

Texas Accountability Advisory Group Meeting

March 25, 2025

Performance Reporting Policy & Communications Team





Katherine Beck

Performance Reporting Division Director



Cindy Phelps

Accountability Research Coordinator



Daniel Brown

Training & Outreach Coordinator



Linda Johnson

Accountability Content Coordinator



TAAG March 2025 Agenda

- Welcome & Introductions || Norms and Expectations
- 2025, 2026 Manual Rulemaking: publication timeline
- 2028 A-F Refresh
 - Updates on previous proposals (MS Accelerated Testers)
 - Share and get feedback on HS Accelerated Testers proposal
 - Share and get feedback on Relative Performance proposal
 - Gather ideas on updates to Distinction Designations
 - Review first round of data checks results
- Reminder of public feedback form
- Upcoming TAAG Topics
- Meeting Closure

Today's Warm-Up

- 1. Name
- 2. Role/Organization
- 3. What's your ideal Spring Break vacation?







- Participate in Discussions
- Ask Questions
- Be feedback-oriented
- Prioritize student-centered approaches
- Maintain regular communication!



- Identify broader potential improvements to the academic accountability system.
- Bring creative solutions and best practices to the group for discussions.
- Provide both synchronous and asynchronous feedback in a timely manner.
- Assess the impact of legislation and stakeholder feedback on the academic accountability system.
- Serve as a spokesperson for Texas school districts and open-enrollment charter schools to provide recommendations to the TEA



2025, 2026 Manual Rulemaking: Publication Timeline



- As was shared in our last meeting public comment period for the Accountability Rating System Manual for 2025 Ratings closed on 02/10/25.
 - Available comments were reviewed at TAAG meeting on 02/10/25.
 - Full comment and responses will be available on the Accountability Manual webpage on Thursday, March 27th.
- Public comment period for the Accountability Rating System Manual for 2026 Ratings will open on April 18 and close on May 19 as outlined in the graphic below.



Initial Considerations for Continuous Improvement of A–F System



Based on recommendations and feedback from the previous refresh and public comments on previous rules, the agency is focusing on seven initial considerations for the 2028 Refresh:

#	Change Under Consideration					
1	Targets and Cut Scores Update Using New Baselines	 Description: Use most recent year data as baseline to update targets and cut scores across the A–F system. Includes cut scores for domains. (Note: Does not include cut scores for STAAR performance levels, e.g., "Meets Grade Level") Purpose: Align with statutory requirements to "modify standards to continuously improve student performance, eliminate achievement gaps, ensure Texas is a national leader in preparing students for postsecondary success" 				
2	Integration of RDA into A–F	 Description: Determine data sources and methodologies to incorporate RDA into Domain 3 of A–F Purpose: Align federal reporting requirements, reduce duplication of data reporting, and create consistent focus across the state on special population performance improvements. 				
3	Differential Weighting of CCMR Indicators	 Description: Explore different weighting within and across existing CCMR indicators Purpose: Better align methodology of CCMR indicators to post-graduation outcomes 				
4	Variables for Relative Performance	 Description: Investigate and model different campus demographic variables for Domain 2 comparison of relative performance Purpose: Determine whether additional demographic factors besides % eco. dis. should be used in Domain 2b 				
5	Recognition of Accelerated Testers In MS and HS	 <i>Description:</i> Investigate and model potential ways to recognize students who take advanced courses in middle school <i>Purpose:</i> Update MS & HS methodology to ensure <i>A–F</i> system doesn't disincentivize advanced academic pathways 				
6	Revisit Distinction Designations	 Description: Investigate and model potential updates to Distinction Designation indicators or methodology Purpose: Explore potential updates to continuously improve Distinction Designations 				
7	Refine Other Reporting Information	 Description: Investigate and determine processes for potential updates or adding new reporting information Purpose: Explore potential updates or new reporting information to add to TXschools.gov or TPRS 				
In 1	in addition TEA is conducting other data analyses based on previous feedback and 2023 refresh changes (e.g. impact of including Spanish to English testers)					

In addition, TEA is conducting other data analyses based on previous feedback and 2023 refresh changes (e.g., impact of including Spanish to English testers) and will discuss findings with TAAG.



A–F Refresh Consideration #5: Recognition of Accelerated Testers in Middle School Follow-Up

Reminder: In response to public comment, we revisited the methodology for including accelerated testers in Middle School and High School accountability.



- Description: Investigate and model potential ways to recognize students who take advanced courses in middle school
- **Purpose:** Update MS & HS methodology to ensure A–F system doesn't disincentivize advanced academic pathways

Previous Feedback or Public Comments

Received feedback that the *A-F* system could better recognize middle school students taking advanced math pathways (i.e., Algebra I in 8th grade), particularly with Senate Bill 2124 passing in 2023. **Current Investigation Proposal**

The agency is exploring <u>a bonus point</u> <u>methodology</u> for middle school students who successfully take an EOC in place of a grade-level STAAR test.

<u>Middle school proposal</u>: Bonus point for students who successfully take an EOC in place of a grade-level STAAR test



Domain 1 STAAR Methodology

Approaches Grade Level or Above + # Meets Grade Level or Above + <u># Masters Grade Level</u> 3 * Total # of Tests

	All Students		
Total Tests	50		Domain 1 Raw Score
% Approaches Grade Level or Above	80%		
% Meets Grade Level or Above	60%	80% + 60% + 40%	= 60
% Masters Grade Level	40%	3	- 00
# Approaches Grade Level or Above	40		
# Meets Grade Level or Above	30	40 + 30 + 20	
# Masters Grade Level	20	= 60	
		3 * 50	

Proposal: Including in both Domain 1a and Domain 2b.

Bonus Point Example:

"Meets" on Algebra I EOC instead of "Masters" on Grade 8

An 8th grader takes the STAAR Grade 8 Math test and earns "Masters Grade Level". In the Domain 1 raw score calculation, they are included in the # Approaches and Above, the # Meets and Above, and # Masters.

Let's say this same 8th grader instead takes Algebra I and the Algebra I EOC rather than the STAAR Grade 8 Math test, and earns "Meets Grade Level" on the EOC. In the Domain 1 raw score calculation, they'd be included in the # Approaches and Above, the # Meets and Above, but not # Masters.

The proposal adds a bonus point for students who earn Approaches or Above on an EOC in middle school, so the two scenarios above would result in the same raw score.



Previous TAAG questions/considerations to be discussed today:



Requested Analysis:

Performance level comparison: Approaches or Meets

We suggest the proposal maintains Approaches+ for bonus

- Updated modeling: Any EOC taken prior to 9th grade
- Domains where the bonus points would apply:
 - Bonus points would not apply to Domain III
 - Bonus points would apply in Domain II, Part B

We suggest the proposal applies to School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance <u>Approaches+ (previously shared)</u>: Adding a bonus point would not change overall scale scores for majority of middle school campuses



Adding 1 Bonus Point for Students who Approach+ on the Algebra I EOC Prior to Grade 9

Impact to Overall 2024 A-F Scaled Scores for Middle School Campuses



<u>Meets+</u>: The impact of the bonus point is reduced by 100 campuses (6% of campuses).



Adding 1 Bonus Point for Students who Meet+ on the Algebra I EOC Prior to Grade 9

Impact to Overall 2024 A-F Scaled Scores for Middle School Campuses







We suggest the proposal maintains Approaches+ for bonus.

1) For consistency with 'passing' the EOC for graduation 2) It increases the footprint of this bonus by only 6%, small but meaningful. 3) It encourages placing in advanced math pathways.

Bonus Point Example:

"Approaches" on Algebra I EOC instead of "Meets" on Grade 8

An 8th grader takes the STAAR Grade 8 Math test and earns "**Meets** Grade Level".

In the Domain 1 raw score calculation, they are included in the # Approaches and Above and the # Meets and Above.

Let's say this same 8th grader instead takes Algebra I and the Algebra I EOC rather than the STAAR Grade 8 Math test, and earns "**Approaches** Grade Level" on the EOC.

In the Domain 1 raw score calculation, they'd be included in the # Approaches and Above, but not the # Meets and Above, but not # Masters.



<u>Approaches+ All Subjects:</u> The analysis remains consistent with what was previously shared for Algebra I only.



Adding 1 Bonus Point for Students who Approach+ on an EOC Prior to Grade 9 Impact to Overall 2024 A-F Scaled Scores for Middle School Campuses 889 850 (54%) (51%) 49% of campuses increase (App+, All Subjects) All subjects Counts/percent of Middle School 46% of campuses increase (App+, Algebra I) Algebra I only We confirm the proposal applies to any EOC 518 517 prior to grade 9. (Algebra I, English I, English II, campuses (31%) (31%) US History, Biology) 190 174 (11%) (11%) 53 45 17 10 14 10 14 9 (3%) (3%) (1%) (1%) (1%) (1%) (1%) (1%) 3 6-11 2 5 0 1 4

Increase in scale scores

The Accelerated Tester Middle School Bonus Point was supported in Feb. Twothirds of TAAG voted 3 or 4 out of 5

Do you have any concerns maintaining Approaches+?

Do you have any concerns with the bonus points applying in School Progress: Part B, Relative Performance?





A–F Refresh Consideration #5: Recognition of Accelerated Testers in High School

Reminder: In response to public comment, we are revisiting the methodology for including accelerated testers in Middle School and High School accountability.



- Description: Investigate and model potential ways to recognize students who take advanced courses in middle school
- **Purpose:** Update MS & HS methodology to ensure A–F system doesn't disincentivize advanced academic pathways

Previous Feedback or Public Comments

Received feedback that the *A-F* system could better recognize middle school students taking advanced math pathways (i.e., Algebra I in 8th grade), particularly with Senate Bill 2124 passing in 2023.

Current Investigation Proposal

The agency is exploring <u>a bonus point</u> <u>methodology</u> for middle school students who successfully take an EOC in place of a grade-level STAAR test.

Received feedback that A-F system should revisit the performance level standards (i.e., Meets, Masters, Approaches) for accelerated testers in high school taking ACT/SAT instead of EOCs

The agency will <u>review the SAT and ACT cut score</u> <u>ranges</u> used for students taking SAT and ACT in place of a STAAR EOC in high school.

Current methodology to include Accelerated Testers in High School



Current High School Methodology

- Accelerated testers <u>use SAT or ACT results in Math, RLA or Science</u> from grades 9-12 (best results from either SAT or ACT). Results go to the campus where reported as enrolled in Grade 12.
- This current methodology is aligned with federal testing requirements and is required to be approved through a <u>federal</u> <u>waiver request</u>: <u>Texas Accelerated Testers Waiver Renewal Request</u>
 - while in high school, students will be assessed via a state-administered EOC assessment or a nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR §200.3(d) that is more advanced than the assessment the state administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of ESEA

Current methodology is designed to minimize testing requirements and minimize burden on students and districts, since many accelerated tester students are already taking the SAT or ACT at some point in high school.

SAT/ACT Inclusion—Assessment Score Range for Performance Level Standards					
Standard	SAT Evidence- Based Reading and Writing (EBRW)	SAT Math	ACT English and Reading	ACT Math	ACT Science
Approaches Grade Level or above	410 – 470	440 – 520	27 – 33	16 – 20	16 – 22
Meets Grade Level or above	480 – 660	530 – 680	34 – 59	21 – 29	23 – 27
Masters Grade Level	670 – 800	690 – 800	60 – 72	30 – 36	28 – 36

	Total Accelerated Testers (2023)
Math	102,524
RLA	3
Science	5,486

Two ways to update HS Methodology



- Part 1: Review the SAT and ACT score ranges that align to the STAAR Performance Standards
 - Description: Investigate the cut scores used to include an accelerated testers' high school test results (SAT and ACT) in accountability.
 - **Purpose:** To ensure A–F system doesn't disincentivize advanced academic pathways by requiring SAT or ACT scores that are misaligned or not reflective of current SAT and ACT data.

Part 2: Consider other tests/other timing options (initial discussion in February):

- Description: Investigate other options for how students who take advanced courses in middle school are counted in accountability (what tests and when they're counted)
- **Purpose:** To ensure A–F system doesn't disincentivize advanced academic pathways by not including that student until 12th grade.

<u>Background:</u> SAT scores were set first, with meets aligned to the College Board's definition College Readiness Benchmarks.



Development of SAT Score Ranges:

SAT EBRW, SAT Math: "<u>Meets</u>" aligns with <u>SAT</u> College Ready Benchmarks *Texas Success Initiative (TSI) <u>exemption</u>, as used in CCMR <u>Substitute</u> qualifying score for graduation*

10. How were the cut points for Approaches, Meets, and Masters determined?

The Meets cut points align with existing College Board standards that demonstrate that students who meet or exceed the benchmark have a substantial chance of earning at least a C in first semester college classes. Approaches standards were set to align with the Meets standard and the 20th percentile average for 2017, 2018, and 2019 nationwide SAT results. The Masters standards were set to align with Meets and the 90th percentile average for 2017, 2018, and 2019 nationwide SAT results. After SAT cut points were set, corresponding subject-area ACT cut points were set using SAT/ACT concordance tables.



Standard	SAT Evidence- Based Reading and Writing (EBRW)	SAT Math	
Approaches Grade Level or above	410 – 470	440 – 520	
Meets Grade Level or above	480-660	530 680	
Masters Grade Level	670 – 800	690 – 800	

<u>SAT "Approaches"</u> aligns with the 20th percentile averages of 3 years of Texas students' results on the national SAT test. **(2017, 2018, 2019)**

<u>SAT "Masters"</u> aligns with the 90th percentile averages of 3 years of Texas students' results on the national SAT test. **(2017, 2018, 2019)**

Development of ACT Score Ranges:

ACT English and Reading; ACT Math: After SAT cut points were set, corresponding subject-area ACT cut points were set using SAT/ACT concordance tables

ACT Science: Meets aligns with <u>ACT</u> Science College Ready; "Approaches" set to 20th percentile, "Masters" to 90th percentile



- "Meets" remains anchored in statutory requirement that assessments used as a substitute for STAAR EOC meet TSI college readiness benchmarks established by THECB.
 - STAAR EOC "Meets" standard represents a similar performance expectation as the "Meets/Exceeds" standard for SAT.
- To set the "Approaches" and "Masters" performance standards we propose leveraging the SAT-reported standard deviation.
 - This methodology is an accurate, research-based approach to linking performance levels.

Standard Deviation (SD): The standard deviation is a measure of statistical dispersion (variability or spread). It is an indicator of the degree of score variation around the mean.



Standard	Accountability Year	SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW)	SAT Math
Approaches	Current	≥410	≥440
Grade Level +	2028 Refresh	≥360	≥380
Meets Grade Level +	Current & 2028 Refresh	≥480	≥530
Masters	Current	≥670	≥690
Grade Level	2028 Refresh	≥520	≥580

"SAT Approaches" based on 2023-2024 SAT SDs

"SAT Meets" aligned with SAT College Ready Benchmarks, TSI exemption, substitute assessments

"SAT Masters" based on 2023-2024 SAT SDs

<u>Proposed Refresh SAT and ACT Scores</u>: ACT scores based on the standard deviation methodology are below.



"ACT Approaches" based on 2023-2024 ACT SDs						
	"ACT Masters" based on 2023-2024 SAT SDs					
Standard	Accountability Year	SAT Evidence- Based Reading and Writing (EBRW)	ACT English/+ Reading	SAT Math	ACT Math	ACT Science
Approaches	Current	≥410	≥27	<i>∠</i> ≥440	≥16	≥16
Grade Level +	2028 Refresh	≥360	≥20	≥380	≥14	≥16
Meets	Current	≥480	≥34	≥530	≥21	≥23
Grade Level +	2028 Refresh	≥480	≥40	≥530	≥22	≥23
Masters	Current	≥670	≥60	≥690	≥30	≥28
Grade Level	2028 Refresh	≥520	≥47	≥580	≥25	≥28

Only ~3 students would be impacted by a change to ACT E+R

"ACT Meets" updated to align with substitute assessments, passing standards to meet TSI requirements ACT E+R 40, Math 22



Percentages of Accelerated Testers in Each Performance Level (SY2023-24 Graduating Cohort and the Spring 2024 Algebra I Accelerated Testers)

Performance Level	Class of 2024 under Current System	Class of 2024 under 2028 Refresh Proposal	
Does Not Meet	12%	4%	
Approaches Grade Level +	88%	96%	
Meets Grade Level +	60%	59%	
Masters Grade Level	12%	39%	



- Based upon the information provided share out on the following:
 - Accelerated Testers SAT and ACT scores for performance standards
 - NEXT, we're going to capture your agreement with the proposal





Vote Descriptions





Revisiting High School Assessments for Accelerated Testers (Tests and Timing)



Current methodology uses the SAT or ACT as the 'equivalent' for an EOC test in high school

• There are different content measured on these tests. (Algebra I vs. SAT/ACT)

Current methodology does not count the accelerated tester's results until they are enrolled in 12th grade

• This is not aligned with when others in the high school class have an EOC test count (typically 9th or 10th grade)

Should we explore any other considerations?

- Revisiting the test: should we explore whether we can get federal approval for a different nationally recognized test (e.g., PSAT)?
- Revisiting the time frame: should we consider requiring accelerated testers to take the test in 9th grade or 9th/10th grade?

Or is the previous update to SAT and ACT cut scores enough?



Assuming we would get the federal approval, a potential methodology could be:

- If a student takes Pre ACT or PSAT 10 by 10th grade, their best score would be used in accountability calculations in place of the EOC in 10th grade.
- If they don't take Pre ACT or PSAT 10 by 10th grade, they would continue to use their best ACT or SAT score in accountability calculations in place of the EOC in 12th grade.

If the pre-test were taken by an accelerated tester, it's that test that would count, the ACT or SAT would NOT be USED.



Current methodology uses the SAT or ACT as the 'equivalent' for an EOC test in high school There are different content measured on these tests. (Algebra I vs. SAT/ACT)

What's on those tests, compared to what's on the EOCs; and Why are students taking those tests?





Pre**ACT**[®]9 Secure[™]

Pre ACT[®] Secure[®]

PreACT Secure: Gives schools, districts or states the ability to use for high-stakes or accountability purposes while giving students practice with taking the ACT. PreACT Secure measures what students have learned in the areas of English, Reading, Mathematics, and Science.

PreACT Math Section The math section is designed to assess the mathematical skills students have typically acquired in courses taken up to the beginning of grade 12, with an emphasis on skills acquired in grades 8, 9, and 10.

Preparing for Higher Math (64%): Number and Quantity (9–15%), Algebra (12–18%), Functions (12–18%), Geometry (9–15%), Statistics & Probability (9–15%). Integrating Essential Skills (36%)

PSAT 10 Math Section The math section focuses on key elements of algebra, advanced math, problem-solving and data analysis, and geometry and trigonometry.

to a prep-assessment?

Preparing for the PreACT Secure-ACT State and District Testing

Concern: Does this add high-stakes

PSAT 10 Math Test Overview - SAT Suite | College Board

We do not currently collect Pre-ACT data. TEA collects PSAT 8/9, PSAT10 and PSAT.



Current methodology does not count the accelerated tester's results until they are enrolled in 12th grade

This is not aligned with when others in the high school class have an EOC test count (typically 9th or 10th grade)

When are students taking these tests?

of PSAT/SAT tests taken in Texas in 2023-24, by grade level

134,186 8th grade PSAT 8/9 (31% of class) 111,361 9th grade PSAT8/9 (22%) 272,246 10th grade PSAT or PSAT10 (59%) 238,816 11th grade PSAT in fall (55%) 291,694 ever SAT in HS (73%)

Typically, EOCs are taken in 9th grade (Algebra 1, English 1) or 10th grade (RLA).

Does a PSAT10 or Pre-ACT from 10th grade better align to the timing of the EOC?

of Pre-ACT tests taken in Texas

Among students in Texas's 2023 graduating class who took the ACT[®] test, 6,380 (7%) took the PreACT before taking the ACT.

Concern: Would this incentivize a district to add a new assessment to their calendar simply for accountability purposes?

2024 Texas SAT Suite of Assessments Annual Report



What thoughts, questions, or feedback do you have on new assessments used for recognizing accelerated testers in high school?

• NEXT, we're going to capture your level of agreement with the possible methodology should we continue down this path at all?





Vote Descriptions







2028 A–F Refresh Consideration #4: Relative Performance

In response to public comment, we are investigating the relative performance methodology, measuring the achievement of a campus relative to other similar campuses

- Description: Investigate and model different campus demographic variables for Domain 2 comparison of relative performance.
- **Purpose:** Determine whether additional demographic factors besides % eco. dis. should be used in Domain 2b.

Previous Feedback or Public Comments

Received feedback that Domain 2b should include the achievement of students in campuses <u>with</u> <u>similar SPED percentages in addition to the current</u> <u>similar economically disadvantaged percentages.</u>

Received feedback that Domain 2b should look at the achievement of students relative to campuses **with similar prior year performance,** which could consider economically disadvantaged, SPED, and other populations without making the system more complex by adding more variables.

Current Investigation Proposal

The agency replicated previous modeling of the impact of including <u>both</u> a campus's <u>economically</u> <u>disadvantaged percentage and SPED percentage</u> in Domain 2b to see if the conclusion still holds that SPED explains very little of the variance of STAAR that economically disadvantaged doesn't explain.

The agency is preparing to model the impact of using **prior year performance instead of economically disadvantaged percentages** in Domain 2b

Performance

Prior

The Special Education demographic has a small distribution and has small explanatory power if combined with % Economically Disadvantaged.



Economically Disadvantaged % remains a key indicator for STAAR performance, even among the campuses with the highest Special Ed populations.



257 campuses are at **25% SPED** or higher. (Two standard deviations or more from the average).

In these campuses, Special Education rates only account for an additional <u>2.4%</u> of STAAR performance scores:

A campus's Economically Disadvantaged % explains about 34.5% of STAAR performance (R-Squared).

Adding in % SPED adds only marginal value, explains about another 2.4% of STAAR performance.







There are 159 campuses in K-12 that are **40% SPED** or higher, most are very small.

There are only 9 non-AEA campuses with STAAR tested grades, are evaluated for Domain 2B, and have more than 5 students.

- Sample size is too low for R-Squared to be an effective measure.
- These schools are distributed across all A-F ratings.





School Progress, Part B: Relative Performance should remain unchanged because:

Adding special education adds complexity and complication without explaining more about STAAR performance.

- SPED does not vary much across campuses
- % Special Education is not a key factor that explains campus-wide STAAR performance.
 - % Economically Disadvantaged explains about 53% of elementary school STAAR score variation
 - Adding in % Special Education (with % Economically Disadvantaged) doesn't explain campus STAAR score variation significantly more (an additional 0.8%)
 - In K-12 campuses of >25% Special Education, % SPED adds only marginal value, explains only another 2.4% of STAAR performance.

The current methodology is not disproportionately negatively impacting the highest SPED campuses in overall or D2b ratings.

In K-12 campuses of >40% Special Education (9), scale scores are fully distributed with high and low ratings.



What thoughts, questions, or feedback do you have on the proposal to NOT add SPED to the relative performance methodology?

 NEXT, we're going to capture your level of agreement with the proposed no-change to methodology





Vote Descriptions







2028 *A*–*F* **Refresh** Consideration #6: Revisit Distinction Designations

Background: Distinction Designations



- Distinction designations are required by Texas Education Code (39.202 & 39.203)
- A distinction designation acknowledges districts and campuses for outstanding achievement based on the outcomes of several performance indicators several areas.
- Distinctions are based on performance relative to a group of campuses of similar type, size, grade span, and student demographics.
- Districts and campuses that receive acceptable accountability ratings (A,B, or C) are eligible to earn distinction designations.
 - A campus earns a distinction designation if it is in the top quartile (Q1) of its comparison group for at least 33 percent (for high schools and K–12 campuses) or 50 percent (for elementary and middle schools) of the indicators used to award the distinction
- Campuses can earn up to seven.
- Districts can earn one.

Last consideration of Distinction Designations from TAAG January 2023



- 1. Rather than creating a new distinction, incorporate an accelerated learning indicator into existing Distinction Designations to avoid redundancy.
 - Implemented in 2023
- 2. Remove attendance as an indicator for Distinction Designations.
 - Not implemented in 2023
 - Discussion at the time centered on the appropriateness of attendance as an indicator of academic performance.
- 3. Add a Postsecondary Outcomes Distinction
 - Not implemented in 2023
 - 2022 ATAC/APAC feedback: Because of the significant data lag, a campus distinction is inappropriate as the current administration would not likely be responsible for the postsecondary outcomes. The same may hold true at the district level.
- 4. Revisit SAT/ACT participation indicators in the future to see if still needed after passage of HB 3.
 - Not implemented in 2023

4 Public Comments Addressing Distinction Designation 2024-25



2024

- SAT as Science Academic Achievement (AA) indicator in Science
 - Not allowable per USDE Wavier
- **2025**
 - Post Secondary Outcomes (Student Success after Graduation)
 - Previously Addressed
 - AEA/DRS Specific Designation
 - TEA committed to exploring in response to public comment
 - Annual Growth to be included Academic Achievement RLA and Math
 - Also submitted in 2023 Declined because of new transition table methodology being implemented in 2023
- 2028 A-F Refresh Public Feedback (1 of 40 comments received)
 - Create a threshold of how many schools from the same district can be in the same comparison group.



What thoughts or feedback do you have to share about the following:

- 1. Create AEA/DRS specific designation
 - Indicators TBD
 - TEA committed to exploring in response to public comment
- 2. Include Annual Growth as indicator for Academic Achievement RLA and Math
 - Submitted via public comment in 2023 and 2025
 - Declined in 2023 due to new transition table methodology being implemented
- 3. Remove attendance as an indicator for Distinction Designations
 - Not implemented in 2023
- 4. Remove SAT/ACT participation indicators for Distinction Designations
 - Not implemented in 2023
- 5. Create a Post Secondary Outcomes designation
 - Not implemented in 2023 due to lagging data
- 6. Other considerations for indicators or designations

Feedback to be collected in Zoom poll



First Round of A-F System Data Checks



Data Check: Language Transition Growth Ratings

Monitoring the impact of including different language testers in Domain 2A Academic Growth campus ratings (2023 refresh change)

Elementary Domain 2A Academic Growth methodology changed in 2023 for campuses with different language testers



- A-F System Check: When students make a language transition (Spanish to English), what is the impact on growth scores and Academic Growth ratings under the new transition table?
- Purpose: Understand the impact of the growth transition table introduced in the 2023 Refresh; specifically, the inclusion of students whose growth is being measured based on test of two different languages (Spanish to English growth).
 - Prior to 2023, students who switched from Spanish STAAR to English STAAR were *not* included in Domain 2A Academic Growth

2024 Landscape



[•] **3516** campuses (54%) had

- different language testers (i.e., students who took a different language test in the previous year)
- At these campuses, 2% of tests were taken by different language testers



- Spanish STAAR is offered to eligible students in Grades 3-5
- Students must switch to English STAAR by Grade 6

Testers whose growth was measured with tests of different languages have a higher % of testers earning accelerated learning points





At campuses with different language testers

Most campuses experience *no change or received a higher Academic* Growth score in 2024 due to including different language testers

es



2024 Academic Growth Scores, (Actual Score minus excluding different language Testers) which *include* different language 3000 testers, compared to scores excluding these testers: 2500 Testers 61% of the 3516 campuses had

- no difference
- 72% of campuses had no change or a higher score

Not included in this graph: the 3021 campuses (with grades 4th-6th) that *do not* have different language testers



2024 Academic Growth difference

95% of campuses with different language testers receive the same Academic Growth Letter Grade or better when different language testers are included



2024 Actual Academic Growth Rating vs Academic Growth Rating with Same Language only



We *do not* recommend any changes to D2A:

- Including different language testers encourages LEAs to focus on preparing these students for success.
- Using the same transition table for **same** language testers and **different** language testers limits complexity and confusion, and fulfills ESSA state plan requirements to use the same methodology for all students:
 - The Academic Growth results are used to fulfill the requirements of the ESSA State Plan, "Other Academic **Indicators for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that** are Not High Schools".
 - "Methodology must be based on the performance of all students", i.e., must use the same methodology to include students who make a language transition.



Data Check: % Campuses With Domain 3 Ratings

Monitoring the impact of 2023 A-F refresh changes to the percentage of campuses rated in Domain 3 Closing the Gaps

Domain 3 methodology changed in 2023 with the purpose of ensuring more campuses are being rated for Closing the Gaps



- A-F System Check: Did introducing new changes to Domain 3 in the 2023 Refresh result in more campuses being rated on Closing the Gaps, as intended?
- Purpose: To ensure more campuses are rated on their progress to interim and long-term goals among racial/ethnic groups, socioeconomic backgrounds, and other factors, and support is provided to those campuses showing low performance.

New Domain 3 methodology in 2023 Refresh impacting if a campus has data for Domain 3:

Minimum Size Reduced from N≥25 to N≥10 In order to increase a campus's likelihood of meeting the minimum size, 2023 methodology introduced:

Measure only two of the raceethnicity groups (not all), based on who met prior year N Create super-group combining demographic groups into a single High Focus group Regarding **campuses**, there was a 1.47% *increase* in the number of campuses rated in Closing the Gaps in 2024 compared to 2022



campuses rated



The number of rated campuses increased.

- In 2022, 317 campuses were Not Rated 119 more
- In 2024, 198 campuses were Not Rated

Why could a campus be Not Rated?

- If a campus does not have enough data in the Student Achievement component, the campus cannot be measured in Closing the Gaps (D3)
 - To be rated in D3, campuses must have data for 4 out of 8 indicators in the student achievement component. Campuses with smaller grade spans may not have enough math or RLA tests.
 - If a campus does not have enough tests for 2 lowest performing groups, campus may not have data to fulfill the 4 of 8 indicators.
- 2. Special situations (e.g., Hurricane Harvey)

Regarding **districts**, there was a 1.66% *increase* in the number of districts rated in Closing the Gaps in 2024 compared to 2022





The number of rated districts increased

- In 2022, 34 districts were Not Rated
- In 2024, 11 districts were Not Rated

23 more districts rated

Why could a district be Not Rated?

- 1. Campuses did not meet the qualification for both RLA and math
- 2. Special situations (e.g., Hurricane Harvey)

The Closing the Gaps indicator methodology changes have resulted in an increased number of campuses and districts rated.

This helps Texas to fulfill ESSA state plan requirements for annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State

Note: There were 6 RTFS in 2022 and 9 RTFS in 2024. These districts have been excluded from the counts.



Upcoming TAAG Topics



April (Meeting 4/29)

- o 2026 Manual Rulemaking: public comment review (to-date)
- o 2028 A-F Refresh
 - Review and get feedback on any updates from previously reviewed proposals
 - Share and discuss data checks outcomes
- May (Meeting 05/27)
- June (Meeting 06/30)
 - Review of Preliminary 2028 A-F Refresh Framework





Email: <u>performance.reporting@tea.Texas.gov</u> Phone: 512.463.9704 Website: <u>Performance Reporting | Texas Education Agency</u>