

2024 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Minutes

Meeting Minutes for April 2, 2024

The primary objective of the April 2024 TAAG meeting was to reaffirm the design commitments of the A-F refresh and evaluate public feedback concerning the proposed 2024 Accountability Manual. Additionally, TAAG members received an update on the development of a new Early CCMR Outcomes Bonus Counts report. TEA responses to TAAG feedback will be in *italics*, addressing questions/comments as needed, with some requiring further research. The following is a summary of the meeting.

Topic 1 – Accountability Manual: Summary of Public Comments Received During the Public Comment Period

210 individuals submitted public comments for the 2023 accountability refresh. 28 individuals submitted public comments during the 2024 comment period. Full public comment responses will be made available on the [2024 Accountability Development](#) page. TEA set the context for the review of public comments with the reminder that a key design commitment built into A-F is that the system design remains static in most years, and 2024 is the year to maintain the new system. TEA reviewed comments with this in mind.

Accelerated Testers:

Public comment urged a review and adjustment of SAT/ACT score thresholds for accelerated testers, especially regarding the “Masters Grade Level” designation and suggested including the SAT Science subject area test. TEA noted that this level of change to methodology is outside the scope of change in 2024 and agrees that this is a topic for future consideration in the next refresh through an in-depth analysis and review.

Member Comments

- Committee member comments reflected agreement with the public comment, that there is a concern and frustration that the required SAT score for Masters is too high.
- Committee members also noted the connection with the score ranges for accelerated testers and the next public comment on advanced math pathways. (That the SAT/ACT accelerated testers put high schools in a bind and that's directly tied to the accelerated math pathways.)
- One committee member also added that they see these accelerated students not taking ACT/SAT because they are in an advanced academics program already and feel it isn't a good use of their time.

Member Questions

- No questions related to Accelerated Testers.

Advanced Math Pathways:

Public comment urged recognition of LEAs excelling in Advanced Math Pathways. Committee members expressed concerns about the impact of SAT/ACT accelerated testers on high schools and suggested addressing disincentives for LEAs. The agency acknowledged these concerns for future consideration in the next refresh, and directed the committee to the new TPRS report which was the response to this concern in 2023.

Member Comments

- Some committee members believe that students who take the Algebra 1 EOC in 8th grade through SAT/ACT accelerated testing place high schools at a disadvantage. They expressed concern that the implementation of advanced math pathways might negatively impact high school accountability.
- Committee members shared concerns about smaller districts being disproportionately impacted by staffing implications and being able to deliver course instruction.

Member Questions

- Committee members seek clarification on whether any features disincentivize LEAs from placing students in Advanced Math Pathways.
 - *The agency agrees that this is a topic that will be considered as part of the next accountability refresh through an in-depth analysis and review.*

CCMR Indicators:

Public comment suggested adding CLEP to CCMR. Public comments also reiterated the feedback received during the 2023 refresh to tier or weight various indicators in CCMR. TEA noted that this level of change to methodology is outside the scope of change in 2024 and agrees that this is a topic for future consideration in the next refresh through an in-depth analysis and review.

Member Comments

- No comments

Member Questions

- No Questions

CCMR for AEA/DRS:

Public comment named concerns with the measures of CCMR for special student populations. TEA noted that disproportionate impacts to special populations will be monitored and, if needed, addressed in the next refresh.

Member Comments

- No comments

Member Questions

- No questions

Academic Growth:

Public comment urged differentiated transition tables/methodology for EB/EL students. TEA noted that this level of change to methodology is outside the scope of change in 2024 and agrees that this is a topic for future consideration in the next refresh through an in-depth analysis and review.

Member Comments

- Committee members stated they do not see what is being requested as being a change, but “a correction”. One member requested to see some data for students that are transitioning from Spanish to English, for growth. One member requested to see some data that support the existing transition tables concerning students who transition.
 - *The agency confirmed that the supporting data on the growth transition table results from Spanish to English would be provided.*
 - *The agency also suggested that the scaling process of the English and Spanish STAAR tests is intended to align with the language transition.*

Member Questions

- One committee member stated that previously we could not calculate a STAAR progress measure from Spanish to English. Has that been developed?
 - *The agency reminded the committee that the student-level STAAR progress data will not be in the CAF file, as it is not a part of accountability, and that this data will be in the individual STAAR assessment files. Conclusively, the transition table model will continue to be the methodology for growth in the A-F Accountability system.*
 - *Students will only receive a STAAR progress measure if they take the test in the previous and current year in the same language. (See: [Progress Measures](#))*

Domain III:

Public comment voiced concern with the new 0 to 4 point methodology used in Domain 3. TEA noted that this level of change to methodology is outside the scope of change in 2024 and agrees this 2023 refresh change will be monitored and, if needed, addressed in the next refresh.

Member Comments

- Committee members shared that there is a perception of difficulty to earn full vs partial credit in Domain 3.
- One committee member stated they’re trying to promote a 3 is the new Y.
 - *The agency has modeled this change from one single target for “full points” versus making progress and earning “3 points” during the A-F refresh and has reassured that district scores are not drastically impacted when not scoring “full 4 points”.*

Member Questions

- Committee members asked what the public comment is suggesting be changed about the Domain 3 scoring.
 - *The agency responded that the public comments surrounding this topic are about the incremental growth process. We have a 15-year target to reach full points. So, looking at*

the incremental time to get to a 4, and want to review the growth process. Domain 3 is a federal requirement that involves an ESSA amendment.

TELPAS Methodology:

Public comment requested different standards based upon years in US schools/years of English instruction be considered. There was also a public comment recommendation to remove rounding from TELPAS composite scoring. TEA noted that this level of change to methodology is outside the scope of change in 2024 and agrees that this is a topic for future consideration in the next refresh. The agency also reminded the committee that changes to TELPAS composite scoring for 2025 Accountability will be presented to the committee in advance of preliminary manual development for 2025.

Member Comments

- A committee member suggested that this proposal be considered for the next refresh cycle including both differentiated standards for newcomers and TELPAS composite scores.

Member Questions

- No Questions

Identification of Schools in Improvement:

Public comment asked to postpone PEG list publication until after appeals.

Member Comments

- Committee members agree with holding the posting of the final PEG list post-accountability appeals process completion.
 - *The agency responded that the PEG list could be labeled as preliminary and final to align with the release of ratings.*

3 D's and 3 F's Rule:

Public comment was received regarding the use of these rules in the A-F state accountability system. TEA noted that this level of change to A-F policies and methodology is outside the scope of change in 2024 and will consider this topic as part of the next refresh.

Member Comments

- No Comments

Member Questions

- No Questions

District/Campus Ratings:

There were public comment requests for changes to the district rating methodology. Public comment also was received regarding the construction and use of campus types in A-F accountability (including level-based Domain 3 targets), noting potential disproportionate impacts based on a school's grade span served. TEA noted that this level of change to A-F policies and methodology is outside the scope of change in 2024 and agrees that this is a topic for future consideration in the next refresh through an in-depth analysis and review.

Member Comments

- Members were supportive of additional modeling of the impact of campus-type on ratings.

Member Questions

- What is the ability for a district to consolidate to a K-12 rated district from having each campus individually rated?
 - *The agency responded that districts should refer to AskTED processes for campus consolidation.*

Edits for clarification:

Other public comments were shared by the agency where edits for clarity have been made to the Final 2024 Accountability Manual as a result of the Public Comment period.

Member Comments

- No comments

Member Questions

- No questions

Accountability Manual Release:

There are requests for concurrent release of manual and appendices and advanced notice of system changes.

Member Comments

- Members were supportive of the effort to provide advance notice regarding system changes, methodology, and cut scores.

Member Questions

- Will this group ever talk about distinction designations methodology, calculations, and changes?
 - *The agency directed the committee to the discussion from the 2023 refresh (consideration #9 in the last [March framework stakeholder feedback update](#)), which indicates TEA will continue to explore distinction designations. The agency will come back to TAAG to discuss if this is of interest to the committee.*

Topic 2 – Appendix J IBC/POS Timeline

In the March TAAG meeting, the IBC/POS timeline was presented. This is a follow up to the feedback received from TAAG on how to include this information in the manual. The agency shared that Appendix J will include the following description with a hyperlink to the “Aligned IBC, Programs of Study, and Accountability refresh review cycle”.

Member Comments

- Committee members prefer the color chart (see slides for details).
- Committee members suggest the visual of the phase in the plan to support overall understanding of the newly added Appendix J.

Member Questions

- Is there a specific reason for not including the chart? Some stakeholders print the manual, and if the information is in a link, it is a separate page to print.
 - *The agency wants to be able to ensure the manual includes the most up to date information. Since we received this chart from the CCMP division, we want to make sure any updates they make are reflected in the manual appendices.*

Topic 3 – Early CCMR OB Counts Update

The TAAG Committee was provided with information about a new report the Performance Reporting Division has created in response to stakeholder feedback. The committee was introduced to the Early CCMR OB Counts file. The agency shared that this file allows for earlier communication of information to support LEA's understanding of CCMR outcomes bonus payouts.

Member Comments

- Committee members stated that this is a compelling breakthrough for school systems that are focusing on these outcomes.

Member Questions

- A member asked if there any way to also put something on the TAPR report that says, these are the number of students that met and show this data? This would be very helpful.
 - *The agency is working on a TPRS report to include in TAPR with CCMR Outcomes Bonus "met" rates. The agency will reach out to gather your feedback on this report.*
 - *The TPRS report will be posted mid-May.*
- Do you find that clearinghouse data is more of a superset?
 - *The agency responded stating that the data from NSC largely encompasses any additional enrollment data coming from the THECB.*
- Can you remind me if the first semester or the full year is being considered for CCMR OB?
 - *The first semester is assessed for enrollment for CCMR OB funding purposes.*