Can we consider sliding scale targets that adjust for low and high economically disadvantaged? *The USDE has not approved a state plan with targets such as this.*
 - Can the total possible points be 3 so that if a campus/district earns a 4, they receive a bonus point?

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on July 29, 2021

- Is the student group design also up for discussion? Specifically, breaking each student group into economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged? *This has not been well-received by the U.S. Department of Education.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - The targets seem to be too difficult. A relatively high-performance outcome should be recognized.
 - The long-term goals as they are set are not realistic for many in the shorter term.
 - A campus/district should earn credit if they maintain performance, even if it's less than the interim target.
 - The requirement for the full 4 points should be no different from what currently awards points. If they meet the interim target, they should earn a 4. If we are increasing the difficulty with the gradation, the scaling will need to significantly be adjusted.
 - We need to differentiate the lower performing campuses/districts, not the higher performing.
 - Adding complexities to the system makes it more difficult for smaller school systems that don't have accountability support staff.

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

- Questions
 - Could medical exemptions be considered for exclusion? *Yes.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - Mental health is a big contributor to chronic absenteeism. With COVID being an issue, now might not be the time to evaluate chronic absenteeism.
 - Without the ability to file truancy charges, our resources are limited.
 - We should consider social and emotional learning, fine arts, and other non-assessment indicators.
 - We need to demonstrate that this indicator is tied to achievement.
 - A standardized learning/climate survey should be revisited. It's a non-assessment indicator, and it could provide validity we're looking for.

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

- Questions
 - Why would we not award a full point to those that earn an industry-based certification (IBC) without completing a program of study? *This option is up for discussion.*
 - Could it be half a point for completing the program of study and a full point for the IBC? *This option is up for discussion.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - This proposal makes it even more difficult. It goes against the essence of the bill and the intent of the law. Do not take away IBCs as a full point.

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on July 29, 2021

- If you are talented enough to earn an IBC by taking the test, you should receive credit for the IBC.
- Do not link program completion to certification. Life happens and may inhibit the student from earning the IBC.
- A student can earn a full point by completing a college prep course, which requires far less effort than an IBC.
- Students can earn a full point by simply testing for AP/IB. If we require the program of study *and* an IBC, that is inconsistent.
- A student should earn the district/campus a full point if they either complete the program of study or earn an IBC.