Notable Changes to House Bill 22 Framework Based on Feedback

The Decisions Framework for House Bill (HB) 22 (85th Texas Legislature) has evolved significantly based on stakeholder feedback. TEA sought feedback from many sources, including 60+ regional forums with superintendents, 40+ focus group meetings, and countless emails and one-on-one conversations conducted by multiple agency staff with superintendents, school board members, principals, teachers, parents, students, business leaders, professional associations, and other advocacy groups.

As is expected given the complexity of the topic and the size of Texas, stakeholders brought a range of perspectives. The feedback we solicited did not give us one consistent direction, and at times stakeholders proposed radically different or even directly conflicting directions for our A–F framework. To help us weigh competing recommendations, the Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC), with technical support provided by the Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC), reviewed much of this feedback and engaged in rigorous discussions on these topics. These advisory groups then submitted synthesized recommendations from this feedback, which we found immensely helpful in reconciling competing points of view, but even their recommendations were not unanimous in all cases.

Despite these challenges, this feedback was immensely helpful and guided our revisions to the Decisions Framework substantially. The following chart highlights the impact of this stakeholder feedback on the final Decisions Framework to be put forth as proposed rule in the *2018 Accountability Manual*. The chart notes:

- TEA's original recommendations prior to stakeholder feedback,
- stakeholder feedback, as synthesized by APAC and ATAC, and
- the resulting changes to TEA's recommendations.

Notable Changes to House Bill 22 Framework Based on Feedback

House Bill (HB) 22 Original TEA Proposal	Stakeholder Feedback	TEA Final Decisions Framework for Proposed Rule
Student Achievement Domain		
Dual Credit Under HB 2804, which preceded HB 22, students who did not qualify as college ready based on TSI scores could otherwise qualify by completing twelve credit hours of dual-credit coursework. Under HB 22, TEA proposed reducing this requirement to nine credit hours.	Reduce the requirement to three hours of dual credit in any subject area.	Earn three hours of dual credit in ELA **OR** mathematics; or nine hours of dual credit in any subject. This decision considers both stakeholder feedback and research that shows a correlation between first year persistence in higher education for students who complete three hours of credit in ELA/mathematics or who complete nine credit hours in any subject.
CTE Coherent Sequence TEA proposed that students could qualify as career ready by relying solely on whether students achieved one of the workforce-vetted industry-based certifications. Students who did not receive this certification would not be considered career ready, even if they were enrolled in a coherent sequence of CTE classes.	Include some mechanism to recognize CTE coherent sequence graduates, especially given the fact that many districts have not yet transitioned to offering the industry credential examination opportunities.	Include CTE coherent sequence graduates as career ready if they have completed and received credit for at least one CTE course aligned with the list of 73 industry-based certifications. Given that passing rates on industry-based certifications appear to average about 50 percent (although they vary by type), apply a one-half point credit to the CCMR score for those qualifying coherent sequence graduates who did not receive an industry-based certification. Maintain this one-half point credit through 2020 to ensure districts have enough time to begin offering these certification examinations.

Notable Changes to House Bill 22 Framework Based on Feedback

House Bill (HB) 22 Original TEA Proposal	Stakeholder Feedback	TEA Final Decisions Framework for Proposed Rule
Student Achievement Domain		
High Schools, Districts, and K–12 Weights At the high school and district level, Student Achievement is made up of three components: STAAR, College, Career and Military Readiness (CCMR), and graduation rates. TEA proposed weighting these as follows: STAAR-45%, CCMR-45%, graduation rates-10%.	Give greater weight to graduation rates. Options included the following: • Use equal weighting for the three components of the Student Achievement domain: STAAR-34%, CCMR-33%, and graduation rates-33%. • If not equal weighting, then weight the three components of the Student Achievement domain at STAAR-40%, CCMR-40%, and graduation rates-20%.	Weight the three components of the Student Achievement domain at STAAR-40%, CCMR-40%, and graduation rates-20%.

Notable Changes to House Bill 22 Framework Based on Feedback

House Bill (HB) 22 Original TEA Proposal	Stakeholder Feedback	TEA Final Decisions Framework for Proposed Rule
School Progress Domain		
Academic Growth Calculation Prior to HB 22, credit for academic growth was only given for those students who saw sufficient vertical scale score point growth to be designated as reaching the *Expected* or *Accelerated* STAAR Progress Measure. This meant, for example, that credit might not be given for students who maintained Masters Grade Level from year to year. TEA proposed providing full credit for maintaining Masters Grade Level but not necessarily full credit for maintaining proficiency below this threshold.	Award one-half point for students who maintain Meets Grade Level or Approaches Grade Level year over year if they don't meet the *Expected* or *Accelerated* STAAR Progress Measure; award a full point if they also meet the *Expected* or *Accelerated* STAAR Progress Measure.	Accepted recommendation as proposed by stakeholders. Award one-half point for students who stay at Meets Grade Level or Approaches Grade Level year over year, regardless of whether they met the *Expected* or *Accelerated* STAAR Progress Measure; award a full point if they also met the *Expected* or *Accelerated* STAAR Progress Measure.
Academic Growth in High School The variation in examinations taken by high school students presents unique challenges in evaluating growth: • A significant number of students take Algebra I in 8th grade. There is no subsequent mathematics examination, and therefore, we have no way of evaluating growth from 8th to 9th grade. • Students take English I in 9th grade and English II in 10th grade. This allows us to calculate reading growth in 10th grade only. Given this limited sample size, TEA proposed excluding Academic Growth for high schools when evaluating School Progress, relying only on Relative Performance.	Even though sample sizes will be limited, it is still valuable to recognize the growth achieved for high schools.	Accepted recommendation as proposed by stakeholders. Academic Growth to be included at the high school level.

Notable Changes to House Bill 22 Framework Based on Feedback

House Bill (HB) 22 Original TEA Proposal	Stakeholder Feedback	TEA Final Decisions Framework for Proposed Rule
School Progress Domain		
Relative Performance Calculation TEA proposed using a linear calculation $(y = mx + b)$ to determine relative campus performance, examining the Student Achievement domain score relative to district and campus economically disadvantaged student percentages.	The linear comparison model appeared to create outliers at the extremes (very low poverty and very high poverty schools). Consider some adjustment to the model to minimize this effect.	Acted on recommendation from stakeholders. The comparison will now be based on a slightly curved line, using a quadratic calculation to better account for the outliers at the extremes.
School Progress Combined Rating HB 22 describes using academic growth and relative performance to assess school progress but does not specify how to weight the two parts of the domain. TEA proposed using the average of the two to get the school progress combined domain rating.	Use a best of approach, taking the better of academic growth or relative performance for the school progress combined rating.	Accepted recommendation from stakeholders. School Progress will be based on the better of academic growth or relative performance.

Notable Changes to House Bill 22 Framework Based on Feedback

House Bill (HB) 22 Original TEA Proposal	Stakeholder Feedback	TEA Final Decisions Framework for Proposed Rule
Closing the Gaps Domain		
Indicator/Student Group Targets This domain includes multiple performance indicators analyzed for multiple student groups, with targets sets for each. This domain also aligns with ESSA, so there is a single state and federal accountability system in Texas moving forward. TEA proposed targets that were aligned with the 5-year goals for the state from the state's submitted ESSA plan.	Consider using lower targets given the 5-year goals were substantially above the state's current average performance.	Acted on recommendation from stakeholders. Targets will be aligned with current average performance for each student group for each indicator upon approval of an amendment to the ESSA state plan.
Component Weighting TEA proposed weighting each component equally to compute a percentage of indicators met within the domain.	Consider adjustments to place an equal emphasis on growth and achievement.	Accepted recommendation from stakeholders. Weights will be applied to each component to provide equal emphasis on growth and achievement upon approval of an amendment to the ESSA state plan.
English Language Proficiency Consistent with ESSA requirements, TEA proposed using TELPAS as an indicator to measure progress for English learners.	Request a one-year waiver from the USDE due to TELPAS changes in 2018.	Accepted recommendation from stakeholders. If granted, a one-year waiver will allow TEA to use two years of comparable TELPAS in 2019 to calculate the English Language Proficiency component.

Notable Changes to House Bill 22 Framework Based on Feedback

House Bill (HB) 22 Original TEA Proposal	Stakeholder Feedback	TEA Final Decisions Framework for Proposed Rule
Other		
Substitute Assessments TEA proposed attempting to use substitute assessments in the accountability system in lieu of STAAR EOC, at least in the Student Achievement domain.	Create performance level descriptors for all substitute assessments at Masters, Meets, *and* Approaches Grade Level standards, and use both for Student Achievement and the Academic Growth portion of School Progress.	Working to explore and implement stakeholder feedback. The standard-setting and equating processes for aligning substitute assessments with STAAR takes more time than what was available in the 2017–18 school year. For the 2018 accountability ratings, only Meets Grade Level will be included for substitute assessments. TEA will explore identifying cut points for Approaches Grade Level and Masters Grade Level on all substitute assessments. TEA will also explore using the differentiated performance level descriptors described above to calculate simple academic growth for high school students on substitute assessments. The goal is for this to be in place for the 2020 accountability ratings.