2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)
Summary of Meeting on November 16, 2022

The objective of the November 16th TAAG meeting is to review the updates contained in the 2023 Preliminary Framework published last week. TEA will respond to questions/comments that require a response in *italics*. Some questions require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the meeting.

Welcome

- Question: Is the concept of TAAG being communicated to districts? The districts think that TAAG is initiating the Refresh. *We have a description of TAAG on our website, and will make sure it says that TAAG is providing feedback on A-F proposals. Let us know if you have other thoughts on how we can improve it! https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/accountability/academic-accountability/performance-reporting/2023-accountability-development-materials*

***A–F* Framework Updates**

Updating Targets Discussion Questions

- Will the "What If" scores be sent out in November? *No, we need to set targets and cut points before we can send out the "What if" scores. There are decisions that are still pending that are needed to finalize targets and cut points, e.g., we are waiting on more feedback on the new Algebra 1 and early graduation proposals.*
- Why is average anchored around 78 instead of 75? *In general, average will scale in the 75-78 range. If average is anchored to a lower number, the system would end up with more Ds/Fs.*
- How many districts have 90 percent or more of their students growing more than one year? *This depends on how we measure growth. We are currently running analyses on actual statewide outcomes using our new transition table model, and will use that data to inform our goals.*
- Would the 88 percent CCMR *A* cut point be implemented for 2023 accountability? *Yes, pending modeling to make sure this is a rigorous, yet fair expectation.*
- How set is the 88 percent? *It is proposed to proceed if the data modeling continues to show it is both rigorous and fair. Based on research and baseline data, it appears aligned with state postsecondary goals for our students.*
- It takes several years for us to get programs and teachers in place. It is important to allow for grace for us to implement. We need time to align resources. We need a few years. *Cut point adjustments would happen immediately for 2023 as they are set stable for the next five years. We could go back to making target adjustments every year, so the adjustments are smaller, but we have a design commitment to hold cut points steady over multiple years. When we hold cut points steady for five years, the increases appear more significant during the refresh as there were no smaller incremental increases each year. The CCMR criteria themselves will be phased in with future classes to allow programming adjustments.*
- Do we know when Texas College Bridge was fully implemented? Prior to that year, the College Prep classes were not as rigorous. My concern is that we are making decisions on data that isn't really what we think it is because of the lag. *Texas College Bridge was brought onboard during the height of the pandemic.*
- Was the 60 STAAR and CCMR *A* score also originally based off the 60x30 plan? *Yes, that 60 was aligned with the 60 percent by 2030 goal*

- Can we get more modeling on the 88 percent for A CCMR cut point for rural schools? *Yes*
- Comments/Concerns
    - The STAAR cut point is more fair than rigorous. It appears that we are setting the bar too low.
    - 88 percent for an *A* seems rigorous.
    - When the ESSER funds are removed, CCMR may become even more rigorous.
    - The rigor is in the curriculum and how we are asking them to demonstrate proficiency. Five years ago, cut scores were anchored to 60 percent. Given the disruption of COVID, this should remain unchanged.

Academic Growth Discussion Questions

- Why are Did Not Meet assessments included in both denominators? *To focus on this particular subset of data.*
- Is this extra credit for accelerating the students? *It's two points in the denominator with potentially two points in the numerator as well.*
- Is this indicator where it's going to be? It should be in Student Achievement. *Yes, it will remain in School Progress.*
- Are we looking at measuring growth for English I end-of course (EOC) to English II EOC? *Yes, it is first time to first time. We considered how to include additional opportunities for retesters but ultimately, those tests will not be included.*
- What about grade 8 science to biology? *This measure would only evaluate RLA and mathematics.*
- What does modeling look like for high poverty campuses? Can we scale them separately? This may hurt high poverty campuses. *We are continuing to model data and scaling. We are evaluating several options for how to combine the growth tables. Breaking them out as two raw scores is the current option based on feedback.*
- Comments/Concerns
    - There is a lot of confusion around 2023 "school progress" versus the STAAR progress measure still. There seems to be a vocabulary problem as some still do not believe there will be a School Progress, Part A: Academic Growth domain in 2023 accountability.
    - If you don't scale these charts independently, then the outcomes will be harder to explain to our stakeholders.
    - These measures should be two separate tables and two separate scales. We need to see more modeling.
    - When the outcomes for both sections are combined, they will focus on the kids who did not meet.
    - It adds value to have a weighted average and having two scores. You get two raw scores that can work together.
    - Reviewing more data on this before deciding is important. I am not sure my teachers will understand this accelerated growth and then the averaging.
    - School board members will struggle with this concept.

CCMR Discussion Questions

- What is the state doing to support small districts that don't have funding for more than one pathway. Are we taking the impact on small/rural schools into account? *We evaluate*

all types of districts when we model data. We will share this concern with the College, Career, and Military Preparation Division (CCMP).

- Can you provide a quick update on which previously discussed topics such as capping growth, capping CCMR, college prep courses (CP), and/or IBC? Which previous proposals are still alive versus which ones have been tossed out? *We are not moving forward with the previously discussed CCMR adjustments, because of the feedback to address the issues more directly. The feedback that we've received about college prep has made it clear that the problem is not with all college prep courses, so we shouldn't implement a cap that may impact all courses equally. Instead, we will continue to work with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to figure out how to better define rigor requirements for college prep courses.. We are also continuing to examine data on IBCs, including workforce and wage data. All potential changes to College Prep or non-sunsetting IBCs would only apply to future graduating classes. We are continuing to look closely at data related to the sunsetting IBCs.*
- This IBC chart is incredible. Do we have this for all certifications in the state? *Not yet. CCMP has been analyzing these types of data, and we will continue to share as we have them.*
- There will be no adult behavior change happening for the 2023 graduates as those schedules are set. There are a lot of kids who do a sampling of career and technical courses in career exploration. Can we move the proposed phase in back to the following year? *We will pass this along to CCMP. Their team is releasing data in TEAL to provide districts insights into how the phase in may impact their programming.*
- Do conversations with THECB include consideration of which IBCs constitute credentials of value? Is there a framework you all are working on to identify which IBCs are credentials of value? *We are working with the Texas Workforce Commission and THECB. CCMP works closely with both agencies. The IBC list gets updated every two years with the rigor evaluated each cycle.*
- Some of the analysis logic is not considering small rural districts for IBCs. *We have shared this feedback with CCMP. We always consider the impact on small rural schools when we model data.*
- Comments/Concerns
    - Changing CCMR scaling cut points for the 2022 and 2023 graduating classes seems unfair. This class will not change, and the agency will receive pushback.
    -

Closing the Gaps Discussion Questions

- Why did we not include grades K–2 in the district proportional rollup? *The grade spans offered by in Texas districts are incredibly varied. Having a uniform exclusion removes this variable from the equation and makes the methodology uniform without regard to where a district chooses to serve students in these grades.*
- Why did we include grades 9–12 in the district proportional rollup? *Those students are working on CCMR and graduation requirements each year.*
- Is the large Closing the Gaps data table "report only" for districts? *Yes, it will be report only for district planning purposes. It will have the district subset applied so it will include outcomes for any students who moved between campuses but did not move outside of the district.*

- We want to incorporate as many kids as possible, including those that are mobile, but won't they be excluded if they are not one of the evaluated groups? *ESSA requires campus ratings; they do not require or evaluate district ratings. For Comprehensive Support identifications we only need to use All Students, but for our state system we need the state-required groups in addition to All Students. Targeted and Additional Targeted identifications will continue to focus on the disaggregated data across all those disaggregated groups.*
- Why test students at all if we are not evaluating a test from a student that moves? *Test results are not just for accountability, but also to support parents, educators, and the community in better supporting their students. Data modeling shows an average of 1 percent of tests are lost between the district and campus subsets. That is roughly 0.5 percent of students statewide. It is a very tiny percentage. This is a district administrator messaging piece as the movement has no change on how tests are included for the campuses. These results will be reported in the district's Closing the Gaps data tables.*
- Could we create a "mobile" campus for students from that group and incorporate that campus into the district rating? *We can run data and see the impact of that proposal. This goes back to the balance between fairness and transparency. Are there enough students in districts to consolidate them for reporting and evaluation purposes?*

District Ratings Discussion Comments/Concerns

- It feels like we are gaming the system to get higher scores by using the "better of" domain scores. We are trying to make it fairer, but then the more complicated it becomes, the less transparent it becomes.
- Kids don't take NAEP seriously. That may be one of the reasons for the gap.
- Learning is complex. To me it's not about options; it's about the various ways to measure learning.
- NAEP is a representative stratified sample every other year
- Comparing a low socioeconomic school at 89 percent to a school with no low socioeconomic students is messy. The balance for "accountability" is a challenge.

Student Achievement Algebra I EOC Proposal Discussion Questions

- What about English I and Biology accelerated testers? *We have so few of these statewide.*
- Would the middle and high school receive the score? *Yes, both schools get the results, and the accelerated students must still take ACT/SAT before graduation.*
- What if your high schools don't want those scores? *Most districts would want these counted twice since the passing percentage is higher than for students taking it in 9th grade.*
- Could we not include our SAT/ACT accelerated testers results in the first two domains then? *Yes, we could do that. Those must be included for ESSA under Closing the Gaps.*
- For campuses that are 6–12 or K–12 would they still get to count Algebra I twice as well? *Great question. We have not gotten to that level of detail yet.*
- Comments
    - I would like to incentive this. If you want to do STEM, you need Calculus in high school. They need the rigorous courses early.
    - What is the problem we are trying to solve? This does not seem to target the right areas.

- We give STAAR to measure learning. This morphs the STAAR into something it should not be. The high schools would love this, but it does not make for a valid accountability system for high schools. How can we do more incentivize acceleration in the middle schools?
- This will boost our high school scores when they did not provide the instruction. They are unhappy with not having those high performing students.
- While I support incentivizing this as the intent is good, but I'm not sure this solves the problem. Let's incentivize this carefully. This is not the best approach. Changing adult behavior is the issue.
- The high schools would like to have that score. But does this then "hide" missing rigor of our non-accelerated students? If we are going to double test, then let's just double test STAAR. Other states are double testing their accelerated learners.
- I can see this leading to districts only placing the guaranteed Master's students into middle school Algebra in order to game their STAAR accountability scores.

Early Graduation Discussion Questions

- What is the problem? *We have received feedback that some districts were not letting students graduate early as they were not CCMR.*
- Comments
  - Our team liked the possibility of this Early Graduation incentives.
  - This could create major issues with connecting from high school to college. Sometimes it is developmentally inappropriate. It could also pit families against schools if we tell them they must graduate early, and families don't want that.
  - Don't we want every kid to be CCMR ready? This sends conflicting messages. You can graduate early without regard to CCMR, but you are expected to graduate on time with CCMR?
  - The district told my daughter she could not graduate early. They wanted her to earn more AP credits. We need to do what's best for each child.
  - The incentive for early graduation should be limited only to students who meet CCMR.

Overall Ratings: 3 out of 4 Ds Discussion Questions

- Why not align *B*s, *C*s, and *D*s? *We will share this feedback.*

STAAR Redesign Discussion Questions

- Is the difficulty only based off the TEKS or based off the question type as well? All the questions I get center around how the question types alone (move from multiple choice) is increasing the difficulty. *How many students are getting it right or wrong. We are capturing how hard a question is through field testing. If a question is more difficult because it isn't multiple-choice, we will capture that through field testing, and can take that into account when building a test.*