

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

Summary of Meeting on January 18, 2023

The objective of the January 18th TAAG meeting is to review the updates contained in the 2023 Preliminary Framework published in January, review current proposals on Badges and Distinction Designations and gather feedback. TEA will respond to questions/comments that require a response in italics. Some questions may require additional staff research. The following is a summary of the meeting.

- Welcome
- Framework Updates
- Adjustments to the Proposed Academic Growth Calculation
 - Questions
 - The current STAAR cut scores will remain for 1 year (2022–23) or the next five years? *We are setting cut points for the next five years.*
 - Why 0.25 for bonus points? *We did not want to scale down, and we wanted campuses without any Did Not Meet students to still be able to earn an A. See slides for more details.*
 - When you scaled did you include the bonus points? *Yes*
 - How is it a bonus point if it is included in the scaling? *We are not expecting everyone to be accelerated.*
 - Do you have a slide that shows the % of students statewide who fall into each of these categories to earn 1/2 point or a full point? *Yes, this was in a previous TAAG meeting slide.*
 - Does this include retesters? *No, annual growth is about growing a year, and accelerated learning is aligned to HB 4545, which doesn't include retesters.*
 - Is it the same subset rules? *Yes*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - I think this bonus point system makes a ton of sense.
 - Calling it “bonus points” may be misleading, because it leads me to assume it is not in the scaling of the scores.
 - When you include bonus points as part of the scale it removes the extra. I would recommend changing the word "bonus." We could call it “value add”.
 - We don't have to call it anything. People will see the numerator and denominator and understand it.
- Transition plan to integrate Program of Study requirements with IBCs by one year
 - Questions

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

- Can you remind me the distinction between completer and concentrator?
Concentrator - A student completing and passing at least two or more CTE courses for a total of at least two credits within the same program of study and not a completer.
Completer - A student completing and passing three or more CTE courses for a total of four or more credits within a program of study, including one level three or level four course from within the same program of study
- Comments/Concerns
 - Small districts will need support to be able to offer multiple pathways.
 - The statute does not specify the connection between IBC and program of study. They are on two separate lines.
 - This will be difficult for highly mobile districts. Students who move districts may not have the opportunity to become a Completer. We need to emphasize the cohorts of when they start.
 - It requires time for districts to put this into place. It is good that we are pushing back the transition timeline one year.
 - Implementing programs of study will require huge financial support for districts. Districts need more money to create these programs.
- Phase-out of sunseting IBCs
 - **Questions**
 - What was the reasoning behind the 20% limit? *TEA conducted analyses on high-usage sunseting IBCs and found that a small number of campuses are reporting a disproportionate number of students attaining a sunseting IBC, which may be indicative of students not being provided with varied opportunities to demonstrate College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR). For example, some campuses had over 80% of their students meeting CCMR through a sunseting IBC only. Campuses that did not have a disproportionate number of students attaining the same IBC rarely had 20% or more of students meeting CCMR through IBC only. The 20% limit was set to reduce impact on those campuses while also making sure that cut scores are not unfairly driven up by high CCMR scores that rely heavily on sunseting IBCs alone.*
 - Have the cut scores been adjusted to take this limit into account? *Yes, this limit was taken into account when modeling cut scores.*
 - Is there consideration to set a higher cap with students that have already graduated with CCMR from last year and last year's rules? *No, historically we have always applied changes to past years.*
 - Do you have information on schools that are only meeting sunseting IBCs, are they rural? *Yes, we have that information. There are different types of campuses, not just rural.*

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

- When are the “What if” rating released? *We are working to incorporate the recent updates to the framework that we made based on stakeholder feedback. What if ratings will be released in the spring. We are working on providing a more specific date for release.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - CCMR is challenging, because it changes every year (new IBCs, sunseting IBCs, military readiness, etc.).
 - People will only trust the system if it seems fair. It feels too late to make changes for 2022 and 2023.
 - In the past, cut points were changed every year. Those cut points always impacted previous classes for CCMR.
 - This is a big jump in cut scores. What was previously an A will now be a D, which creates a problem for planning and communications. While we may be able to communicate this in detail to our board, the public perception is that the school went down. This can feel frustrating to practitioners, principals, and teachers.
 - With the increase in cut scores, it might be helpful to show improvement and acknowledge anything more than 60%.
 - Our goal is for Texas to be a leader. We need a system to be rigorous. Nobody thinks that 60% of students being prepared for college, career, or the military is rigorous, so we have to raise the bar.
 - This is not the same rating system. This is difficult to communicate to staff, administrators, and board members. Messaging from TEA will be critical.
 - The challenge isn’t necessarily the new cut scores. It’s that they apply to students that are already graduated.
 - If we had cut points early, we can tell people sooner, so they are prepared.
 - This is better than changing cut scores every year, but in the future, we should plan farther in advance and share cut scores maybe a year or more in advance so districts have time to plan.
- Reframing Badges
 - Comments/Concerns
 - I really appreciate that TEA is dropping badges and reframing in this way.
 - The systems connect and show these things matter.
 - I am loving the move to visualizations. Much easier for the public to digest.
 - I like the fact that some of these are part of TPRS and some are TXschools.gov. It’s good to make the public aware of this information.
 - Keep this information separate from the letter grade.

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

- Keep any information and data visualization simple on TXschools.gov and include more detail on TPRS.
- Reframing Badges: Attendance
 - Comments/Concerns
 - Linking attendance with academic performance is helpful. The visualization can help break it down to the public.
 - It may be helpful to tie attendance to funding to make that connection for families.
 - I am not sure funding motivates parents to put them in school.
 - Parents may not care about absenteeism.
 - It is interesting to know the absenteeism, but we also want to be careful. There is a correlation between lower attendance and poverty. There are many layers to a culture of school attendance.
- Reframing Badges: Advanced Math Pathways
 - Questions
 - Will the 8th grade Algebra I scores count for high school as was in the November framework? *Based on feedback gathered so far, stakeholders largely do not support the Algebra I proposal in the November framework.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - I think this is more important to show than Chronic Absenteeism.
 - I support putting it on TPRS. Algebra I access for different student groups is good data for districts to see.
 - I think parents would be interested. How many kids are ready and stay ready? It is important to measure.
 - In a district of choice, some of our parents do look at this data as they are applying to schools in the district.
 - For small rural schools, this information for our public may get too complicated.
 - For TXschools.gov, we should limit to one data point.
 - Advanced math pathways are not right for all students. Would be better to show Algebra I completion rate for high performers rather than Algebra I completion rate for all students.
 - Advanced Math Pathways may be hard for the public to understanding – potentially call it “Providing Opportunities for High Performing Students,” “Maintaining Student Performance at High Level in Math,” “Accelerating on track math students to access higher level math courses,” or “Sustained success for on track students in Math”. Want to be careful not to confuse acceleration with HB 4545.

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

- Reframing Badges: Discipline Data
 - Comments/Concerns
 - Including discipline data is important and is powerful.
 - I would recommend putting together a group to look at discipline data. If you are doing everything right, you will look bad and if you are letting things run wild you will look good.
 - This will take some careful thinking and planning to make sure we avoid unintended consequences.
- Reframing Badges: School Program Highlights to share on TXschools.gov
 - Comments/Concerns
 - We should look into the most common indicators in other accountability systems.
 - This makes me nervous. Human beings want to look good. We had many programs, but it masked the performance data. Want to make sure parents don't feel misled.
 - I would recommend as part of the process we need to agree on definitions. This is about context. We will need a common definition.
 - We would need any highlights to be research-backed. We should require campuses/districts to submit the research behind any proposals.
 - We could cap what campuses highlight.
 - We could highlight specialty schools.
 - We could look at Pre-K enrollment, Head Start Programming.
 - We could highlight moves in percentiles for Distinction Designations. That information is currently buried but is valuable for my district.
 - Maybe start small with one or two clear definitions, try a collection process, but not with immediate reporting. Picking one or two would help test out the process. JROTC would be a good one to start with.
- Distinction Designations
 - Questions
 - Would it possible to add retesters to the accelerated learning indicator?
We can consider adding that here.
 - Comments/Concerns
 - We keep excluding a large group of students. We fixed it on the AEA. Having the retesters appear somewhere would be good.
 - Keep it simple.
 - The more we add the harder it becomes to discern what it means.

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

- “What If” Ratings?
 - Questions
 - Could we have a report in TEAL after snapshot that would have campus enrollment 3–12 and campus weights each year as soon as that data is final? *We will take that feedback into consideration.*
 - When should we anticipate receiving this file? *We don’t have a date yet but will be this spring.*
 - Will we have it by campus level? *Yes.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - This will be helpful.
 - This is letting the public know that the new system is harder.
- Mobile Campus Ratings - TEA will not be including a “mobile” campus for district ratings, given that data on these students will still be available and the mobile campus would have a minimal impact on district ratings.
 - Comments/Concerns
 - It is important that we still see the data on these students.
 - The type of students being excluded are the ones that need to be included the most.