Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Taskforce

January 11, 2022, Zoom Meeting Notes
Attendees

Juan Cabrera, *PSP Partners*

Julie Conde, *Responsive Education Solutions*

Chris Duke, *Office of the Lieutenant Governor*

Carolyn Hanschen, *Austin ISD*

Joseph Mena, *Texans Can Academy*

Syndi Mitchell, *Office of the Governor*

James Ponce, *Texans Can Academy*

Melissa Ruffin, *University of Texas University Charter School*

Craig Shapiro, *PSP Partners*

Theresa Urrabazo, *San Antonio ISD*

Leslie Brady, *TEA: Performance Reporting*

Samantha Caswell, *TEA: Performance Reporting*

Joel Leagans*, TEA: School Improvement*

Bruce Marchand, *TEA: Charter Schools*

Stacy McDonald, *TEA: Performance Reporting*

Heather Smalley, *TEA: Performance Reporting*

Cynthia Wu, *TEA: Performance Reporting*

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Taskforce

January 11, 2022 Meeting Notes

Welcome/Introductions/Updates

- Question: Were there any AEA campuses eligible for the Senate Bill (SB) 1365 *Acceptable* rating? I felt the participation rate prevented AEAs from being approved for an acceptable rating.
    - TEA: Yes, out of the 88 campuses that were eligible for an *Acceptable* rating, 9 were AEA campuses (8 Droupout Recovery Schools).
- Comment from TEA: We should leave here today with our skeleton for the AEA Accountability System. I have a meeting with the commissioner on January 24th and the Governor's Office on the 26th where we will be bringing the proposals as well as the data that supports these proposals for approval.

2023 Accountability Reset

- For the 2023 Accountability Reset, we are still needing to make decisions on the following topics:
    - Scaling/target adjustments as needed
    - Growth methodology revision
    - Adjustments to Closing the Gaps
        - 0-4 methodology instead of Y/N for each indicator
        - Addition of a non-STAAR indicators such as chronic absenteeism (slow phase-in likely)
        - ELP targets by school type (possibly for all indicators)
    - Alignment of district rating with its campuses' ratings
        - Note from taskforce: Let's be sure we keep in mind the impact of DRS on district.
    - Closer alignment with federal school improvement label and overall grade
- Question: Will they be tweaking the methodology for chronic absenteeism?
    - TEA: Yes, we would want to refine the methodology. We have the ability to define chronic absenteeism as we want.
- Question: Can you verify that we will have a consecutive/nonconsecutive definition for chronic absenteeism? We have so many students coming and going.
    - TEA: Yes, we will have to create a subset for the students.
- Comment: I am often trying to explain mobility vs. chronically absent. So, we need to make sure there is a differentiation.
- Comment: We noticed that the attendance rate in the TAPR is not correct, and we checked the glossary, and it is not correct.
    - TEA: Yes, that was an error on TEA's part. We had an error in the glossary. The attendance rate is the average of the 4 highest six weeks. The glossary has been corrected and reuploaded.
- Question: Are you referring to the district scales and campus scales? (Referring to alignment of district and campus ratings)
    - TEA: You can see a disconnect between the district ratings and the campus ratings. We have districts with a *B*, but the campuses have *C*s and *D*s. I would say the root cause is

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Taskforce

the scaling specifically with CCMR at the district level. Elementaries and middle schools reflect lower ratings because of this.

- Question: Will ATAC/APAC get to be part of the discussion about federal label and overall grade?
  - TEA: Yes, that is part of our February meeting.
- Question: Results Driven Accountability (RDA) is too extensive. Is there any discussion about implementing changes to the RDA process?
  - TEA: Yes, there are changes coming.
- Discussion about 2022 DRS/AEC labels:
  - TEA: We are getting rid of the AEC of Choice label. If you have a campus that is not eligible for the 60% age 16+, you can apply to be a discretionary DRS. This is for campuses that offer the services and meet the other AEA criteria, but do not meet the age established in statute. We will only have DRS and RTF campuses on the final AEA list this year.

Review Performance and Growth Proposals

- Student Achievement: STAAR Methodology
  - Numerator – 1 pt for Approaches, 2 pts for Meets, 3 pts for Masters
  - Denominator – STAAR assessments (all subjects)
- Student Achievement: CCMR and Completion Rate Methodology
  - Numerator – Annual graduates that accomplish PLUS previous dropouts that accomplish
  - Denominator – Annual graduates (exclude previous dropouts)
  - This encourages dropout recovery with no penalty.
- School Progress: Academic Growth Proposal
  - Use the same methodology from regular accountability system and update with standard accountability reset updates.
  - Use the better of A or B for School Progress like the regular system.
- School Progress: Retest Growth Proposal
  - Use current STAAR AEA Bonus Point methodology.
  - Numerator – 1 pt for Approaches and above STAAR EOC retesters
  - Denominator – STAAR EOC retests
- Question: Are we changing the definition of a previous dropout?
  - TEA: That is something we can continue to look at. I know recently we went back and started excluding returning adults for CCMR, but we can look back at data and determine a new definition if we would like.
- Question: Why aren't the students who are in a DRS all considered dropouts?
  - TEA: A majority of the students served in DRS are technically dropout prevention. The students have not been officially coded as a dropout in PEIMS.
- Recommendation: Use another term other than "bonus".
  - TEA: We will remove that term from the slides.
- Question: What we are saying is we are using the AEA bonus points methodology for Part B?
  - TEA: Yes, this is the second part of growth looking at retesters. This will be better of Growth (same growth as traditional accountability system) and AEA Bonus Points methodology.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Taskforce

- Question: Is there a reason why we cannot look at growth from same test to same test? We could see how many more TEKS a student knows or something.
    - TEA: We can reach out and ask.
- Question: These retesters are already included in Domain 1. So now we are including them as their own indicator?
    - TEA: Yes, because a majority of testers in AEA campuses are retesters. Students who test multiple times in a testing cycle are not included in D2B. Students must have a test in the prior year and test again in the current year to be a retester.
- Concern/Question: We will have 9th graders who have never tested, so these students could have been retesters but are now first-time testers. Will this skew our data because they look like first time testers even though they took this course a couple years ago? We do not want to penalize students who chose not to test due to COVID and other reasons.
    - TEA: The definition of a retester is a student who has a scored assessment in a previous cycle. They will not fall in this new domain until they have a prior year assessment.
- Recommendation: We could include students who got credit for a course and tested in a later year in the denominator for D2B.
    - TEA: We could look at data between course completion and who did/did not test.
- TEA Comment: Statewide, English I and English II EOC are the only subjects that saw an increase in outcomes during our COVID year. Data reflects a large drop in the number of E1/E2 retesters.
- Question: If we have time at the end of the meeting, can we have a discussion about IGC?
    - TEA: Yes, we can do that.

Closing the Gaps

- We use Closing the Gaps to flow in data from other portions of the system. This domain meets the ESSA requirements and any changes require an amendment to our state ESSA plan. An AEA specific plan in this domain has been approved in other states, so I am confident that what we propose can get approved.
- Overarching ideas for DRS in Closing the Gaps include:
    - Develop DRS-specific indicators that measure outcomes for previous dropouts, completion rates, and CCMR along with indicators that meet ESSA requirements.
    - Reset weight and targets for DRS
    - Propose student group targets that are unique DRS
    - Implement 0-4 in place of Y/N
    - Pull out DRS and identify the bottom 5% separately for comprehensive support
- Closing the Gaps Proposed Methodology
    - Academic Achievement
        - STAAR Reading/Math at Meets Grade Level (5%)
        - STAAR D1 data (95%)
    - Graduation Rate
        - 4-year federal graduation rate with growth built in (5%)
        - 4-year federal completion rate with growth built in (95%)
        - Default to Retest Growth (retester data) if no 4-year rates
    - English Language Proficiency
        - Same as traditional system

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Taskforce

- School Quality/Student Success
    - ~~CCMR – with non-graduating 12th graders in denominator (5%)~~
    - CCMR – with graduates in the denominator (95%)
        - Note: When we ran a data analysis after the meeting, we found less than half of AEA campuses would meet minimum size (10) in the non-graduating CCMR indicator. We will come back to this when we are modeling student targets to see if AEA-specific targets alone can address this issue.
- Comment: I am very appreciative that you took the time to look at the data and realize how inappropriate it is that there is such a discrepancy between AEAs and traditional campuses. Something needs to counter the idea that these are such bad schools by looking at the data. Include up front that other states have a different system for these types of schools.
    - TEA: We will make sure to show the populations of these campuses and their retests, CCMR, graduation, etc. I know of two states that have an AEA specific system. Part of the data that I point out to the commissioner is that these students are more likely to drop out, and it is a positive thing what we are doing here for these campuses.
- Question: Will these numbers of *A-F* campuses stay the same when weighting/scaling change with this 0-4 methodology.
    - TEA: We will see a slight change, but not a drastic one. We are not trying to lower every district/campus's outcomes.
- Question: So we cannot use the Approaches Grade Level in the Closing the Gaps Academic Achievement?
    - TEA: We cannot use Approaches in the Closing the Gaps Academic Achievement because the USDE does not see it as passing. Meets is the required level in this indicator. We have the discretion to weight within an indicator. So, we can weight the STAAR Reading/Math at Meets grade level at 5% and weight STAAR D1A data at 95%.
- Concern: Many campuses will not have Algebra I and English I already taken by students, so my fear is that it is going to look like a lot more students are failing when in reality we had student who took a course and did not test until a year or so later. Especially with the number of students returning after having their learning interrupted. It is an absentee issue, not an academic issue.
    - TEA: I think that we will have to revisit the STAAR data over the next few years, because it will not follow the traditional pattern of who is testing and not testing because of COVID.
- Concern: On the ELP indicator, for DRS campuses not attached to an ISD, it is important for us to gain access to this data for our transfer students.
    - TEA: Yes, we have asked the vendor for a robust TELPAS history to go with the STAAR history for transfer students.
- As DRS campuses tend to have a higher number of non-graduating 12th graders (continuers), can we make the federal requirement for CCMR denominator the 5% and can we use our own denominator definition the 95%?
    - TEA: Yes, we can suggest non-graduating 12th graders in the denominator at 5% and graduates in the denominator at 95%.
        - See data note above. We need to revisit this during scaling/target time.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Taskforce

- How should we weight the components? 30/30/30/10? Same as current?
  - Comment: I think the ELP in Closing the Gaps should be weighted a little more.
  - Comment: Something else we should consider, is the closer we stay in alignment with the traditional system, does that help us get what we accomplished?
  - TEA: When we come back and run data with 2022, we can decide if we want to change the weights.

Next Steps/Outstanding Topics

- Continue to explore distinction designation possibility
  - Attendance
  - Advanced diploma plans (current AEA bonus points)
- Updates to school improvement
  - Align SI and overall grade more closely
  - Consider AEA specific interventions
  - Develop an intervention framework specifically for DPRS
  - RDA AEA-specific interventions
  - Dedicated alternative education unit at TEA

Closing Remarks/Questions

- IGCs
  - Concern: We had the question come up of why were IGCs created.. If we do not get a handle on overuse, my fear is there will be something put in place where there could be a reduction in accountability if there is a certain percentage of IGCs on campuses.
  - Comment to above: I thought it was put in place that this was not to be implemented until 12th grade. It can be discussed in 11th grade but implemented in 12th grade.
  - Question: Where is this information about IGCs located?
    - TEA: IGC data can be found [here](#). It is published by Research.
- Question: Can you share the data with us that you will be sharing with the commissioner?
  - TEA: Yes, once I share the slides with the commissioner, I will send them to you all. Much of the data are what we have covered before. You can also find data in the slides using the analytic portal. Just FYI, it is raw STAAR data.
- District and Campus Ratings
  - Comment: Districts should stand on their own rating, instead of standing on their campus ratings because of DRS campuses.
  - Comment: The accountability system is skewed in favor of campuses/districts with CCMR.
  - TEA: Programmers have worked with different weighting with CCMR, but we have not made a decision yet.
  - Comment: What role do DRS campuses play in district overall ratings? We need to get ahead of it and get something in place. DRS campuses should not be used when calculating the district rating.