

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

The objective of the October 7th 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.*

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 somton Td()TjTT2 1 Tf-0 -1.145 -1.145 j0.509 0 Td()Tj0.5*

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% **RIDOBELW** 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