

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on September 29, 2021

The objective of the September 29, 2021, Accountability Technical and Policy Advisory Committee meeting was to discuss the 2022 accountability rating system and associated school improvement options. 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.

School Improvement (School Improvement staff)

- Questions
 - How would a campus that is a new *D* or *F* fall into these options since they are *Not Rated*? *We will use their scale scores to determine who would have had a D or F even though they are technically Not Rated.*
 - Has there been any discussion as to the online targeted improvement plans (TIPs) and the difficulties accessing them and editing them through ISAM? *We are exploring resolutions to these issues. Reach out to us directly if you need help.*
 - In the past, each campus that needed improvement received financial support. This year, the state kept the federal funds and only awarded \$10,000 per campus. That was a major reduction (cut teachers). Will this be the plan moving forward? *This year we did have a competitive grant that we opened for targeted and additional targeted. Next year we will continue with the school improvement grants.*
 - What is the rationale behind requiring board approval of TIP if it will be maintained locally? *This is driven by Senate Bill 1365 and wanting to make sure our D campuses are following with improvement efforts.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - I thought the whole point of having a not rated option was to put the onus of school improvement and put it entirely on the school districts instead of TEA. It seems like we are going through the motions but only a few of the motions. *The purpose of the Not rated for D or F is to pause the years of consecutive years of unacceptable performance instead of campuses being faced with board of managers or closures. It is not to mask the data from the public or to stop interventions.*
 - Committee filled out survey for SI division.

Senate Bill (SB) 1365

- Questions
 - In regard to the special provision limiting a district rating due to a low campus rating, if the campus uses a scaled score that is above 70 but the other domain that was not used is below a 70, would it limit the district to a *B*? *Yes, a domain not chosen can still impact the district rating. When we do evaluation at the district level, we still use domain scores even if they were not used for the campus's overall rating.*
 - If an alternative education accountability (AEA) campus earns a *D* or *F*, does that limit the district rating to a *B*? *If they earn an F.*

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on September 29, 2021

- Comments/Concerns
 - Publishing scaled scores will affect the morale of staff and impact public perceptions.
 - Using the scaling and expectations set prior to Covid-19 is concerning. I'm concerned about the public perception of issuing scaled scores. *There's not enough data to use to set new baselines at this time. Also, low participation in 2021 for historically underserved student groups would impact scaling. When participation increases for these student groups, using 2021 data absent their participation, could make targets artificially high.*
 - Pre-Covid expectations for a post-Covid world is worth recognizing, but it is important that schools and districts have consequences so that students get the services they need.

SB 15

- Questions
 - What about the students who are not funded? How are they reported? *There will be crisis codes.*
 - Districts who decide to send their students somewhere else will still be accountable for those students? *Yes. If the students remain enrolled in your district, they will be included in your calculations.*
 - Will the student be attributed to the home district? *Yes.*
 - Can students be attributed to more than one campus? *No.*
 - Are there virtual programs that have their own county-district-campus number? *Potentially. This is under discussion.*
 - In the absence of state funding, how can they be included in accountability? In many cases, this is a parent decision not a district one. *The district is choosing to allow them to participate virtually. These are the students that we really need to monitor. The Department of Ed requires us to report and include students regardless of average daily attendance eligibility.*
 - Might the use of hold harmless be useful in some way in this matter of unfunded students? *SB 15 does not specifically allow for unfunded students to be excluded from the evaluation. SB 15 specifies that the program evaluation must include full-time virtual students regardless if they are enrolled in a virtual program established by the bill.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - The fact that students must meet Approaches in the previous year to participate virtually could set up a false narrative that students are doing better in virtual schools.
 - Most of our students whose parents want them in a virtual program are not eligible for funding.
 - We are expecting a high number of unfunded virtual students due to parental demand.

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on September 29, 2021

Student Achievement, School Progress, and Closing the Gaps Domains

○ Questions

- Do you anticipate any impacts to CCMR with reduced opportunities for students like CTE and military being removed? *Military was nominal. CTE 9% statewide. The other indicators either saw an increase or a nominal decrease between 2019 to 2020 graduates.*
- Could we treat growth the same way we did TELPAS this year? Compare 2021 to 2022 if available or 2019 to 2022 if not? *Statewide we had 89% RLA participation and 88% in mathematics. That is the rough base of the percentage of students who may be eligible for a growth measure in 2022. We are restricted by the fact that we need two data points. That means 6th graders would be the earliest we could do that (going back to their 3rd grade in 2019 and this year in 6th); the further we move from the first test, the less accuracy we have.*

○ Comments/Concerns

- For Relative Performance, I am concerned about the validity of the cut scores since they were set before Covid. *This is a consistent challenge this year since our baselines were set on 2016–17.*
- Some of our middle school campuses had less than 50% test in 2021.
- The student-level progress measure is a concern since a two-year measure was used this year and a one-year measure will be used next year.
- Continuing to use multiple years with a hold harmless for ELP seems to be the best thing to use for students and districts.
- I see a potential impact on exiting students too early if we go back to 2019 for ELP.
- Military may be nominal across state but in a rural district with a graduating class of 9 and 3 who enlisted, it makes a large impact. I know that gathering data is a problem, but some solution is needed. *The Legislature continues to work on other statutory options. Until they pass a bill that updates the statute, we are linked to actual enlistment.*
- Growth is what we rely on each year. Losing the growth measure for the kids who chose to not take the STAAR in 2021 will hurt districts like us. We had 81% of our kids test.

Distinction Designations

○ Questions

- Can we use distinctions as an opportunity to recognize *D* schools with indicators in the top quartile?
- Where would accelerated students using SAT/ACT fit into these indicators? *Accelerated testers' outcomes are included in the STAAR performance indicators at the corresponding performance level.*
- Could the concept of a Q1 "rating" be bridged into other areas? *We can make a note of this and discuss it as part of 2023 accountability reset.*

○ Comments/Concerns

2022 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on September 29, 2021

- Distinctions should be used more than they are to showcase campus successes and improve public perception of schools.

Miscellaneous Questions and Discussion

- Questions
 - Could we have an extra year to prepare for 100% online testing? *That would be a question to pose to Student Assessment. There does need to be a discussion about concerns with infrastructure to keep up with online testing.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - Add contextual data to TXschools.gov, such as change in attendance data or enrollment data, teacher attendance data, and other indicators that help parents understand why the campus/district isn't performing well. Learning loss data would also be helpful to add as context for the public.
 - I appreciate the availability of data to combat the subjective perceptions among the public.