

**Accountability System Development for 2013  
Meeting of the Academic Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC)  
May 30, 2012  
Meeting Outcomes**

**Meeting Objectives**

The objectives for the second meeting of the ATAC are listed below followed by a description of each topic.

1. Review and discuss the Performance Index (PI) Workgroup proposal;
2. Review the issues and options outlined in the discussion documents for state and federal accountability alignment, student groups, and leaver indicators;
3. Provide an update to the Progress Measures Workgroup on the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) Progress Measures development;
4. Provide an update to the ELL Workgroup on the English Language Learners (ELL) assessments; and
5. Discuss the charge and scope of work of the Progress Measures, End-of-Course (EOC), and ELL Workgroups.

**Performance Index (PI) Workgroup Proposal**

Members of the PI Workgroup presented an overview of their approach to developing the PI proposal for consideration by the ATAC. The overview included a summary of their outreach efforts to gather information from accountability subject matter experts within each workgroup member's Education Service Center (ESC) region such as superintendents, special education and curriculum directors, and district and ESC accountability staff. They explained that their proposal is based on the expectation that the new state accountability system should:

- improve student performance for every child;
- direct resources for improvement;
- be comprehensive in nature;
- focus on narrowing the performance gap between historically disadvantaged and advantaged students; and
- measure indicators that move a school and district towards higher performance.

The PI workgroup proposal includes four performance indexes:

Performance Index 1: student performance aggregated across grade levels for all subjects (reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies) and student participation rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity;

Performance Index 2: student progress by race/ethnicity;

Performance Index 3: close performance gaps between high- and low-performing students; and

Performance Index 4: postsecondary readiness that includes rigor in elementary/middle schools that will lead high school students to successfully meet graduation standards.

For each performance index, the workgroup members provided the rationale for their proposal in relation to policy goals, incentives, instruction, communication, and accountability development and implementation.

After discussing the various aspects of a performance index framework, the full ATAC agreed to endorse the use of all four performance indexes. The indicators and student groups that will be evaluated in each index will be discussed at the August ATAC meeting.

## **Summaries of Discussion Documents**

### **State and Federal Alignment**

The ATAC members reviewed the discussion document on the alignment of the state accountability and federal AYP rating systems. The group acknowledged that the PI framework provides an opportunity for greater alignment of the state and federal requirements. The group was reluctant to fully align the accountability indicators due to concern for the uncertainty of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and/or uncontrollable changes to the federal accountability requirements. Also of concern was the state's capacity to assist campuses identified in need of improvement based on both federal and state accountability outcomes. The ATAC agreed with the proposed plan for 2013 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) presented in the discussion document.

### **Student Groups**

After review of the options available for accountability student group evaluation, there was a consensus among the ATAC to use common sets of student groups across the four indexes, and common minimum size criteria. Members recognized an advantage of the PI framework to allow additional evaluation of student groups yet not increase the number of targets that must be met. The group discussion of current statutory requirements reiterated that accountability student group performance must be based on socioeconomic status and race/ethnicity; however, statute does not require student group performance to be evaluated for every indicator. Additional options for including student groups within the PI framework will be presented at the August ATAC meeting.

### **Leaver Indicators**

Introductory comments for this discussion included a review of statutory requirements that dropout, completion, or graduation rates be used as indicators in the new accountability system. Members discussed the new requirement to exclude certain students from state accountability calculations; the result of which is graduation rates evaluated under state accountability will no longer align with federally required graduation rates for AYP.

The ATAC members reviewed recommendations for the leaver indicators that could be evaluated in the Postsecondary Readiness Index (Performance Index 4). They also discussed the recommendations regarding leaver data quality and minimum size requirements. There was general consensus that the grade 9-12 four-year and five-year graduation rates should be included in the Postsecondary Readiness Index. There was also consensus to include the Recommended High School Program (RHSP) and Advanced High School Program (AHSP) in that index. The dropout rate and leaver data quality indicators will be discussed further at the August ATAC meeting.

## **Future Workgroups on Progress Measures, EOC Indicators, and ELL**

Three ATAC workgroups will collaborate over the next few months to develop proposals for incorporating progress measures, EOC indicators, and ELL progress into the Performance Index framework. At the August meeting, each workgroup will present their proposal for discussion by the entire ATAC.

- The Progress Measures Workgroup will consider how to include measures of student progress across the PI framework. The workgroup will also address how Required Improvement (RI) will be included in the new rating system.

- The EOC Indicators Workgroup will consider what types of EOC indicators should be included in the PI framework. For each of the four indexes, the workgroup will examine issues specific to middle schools and high schools.
- The ELL Workgroup will consider the appropriate inclusion of ELL students in the new rating system, while balancing state and federal ELL requirements. The workgroup will also consider ways to incorporate the ELL Progress Measure into the PI framework.

Additional presentations offered information to assist the Progress Measures and ELL Workgroup.

### **Progress Measures Workgroup Update: STAAR Progress Measures Development**

Staff from Pearson, the test contractor for the state assessment program, reviewed the Measures of Student Progress for STAAR Assessments with the ATAC members. The Pearson staff outlined the three types of progress measures that are currently under consideration.

### **ELL Workgroup Update: ELL Assessments**

Student Assessment staff provided the ATAC members with an update on the testing policies for English Language Learners (ELL) for the STAAR assessments. The ATAC members were also updated on the current plans for the development of an ELL progress measure.

### **Next Steps**

The ATAC members scheduled their next ATAC meeting on Wednesday, August 29, 2012. At that meeting, the Progress Measures, EOC Indicators, and ELL workgroup members will provide their respective proposals to the full committee.