

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on September 29, 2022

The objective of the September 29th TAAG meeting is to welcome and introduce TAAG members and 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.

- Introductions and Meeting Norms
- System Design Commitments and Refresh Timeline
 - Questions
 - Do TAAG Members have some parameters in sharing TAAG meeting information to other educators or district stakeholders? *No. In addition, we will post the notes and presentation publicly on the [2023 Accountability Development Materials](#) webpage. TEA can also assist in supporting presentations to different stakeholders.*
 - How can TEA provide “what if” ratings based on the new methodology to facilitate continuous improvement efforts? *We will utilize the 2022 accountability data and analyze it through the new accountability system to create the “what if” ratings. This will help districts provide a “bridge” between the 2022 ratings and the 2023 refreshed ratings.*
 - Can TEA provide “what if” ratings separating online testers and paper testers? *No. We do not have a flag in our accountability data that distinguishes online versus paper testers.*
 - Why provide “what if” ratings? *The purpose of “what-if” rating is to track the continuous improvement from the old system to the new system. It is meant to serve as a bridge allowing districts to compare how their 2022 results from the old system perform in the new system.*
 - Are “what-if” ratings released to districts (or publicly) prior to the delayed mid-September 2023 ratings release? *The “what-if” data will likely be released in the spring 2023. Districts will receive very detailed outcomes and the public will receive very broad outcomes.*
 - Will any “what if” calculations be used in School Improvement calculations? *No.*
 - Once “what if” ratings are released will TEA do an analysis of how outcomes shifted and how much deviation there was between the old and new systems? *Yes. TEA conducts various analyses during development that analyze potential impact using many indicators such as district/campus size, economically disadvantaged percentage, charter status, etc.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - The “what if” calculations will be important for those whose district rating mirrors their high school rating. It will assist elementary and middle schools to understand the impact they have on the district as whole.
- What are you currently hearing about the A–F refresh?
 - Questions
 - How many refresh considerations are final and how many are still under consideration? Can stakeholders still have some influence on these decisions? *The considerations we review today are mostly final. Topics*

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on September 29, 2022

included in future TAAG meetings are still under consideration and open for feedback.

- Are there studies about each CCMR measure and how many students remain in college long term versus those that enroll and leave? Yes. *TEA is doing extensive data modeling with our available data sets. In addition to reviewing national research, we are isolating CCMR indicators, studying the impact of linking CCMR indicators, and completing analysis of outcomes for the different indicators.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - There is a lot of concern in the field about the impact of STAAR redesign on accountability. Many stakeholders believe there should have been an accountability pause for the first STAAR redesign year since it is such a significant change. *We'll revisit this in a future meeting to see how we can address public concerns.*
 - There is concern about re-scaling the scores for 2023 given the impact of COVID-19. *We'll revisit this in a future meeting to see how we can address public concerns.*
 - Standard setting does not give the field confidence that the STAAR redesign is not impactful on accountability.
 - Stakeholders are concerned about various growth models. We need to recognize a growth model that can demonstrate that when students move from the Spanish test to the English test that is also demonstrating growth. This ensures we don't create a system where schools are disincentivized to transition students from Spanish to English so they ensure the growth points are awarded. *We'll dedicate a lot of time to Growth in our next meeting.*
 - Stakeholders want to know if the Spanish to English and English I will be included in Domain 2A: Academic Growth. *As of today, yes. We have received repeated requests to include these results even though it has shown to be a net-negative statewide.*
 - There is a strong concern about adding IBCs on top of the programs of study when that doesn't seem to have been the legislative intent. Programs of study and IBCs take time to build and CCMR data already lagging by one year.
 - Some districts were unable to test online in 2022. There is concern that students will not perform as well in 2023 because they are not familiar with the online testing platform.
 - Should CCMR be an indicator of college readiness or attainment? Districts need to be clear on what the expectation is for their graduates. *We will dig further into CCMR in our next meeting.*
 - There is concern that college persistence data is used to make CCMR decisions without recognition of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB's) role in persistence. *We will dig further into CCMR in our next meeting.*
- Ensure cut points and targets reflect appropriate goals for students post-COVID
 - Questions

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on September 29, 2022

- How will you determine cut points given the impact of COVID-19 and the increased growth leading the 2022 ratings? *Will likely use the average between 2019 and 2022 (i.e., pre & post COVID) for performance indicators. Early data shows there is not much variation between existing cut scores and projected new cut scores using the average.*
- TEA has stated that under the accountability system, all schools and districts could earn an A. If the average is a 78, how is that appropriate when comparing data to a traditional bell curve? We need more information on how it is used in standard setting and determining final letter grades or passing scores. *The goal is that unlike the old system where we had a moving scale every year, once we set cuts now they are static for 5 years. This allows for all schools and districts to improve their scores each year.*
- If we set 70 as the average C score, what is the impact on accountability ratings? *This topic actually links directly to scaling. What should the “average” outcome scale to? If average scales to a 78, more campuses will have As and Bs, as the scaling is set slightly higher. If average scales to a 70, more campuses will have a D or F as just one point below average would be a 69 (D). Approximately 50% of schools in Texas would receive a D or an F rating if baseline average is scaled to a 70.*
- How did Texas see a 5% gain in math and a 9% gain in reading (at "Meets" and "Masters" level) but only see a 2% gain in the percent of students in hitting expected or accelerated growth? *For large urban districts, many students didn't take STAAR 3–8 in 2021, therefore the state didn't have as many students who were eligible for Academic Growth in 2022.*
- Is there a way to set an average that does not skew to rating proportions either way? *TEA will investigate this.*
- Comments/Concerns
 - It will be important to effectively communicate this 78 as average to different stakeholders (i.e., parents versus districts) in an understandable manner.
- Increase alignment of district outcomes with campus outcomes
 - Questions
 - Would students who take TELPAS in grades KG-2 be excluded from campus enrollment counts when calculating proportional campus weights? *Yes.*
 - Will proportional ratings methodology be reflected in the “what-if” scenarios? *Yes.*
 - Has this proposal been finalized? *Yes, pending a few remaining technical details.*
 - Will the grades 3-12 enrollment numbers be as of the October snapshot date? *Yes.*
 - Did TEA complete data modeling of how proportional ratings would change ratings for districts statewide? *Yes. We ran modeling last fall. The modeling used existing cut points (which will be updated for 2023). If no*

2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Summary of Meeting on September 29, 2022

- other parts of the system or scaling changed, approximately 30% of district scores would be impacted by proportional scaling.*
- For the Closing the Gaps domain would the English Language Proficiency (ELP) component include only grades 3-12 or KG-12 that improved at least one composite rating? *ELP on campuses includes students beginning in KG. The decision remains if we include Closing the Gaps as part of the proportional district roll up or not. The potential impacts are still being explored.*
 - How will proportional ratings affect the scaling tool? *TEA will have to update the Estimator to specifically account for district ratings that incorporate the new system.*
 - Can we incorporate grades KG-2 enrollment counts into the proportional system? *This may be possible. We will investigate this and complete additional data modeling.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - Districts with high in-district mobility rates are concerned proportional ratings excludes a significant number of students from the enrollment data. This could make the accountability system unstable. *TEA has modeled this data. Over three years of data, statewide approximately 1% of student are mobile within the same district. We are continuing to run analysis of outlier districts regarding mobility.*
 - Proportional ratings ensures that districts are held accountable for students instead of campuses.
 - Proportional ratings ensure that one or two low performing campuses can't be concealed in the district rating.
 - Please include KG-2 students in proportional ratings. For many districts, this is a significant number of students.
 - Alignment of A–F Accountability and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)
 - Questions
 - Can we form a technical committee to explore this alignment and make recommendations at a more granular level than TAAG can provide? *Yes.*
 - Would this alignment require a legislative change? *No.*
 - Incorporation of Extracurricular Leadership (ECC)
 - Report due to the Texas Legislature by December 1, 2022. We will discuss ECC in a spring 2023 meeting.
 - Upcoming Meetings