

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 9, 2022

The objective of the February 9, 2022, Accountability Technical and Policy Advisory Committee meeting was to discuss minor updates to the 2022 accountability rating system and the 2023 accountability rating system reset. TEA responses to questions and concerns are provided in italics. Some questions require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the meeting.

- x Welcome, Meeting Norms, and Agenda
- x 2022 Accountability System, Federal Identification Updates
 - o Questions
 - f* Why are we identifying more than 320 campuses (bottom 5%) and not the bare minimum of what is required for federal accountability? This methodology does the minimum and does not identify additional campuses beyond what is required. Newly identified campuses are significantly less than the 320 count and we cannot exit campuses yearly, so the 481 total includes scale score ties and reidentified campuses.
 - f* Can we break out those number then? Break up the newly identified and the reidentified campuses? Excluding reidentified/progress campuses, modeling includes 156 total newly identified campuses (123 elementaries, 27 middle schools, 4 high schools, and 2 AECs).
 - f* When will campuses that were identified as either comprehensive or comprehensive progress in 2019 be eligible for exit? Will this exit criteria begin in 2022, meaning the earliest exit would be 2024? CSI exit criteria requires two years of data. If the campus was identified in 2019, then 2023 would be the first potential exit year because of COVID.
 - f* Alternative education campuses (AEC) must have 67% graduation rate or
hen

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 9, 2022

- x AEA Taskforce Recommendations

- o Questions

- f What would happen to a school if they do not meet the new 60% at ages 16+? What services would they be losing? Nothing. They are not losing any services. AEC programs are locally run and funded. This is solely an accountability label.

- x Closing the Gaps: Targets by Campus Type

- o Questions

- f Why were the targets not set by campus type initially? The guidance we originally received from the USDE was that it was not an option. Since that time, other states have been granted that authority and now that is what we are pursuing.

- f Supergroup combines English Learners (ELs), special education, and economically disadvantaged but does it also remove them from race/ethnicity groups? In Connecticut for example, they only evaluate two groups of students which are the All Students group and High Needs Group (ELs, special education, and economically disadvantaged). Connecticut reports race/ethnicity data where the students are duplicated but they chose to remove race/ethnicity groups, except for all students, and focus on those two groups for school improvement. As student demographics in Texas are quite different than those in Connecticut, we ran an analysis on the overlap of students who would fall in both the All Students group and the High Needs group. Using 2021 demographic data, 26.6% of campuses would have a 90–100% overlap between All Students and High Needs. 77.7% of campuses would have an overlap of at least 50%. Reducing the evaluation focus down to just these two groups would undoubtedly have an impact on these campuses.

- f ~~by the state in 2018 (all) B-1 (1) 3.33 (201) 0.1 (1) 78 (5) (d) 0.1 (us) -1.8.5 (ni) 18.6 (H~~

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 9, 2022

- f* I am reluctant to set targets for 10 years out. Given the unknowns, I am afraid of them not being legitimate. I am fine with setting small range targets, but we need to look at the variables that link to teacher shortages and the changes in STAAR (switching to online administration, RLA redesign, etc.). We do not know the implications of these changes yet, so setting targets is difficult. We must set long-term targets, but there is nothing that prevents us from creating an amendment to our ESSA to change these targets later on.
- f* It does look bad that we have different targets for different races/ethnicities, but taking into consideration the limited resources for economically disadvantaged students seems reasonable.
- f* Without equity measures, the system is applying the same outcome targets and standards which are resulting in highly correlated outcomes to levels of economically disadvantaged.
- f* The more complex we make (t)19e

2023 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on February 9, 2022

growing your students faster. I think awarding points for this accelerated growth makes sense. The only qualm I have is with the supergrouping. I do not think we should group the special education students in with the emergent bilingual students/ELs and the economically disadvantaged. The grouping example was from Connecticut. We can create groupings and ask for approval from the USDE as we see fit.

f In the supergroup it makes sense to group the economically disadvantaged and emergent bilingual students/ELs but it does not make as much sense to include special education students. They're such a different population of students. The grouping example was from Connecticut. We can create groupings and ask for approval from USDE as we see fit.

x Distinction Designations and Badges

o Questions

f What's the difference between a distinction and a badge? Distinctions are based in statute and awarded based on performance on the top 25% of your campus comparison group. Badges do not use campus comparison groups and are similar to Blue Ribbon School designations. We can award badges to campuses and based on exemplar performance irrespective of the comparison group.

f Can we award badges and/or distinctions for AEAs? It's not in statute, but it's something that we're continuing to work on through the AEA taskforce.

o Comments/Concerns

f International Baccalaureate schools and schools with a certain percentage of nationally certified teachers.6 (nt)1 Td (,l)Tj2 (e)18.6 (nt)1.1 (t9n182 0 Td (