

**Accountability System Development for 2013  
Meeting of the Academic Achievement Distinction Designation Committee (AADD)  
June 25, 2012  
Meeting Outcomes**

**Meeting Objectives**

The objectives for the second AADD meeting were to provide committee members with an update on the development of the state accountability system, make a final determination on the proposed AADD indicators, and review and finalize the distinction designations framework.

**State Accountability Development Update**

Agency staff presented the Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) Performance Index Workgroup proposal that was endorsed by the ATAC at their May 2012 meeting. The proposal is posted online at [http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/20120530mtg/pi\\_proposal.pdf](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/20120530mtg/pi_proposal.pdf).

The committee also reviewed the calendar and agenda topic plans for the accountability advisory committee meetings that are scheduled through spring 2013. The calendar is posted online at [http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/20120530mtg/comprehensive\\_calendar.pdf](http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/20120530mtg/comprehensive_calendar.pdf).

**Proposed Indicators for Academic Achievement Distinction Designations**

At the initial AADD meeting in April, the committee identified seventeen indicators as possible measures of academic achievement in reading/English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Following the April meeting, agency staff prepared background information, measure descriptions, comparisons of advantages/disadvantages, and data analyses, where applicable, for each of the proposed indicators. Committee members reviewed the summary information and finalized their recommendation for each indicator as shown in the following table.

#	Proposed AADD Indicators	Comments	Recommendation
1	<b>Algebra by End of Grade 8</b>	Completion of Algebra I in middle school is a key milestone in the progress toward college and career readiness. To address concerns that some schools may be motivated to steer students towards Algebra I in middle school with the expectation of obtaining a distinction, the committee agreed that this indicator should evaluate both performance and participation. Due to the overlap with Indicator 10 that evaluates grade 8 Algebra I and English I end-of-course performance at the Level III standard, the committee recommended combining the two indicators to create a comprehensive measure for middle school campuses.	Combine with Indicator 10 and use in 2013.
2	<b>Greater Than Expected Student Growth on the State Assessment</b>	Since growth data will not be available in 2013, the first possible use of this indicator will be in 2014. The committee agreed that this indicator would provide a level playing field for all schools since it would emphasize progress on the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) rather than meeting the proficiency standards.	Use beginning in 2014.
3	<b>Participation and Performance on ELA/Mathematics Sections</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 8 (EXPLORE)</li> <li>• Grade 10 (PSAT, PLAN)</li> <li>• Grade 11 (PSAT)</li> </ul> <b>College Readiness Assessments</b>	The committee reviewed performance and participation rates for each of these assessments and discussed various funding and participation issues. For example, funding no longer exists for the Texas College Preparation Program (TCPP). Also, participation rates in these assessments can vary widely among campuses. The committee recommended excluding EXPLORE due to the limited number of students taking this assessment statewide.	Use grade 10 PSAT and PLAN and grade 11 PLAN results in 2013.

#	Proposed AADD Indicators	Comments	Recommendation
4	<b>Percentage of Students Who Enroll and Begin Instruction at an Institute of Higher Education in the School Year Following High School Graduation</b>	The committee discussed various data limitations with this indicator. For example, students enrolled in private or out-of-state colleges cannot be tracked. Also, students enroll in college despite the quality of education provided by their high school, thus, limiting the effectiveness of this indicator.	Do not use.
5	<b>Remedial Course Participation in Postsecondary Education</b>	Since the criteria for participation in remedial courses vary widely among Texas universities and community colleges, the committee was concerned that this indicator may not accurately reflect the role of the high school in the student's preparation for college-level coursework.	Do not use.
6	<b>Participation &amp; Performance on the ELA and Mathematics Portions of the SAT or ACT</b>	Since SAT/ACT participation and performance indicators were used in the former Gold Performance Acknowledgments (GPA) system, the committee agreed that these indicators were effective indicators of post-secondary readiness.	Use in 2013.
7	<b>Participation &amp; Performance on AP/IB ELA or Mathematics and Percentage of Students Completing and Receiving Credit for at Least One ELA or Mathematics Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Course</b>	The committee discussed whether larger high schools are more likely to offer these courses compared to smaller or rural high schools. They noted that online courses are available for rural schools but not all advanced assessments are available. Since AP/IB participation and performance indicators were used in the former GPA system, the committee agreed that these indicators were effective indicators of post-secondary readiness.	Use in 2013.
8	<b>Performance on Grade 3 Reading (Level III)</b>	The committee agreed that grade 3 reading performance was a critical checkpoint for elementary school students. They noted that the use of STAAR results for distinction designations will overlap with data used for the accountability ratings that will incorporate Level III performance in 2014. The committee discussed whether students would be double counted as student groups overlap. Use of campus comparison groups may mitigate this effect.	Use in 2013.
9	<b>Performance on Grade 5 Mathematics (Level III)</b>	Same discussion as Indicator 8	Use in 2013.
10	<b>Grade 8 Algebra I and English I (Level III)</b>	Combine with Indicator 1 and include participation and performance. See Indicator 1 above.	Combine with Indicator 1 and use in 2013.
11	<b>Teacher Turnover Rate</b>	Currently, it is not possible to report data for this indicator separately for reading/ELA and mathematics.	Do not use.
12	<b>Head Start and/or Pre-Kindergarten Participation Rate</b>	These programs are not offered by all districts. Currently it is not possible to report data for this indicator separately for reading/ELA and mathematics.	Do not use.
13	<b>Parent Involvement</b>	The committee agreed that this indicator could encourage parental involvement, but that there would be no means to effectively measure such involvement.	Do not use.
14	<b>Percentage of Teachers Teaching Outside Their Field</b>	The committee discussed the possible use of highly-qualified teacher data collected to meet federal reporting requirements. However, these requirements only apply to Title I, Part A campuses and do not apply to elementary campuses.	Do not use.

#	Proposed AADD Indicators	Comments	Recommendation
15	Attendance Rate	This indicator was used as part of the former GPA system and currently is used as one of the Other measures for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) evaluations. The AADDC agrees that attendance rates are a critical component of academic success.	Use in 2013.
16	Percentage of Students Receiving a 2- or 4-Year Degree	Similar to Indicator 4, students enrolled in private or out-of-state colleges cannot be tracked. For follow-up at the next meeting, the committee requested that TEA staff investigate whether students attending and graduating from trade schools, state-supported technical schools, and apprenticeship programs could be included in this indicator.	Do not use.
17	Chamber of Commerce Financial Aid Application Program	The committee determined that this indicator is not viable due to the lack of a common statewide data source.	Do not use.

### Proposed Framework for Distinction Designations

Agency staff presented a proposed framework for distinction designations that uses four stages to determine a campus distinction. The first stage identifies a campus comparison group for each campus and calculates campus performance for each distinction indicator by subject. The second stage compares the performance of the target campus to the performance of the campuses in the comparison group for each indicator. The third stage generates a single outcome by subject for each campus. The final stage is a statewide evaluation of campus outcomes in order to identify the top campus distinction designations by subject.

Two possible approaches were presented with respect to the final stage: (1) establish the statewide distinction designation criteria annually, and (2) use a statistical calculation to identify a previously specified percentage of campuses that earn distinction designations. Of these two approaches, the committee favored the first approach which sets an absolute target for performance.

The committee endorsed the proposed framework and discussed initial recommendations for standards in 2013 that will be discussed at the next AADDC meeting.

### Next Steps

The next AADDC meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 22, 2012. At this meeting, the committee will review modeling data for each of the AADD indicators based on the proposed framework and finalize the targets that will be used to determine the academic achievement distinction designations in August 2013.