

## 2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on October 7, 2022

The objective of the October 7<sup>th</sup> TAAG meeting is to continue providing the commissioner of education with recommendations related to the academic accountability system refresh. 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
- Revisiting lingering topics (Proportional Ratings)
  - Questions
    - What was the denominator for the mobile students in the “proportional ratings: aggregated data at district level” data? *We calculated the number of students who were district stable (all students who had a scored answer document AND remained in the district). The numerator was students who transferred from campus to campus within the same district.*
    - Is there any possibility of implementing an “if then” to apply proportionality to district ratings? *No. The concern is the difficulty in stakeholder understanding. We also want to keep calculations uniform across the state.*
    - Will districts still receive reports with all student data? *Yes.*
    - Why do we need this rating calculation change for districts? *Many stakeholders have questioned how a district could earn an A rating when most of their campuses are Bs and below. When we analyzed the data, approximately 30% of districts were out of alignment with their campus ratings. This new system ensures that districts are aligned with all campuses in their district.*
    - Do you have data on how this would change district ratings across the state? *It is difficult to find accurate comparison data with such a significant change. We used 2019 data for modeling and found approximately 30% of districts would have had a letter grade change (some increased and some decreased). We did not look at 2022 due to many changing variables so it wasn't an applicable model.*
    - Did you look at the rate of out of district mobility? *Yes. At or below 5% of students were mobile in district statewide.*
    - In this new system, which students are included in the district accountability subset? *Students who were at a campus in the district on the October snapshot date and move within the same district to another campus and test on that campus are included in the district accountability subset. They are not included in the campus accountability subset.*
  - Comments/Concerns
    - There is a lack of stakeholder understanding of why the agency is breaking from several decades of practice where either a hold harmless process or pause on accountability is used during assessment redesigns. It would help if the agency could directly explain why both the STAAR redesign and accountability refresh are occurring in consecutive years.
- Improve ability to recognize Academic Growth
  - Questions
    - Can we see the public comments on Academic Growth ahead of the public comment release? *We received over 550 public comments*

## 2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

### Summary of Meeting on October 7, 2022

*with many duplicates and are in the process of reducing them to more digestible version. We will post the summary publicly this fall.*

- If we use a 2 or 3-point table will there actually be extra points, or will you scale them down? *We would scale them down.*
- Would any points above 1 would be considered actual “extra points”? *Yes.*
- Why apply 0.5 points if a student is Approaches low and then earns Approaches low the next year? *The lift for learning is greater in a consecutive school year. For a student to maintain that level of performance, they had to gain a year’s worth of knowledge. That is worth 0.5 points showing some growth.*
- Is there any consideration to include high and low bands in the Meets and Masters performance levels? *We investigated this, and our psychometricians determined we cannot break it down to that level for those performances. There is not enough differentiation between bands in those performance levels.*
- Is the 1-point option the most similar to what we have used in prior years? *Yes.*
- How would this new way of rating impact the chance score range? *Chance score is included in the Approaches low band.*
- Is it correct that there are really no bonus points because we would be scaling down? *Correct*
- Would scaling be static? *Yes. For 5 years.*
- Comments/Concerns
  - Not knowing the denominator for growth made it difficult to submit appropriate public comments.
  - Some stakeholders feel the 1-point table does not adequately reward impressive growth.
  - A concern with the 3-point table is anything above a 1-point range could be deceptive of what a campus is actually achieving. There are many reasons a student could achieve Did Not Meet one year and then perform significantly better next year, especially as they go to high school. We have parents that will “opt out” of testing in grades 3-8 but will test in high school. This could inflate campus performance.
  - When looking at 2 and 3-points there is significant concern around scaling down. This would negatively impact campuses that are making significant annual gains. Campuses would “lose” in system of higher point ranges once it is scaled down. Scaling down eliminates the goal to reward significant growth.
  - This should be applied as a distinction designation or badge for extra points in the accountability system.
  - Providing more clarity around the denominator, scaling, and elimination of "opt-out" will assist many stakeholders in their understanding.
- Update College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) Indicators: Better align methodology with CCMR Outcomes Bonus
  - Questions
    - Why do students need to earn an industry-based certification **after** completing a program of study when they are separate in Texas Education Code? *The linkage between these two indicators originated*

## 2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

### Summary of Meeting on October 7, 2022

*with studies that our career and technical division completed. Their researched determined that linking the two is more indicative of demonstrating a student's accurate career readiness.*

- *How often will the group be updated on recommendations and who makes the final decision? We will update you all, and the public, as decisions are being made.*
- *What is the source for 42% of jobs in 2030 will require at least some college? TEA CCMP analyses are based on Emsi data.*
- *What year did you use to model this data? 2022.*
- *Are you basing the 20-25% threshold on current district performance? By looking at the 42% from Emsi data we would not recommend that 42% of students are college ready. We believe that at least half of 42% of students should be college ready producing our recommendation on 20-25%. We need enough students to be college ready to support the job market.*
- *Why was this not in previous presentations for public comment/superintendents to give input? CCMR is still under development and recommendations have changed frequently based on stakeholder feedback and data modeling. This changed very recently based on stakeholder feedback.*
- *Will there be additional opportunities for public comment outside of the proposed accountability manual? Yes. Feedback will be accepted between now and the spring preliminary accountability manual.*
- *Would weighting be implemented over time or immediately in 2023? It would be implemented in 2023 because of its limited potential impact on ratings.*
- *Has there been consideration to tiering or adjusting the college ready indicators to ensure they do correlate with college readiness? That would require an extremely high level of effort with extended time. We also have many limitations to the National Student Clearinghouse data which are required to use sufficient data for tiering decisions.*
- *How does weighting account for districts that have 80% of students college ready but 60% of those students were all completing a college prep course? This is the work that the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) will begin. THECB will work to make sure there are uniform rigorous standards for earning college readiness.*
- Comments/Concerns
  - *The requirement to earn an industry-based certification **after** completing a program of study limits the options for students who want additional IBCs.*
  - *Perhaps we could change the CCMR measure from attaining an IBC and being a CTE completer to attaining an IBC and being a CTE concentrator.*
  - *The use of persistence data is concerning to districts. TEA changes metrics that hold a district accountable for persistence. Districts should only be responsible for enrollment.*

## 2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

### Summary of Meeting on October 7, 2022

- Once students leave our doors and enter the doors to the post-secondary institution of their choice we have not influence.
- We should use a CCMR system that is equally weighted **or** adjust the indicators.
- A weighted system feels like the agency is trying to overvalue being college ready and making it more important than career or military readiness.
- Student mobility will limit students due to districts offerings in IBCs.
- Rural areas of the state don't always require students to obtain college hours for a strong career. This is concerning with weighting.
- Weighting could create a system of "forced failures" for small districts. What should be important is that all students are ready for CCMR regardless of which component they fall into.
- Rural districts don't see as many students interested in college. They have large numbers of students that go into the workforce and are less likely to be interested in college.
- It is still important to look at some persistence data for indicator predictive accuracy.
- Weighting sends a message that regardless of a student's choice, districts would need to "push" enough students to college readiness when they may all prefer a career path. That is not what's best for students.
- Taking away points based on weighting sets a bad precedent. As a district, if the CCMR metric is not performing as desired then we revisit the metric. We do not need the agency to build this into the system for us.
- Weighting does not address the flaw of how we implement CCMR which should be with an incoming graduating class.
- It will greatly upset districts to make this CCMR weighting change at the last minute.
- Update CCMR Indicators: Redefining A threshold for CCMR based on persistence instead of readiness
  - Questions
    - Are you looking at how all the indicators correlate to completion or just the college ready indicators? *Yes. One of TEA's biggest challenges is getting the appropriate data to make these decisions accurately. We would like to analyze more data but do not have the time to analyze more for 2023.*
    - If you set the goal to 88% now for an A what does that mean will happen 5 years from now? Will it bump up even more? *The 88% threshold determines what an A rating is for the next 5 year in our accountability system. We will have to revisit goals after 5 years based on current and historic data and legislative changes.*
    - Would this change be implemented for 2023? *Yes. This would be how we would adjust our CCMR scaling for what determines and A rating in 2023.*
    - Would this adjustment be made based on only college readiness data given that is currently the only data that we have? *Yes.*
  - Comments/Concerns

## 2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

### Summary of Meeting on October 7, 2022

- We must not forget the social and emotional readiness component to persistence.
  - This is identifying what is needed to earn an *A* rating in our K-12 locus of controls that then correlates with persistence. All schools could still earn an *A* rating but this aligns more with what we are truly trying to demonstrate.
  - It is important to remember that we will not see any results of 2023 changes to CCMR for 4 years or more. We need this to be clear for all stakeholders. *This is one target we would like to possibly revisit year to year if possible. All other targets would be static for 5 years.*
- Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) system updates
  - Comments/Concerns
    - It is the Closing the Gaps domain that is particularly not in alignment with the exceptional work being done with Dropout Recovery Schools (DRS).
    - The new proposals will help support these unique campus types and award them for the work they are doing with Texas students.
- Upcoming Meetings