

## ATAC End-of-Course (EOC) Workgroup – Workgroup Proposal

### Introduction:

#### Summary of Work:

June 5, 2012: The workgroup considered the possibility of a summer, fall, and spring cycle for establishing the accountability subset based on the first attempt EOC results from each of these testing opportunities. It was determined by the workgroup that the Level II standard would be used in determining proficiency. However, the workgroup was divided on the use of the Level II final standard or the Level II phase in standards. After debate, the workgroup determined to remand the discussion to the full ATAC committee on August 29.

June 20, 2012: In this meeting the workgroup established the parameters for aligning the EOC results to the STAAR 3-8 results. The initial recommendation was to blend Reading, Writing, Math, Science, and Social Studies. Upon later input from the agency, Reading and Writing must be combined into a single indicator due to a lack of data and aligned tasks within the fourth and seventh grade Writing assessments. Additionally, during this meeting the parameters were established under which the workgroup suggested that the accountability subset would be established as a summer, fall, and spring cycle. This would change the current fall to spring accountability cycle and allow equity between innovative and traditional programs.

July 18, 2012: The workgroup worked on the first draft of the proposal and determined that middle school students should only take the EOC and not their grade level test. It was also determined that cumulative scores should not be used for Performance Index 1 or Performance Index 4 and that continuing work on Performance Index 2 and 3 should defer to and parallel the efforts of the Progress Measure workgroup.

July 24, 2012: The workgroup considered the position of student movement between Level I to Level II to Level III within Performance Index 2. Additionally, the group discussed whether this movement would be used as a construct to define the 'gap group' in Index 3 or if the 'gap group' should parallel the Progress Measure workgroup. The decision was made to parallel their recommendations to establish clarity and transparency in the system.

August 16, 2012: Members of the workgroup met with TEA staff by phone to discuss the second draft of the plan. Based on further discussion, members of the workgroup amended the plan to parallel efforts of other workgroups and give more specificity to certain processes, such as the establishment and attainment of the accountability subset.

## EOC Workgroup Proposal:

### Performance Index 1:

- Students meeting the Level II standard would count as proficient.
- Results would be inclusive of current accountability year first attempt EOCs. The accountability year would be defined as the cycle of results beginning with the previous summer and ending with the current school year spring administrations. The test data would be matched to the PEIMS snapshot data to establish the accountability subset in the following fashion:
  - Summer Administration matched to previous school year October snapshot data.
  - Fall and Spring Administrations matched to Current school year October snapshot data.
- The workgroup, however, does not recommend the use of data from the summer 2012 administration because of the timing within the current accountability development process.
- Qualifying middle school students would be tested only with the EOC. The results of the EOCs would be credited back to their middle schools for accountability. Per HB 2135, students with unsatisfactory performance on EOCs cannot be denied promotion within SSI.
- EOC scores from students taking STAAR-M, STAAR-Alt, and STAAR-L would be included in Performance Index 1. The inclusion of STAAR-L would follow the recommendations of the ELL workgroup.
- For high schools, grade 11 exit Level TAKS scores will be included in Performance Index 1 for 2012-2013 only. Alignment would occur in the structure of Reading/ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. The workgroup recommends the inclusion of TAKS exit level results in the 2012-2013 accountability cycle utilizing the same methodology from 2010-2011 and prior years.
- For middle and other schools, align EOC performance with Reading/ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies, as appropriate.

### Performance Index 2:

- Parallel the growth measure from STAAR Grades 3-8 to a construct that tracks the progress of students moving from the minimum Level I standard, to Level II, and finally Level III.
- Performance Index 2 would count the best available score based on the Progress Measure workgroup recommendations. The test would be matched to the PEIMS snapshot data to establish the accountability subset in the following fashion:
  - Summer Administration matched to previous school year October snapshot data.
  - Fall and Spring Administrations matched to Current school year October snapshot data.
- The workgroup, however, does not recommend the use of data from the summer 2012 administration because of the timing within the current accountability development process.
- Expand the growth measure to be inclusive of all four subject areas: Reading/ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies. Ensure a parallel to the recommendations of the Progress Measure workgroup.
- Include the use of STAAR-M, STAAR-Alt, and STAAR-L in this measure if the testing contractor can provide a valid growth measure for these assessments. The inclusion of STAAR-L would follow the recommendations of the ELL workgroup.

Performance Index 3:

- Students that failed any EOC would be included as part of the 'Gap Group' set. The definition of the numerator and denominator would be defined by the workgroup assigned to that task.
- EOC retest results moving students from Level I to Level II or above would count for accountability.
- EOC scores from students taking STAAR-M, STAAR-Alt, and STAAR-L would be included in Performance Index 3. The inclusion of STAAR-L would follow the recommendations of the ELL workgroup.

Performance Index 4:

- Students meeting the Level III standard during the first attempt at an EOC assessment would count in the percent of students meeting Level III performance within this index.
- The accountability year and accountability subset would be the same as listed in Performance Index 1.
- Results would be inclusive of current accountability year first attempt EOCs. This would be inclusive of Level III scores from all Reading/ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies STAAR EOCs, including STAAR-M, STAAR-Alt, and STAAR-L. The inclusion of STAAR-L would follow the recommendations of the ELL workgroup.

**TEA Comment for Performance Index 1 and Index 4:**

Statute allows students to retake an EOC assessment for any reason, including students who passed the test, and requires that retest results for the EOC assessments be included in the accountability assessment indicators for student achievement and student progress. The TEA interpretation of the accountability statute is that the commissioner has some flexibility regarding which EOC retest results to include in the indicators.

Following is a summary of the EOC Workgroup proposal for inclusion of retest results in the accountability assessment indicators.

- The EOC Workgroup proposal includes EOC retest results for students who did not meet the Level II standard, or who are performing at low Level II, by including the EOC retest results in the Index 3 student achievement and student progress indicators for the Gap Group.
- The EOC Workgroup proposal also includes EOC retest results for all students in the student progress measures in Index 2.
- The proposal does not include any retest results from within the current year in the student achievement measures for Index 1 and Index 4.

Discussion at the August ATAC meeting must address two questions related to inclusion of EOC retest results in the Index 1 and Index 4 student achievement indicators: (1) Does the EOC Workgroup proposal meet statutory requirements for inclusion of EOC retest results in the accountability indicators? and (2) Is the exclusion of retest results from the Index 1 and Index 4 indicators consistent with assessment policy that allows students to retest?

<p><b>Description – Performance Index 1:</b></p> <p><b>Type of EOC Performance Indicator included in Performance Index 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Percent Met Level II Standard</b></li> <li>• <b>Only first attempt results by EOC assessment during a July, December, May cycle for accountability</b></li> <li>• <b>8<sup>th</sup> grade counts with middle school, but per HB 2135 cannot stop promotion</b></li> <li>• <b>Includes STAAR-M, Alt, and L. Usage for STAAR L will be based on the ELL workgroup recommendations</b></li> <li>• <b>Includes grade 11 exit Level TAKS for 2012-2013 only</b></li> <li>• <b>Aligns performance categories with STAAR 3-8</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Rationale – Performance Index 1:</b></p> <p><i>Policy:</i> This EOC indicator measures progress for students by giving a snapshot of yearly performance.</p> <p><i>Incentives:</i> The indicator gives an incentive for campuses to increase performance and to invest in innovative programs due to summer to spring accountability cycle. Retiming the accountability cycle addresses both the needs of innovative programs and students completing courses at different paces.</p> <p><i>Instruction:</i> Flexibility within the instructional cycle is allowed to expanded nature of the accountability cycle.</p> <p><i>Communication:</i> Through aligning performance categories with STAAR grades 3-8, the indicator is parallel and transparent to the remainder to the system.</p> <p><i>Development and Implementation:</i> The index should be able to be implemented with the introduction of the accountability system. The challenge to the index is defining the use of the phase-in or final Level II standard.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Description – Performance Index 2:</b></p> <p><b>Type of EOC Performance Indicator included in Performance Index 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Tracks the progress of students from Level I to Level II to Level III</b></li> <li>• <b>Would include all available assessments taken in a given accountability year with progress/growth measured from prior year to best performance within a content area of the current year</b></li> <li>• <b>Expand the growth measure to all four areas: Reading/ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies.</b></li> <li>• <b>Includes the use of STAAR M, Alt, and L if a valid growth measure is available. Usage for STAAR L will be based on the ELL workgroup recommendations</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Rationale – Performance Index 2:</b></p> <p><i>Policy:</i> This EOC indicator measures progress for students by giving an ongoing indicator of students progressing from proficiency level to proficiency level.</p> <p><i>Incentives:</i> The indicator gives an incentive to campuses to work with students below the Level II proficiency level to move them forward, thus keeping them on track for graduation. It also provides incentives to continue moving students from Level II to Level III and encourage students to pursue the DAP diploma.</p> <p><i>Instruction:</i> The indicator gives campuses incentive to create innovative programs to move students forward from Level I to Level II. Additionally, wherever possible it will encourage vertical course alignment within high school curriculum.</p> <p><i>Communication:</i> Since the concept parallels that being implemented for STAAR 3-8, understanding should be transparent for stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Development and Implementation:</i> The implementation of this index will require the completion of the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 accountability cycles to gather sufficient data. Additionally, STAAR-M, Alt, and L scores can only be used if there is a valid growth measure available from the testing contractor.</p>
---	--

Description – Performance Index 3	Rationale – Performance Index 3
<p data-bbox="180 264 808 331"><b>Type of EOC Performance Indicator included in Performance Index 3:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="237 373 808 730" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="237 373 808 478">• <b>EOC failures will be included in the Gap Group proposed by the Performance Measure workgroup</b></li> <li data-bbox="237 485 808 621">• <b>Retest scores moving students from Level I to Level II or above during the accountability cycle would count toward closing the performance gap</b></li> <li data-bbox="237 627 808 730">• <b>Includes STAAR-M, Alt, and L. Usage for STAAR L will be based on the ELL workgroup recommendations</b></li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="815 264 1433 331"><i>Policy:</i> This EOC indicator measures efforts to close the gaps between student performance groups.</p> <p data-bbox="815 373 1433 762"><i>Incentives:</i> This indicator would act as both a disincentive and incentive for campuses. At first it would be a disincentive since it would force campuses to deal with the large numbers of students failing one or more EOC tests. This would be the case of high schools receiving students that failed an EOC in middle school EOCs (though this should be a small group). However, the incentive would come in raising the number of students passing the retests at a Level II or higher proficiency level.</p> <p data-bbox="815 804 1433 940"><i>Instruction:</i> As with Performance Index 2, this indicator gives campuses incentive to create innovative programs to move students forward from Level I to Level II.</p> <p data-bbox="815 982 1433 1077"><i>Communication:</i> Since the concept parallels that being implemented for STAAR 3-8, understanding should be transparent for stakeholders.</p> <p data-bbox="815 1119 1433 1297"><i>Development and Implementation:</i> The index should be able to be implemented with the introduction of the accountability system. The challenge to the index is defining the use of the phase-in or final Level II standard.</p>

<p><b>Description – Performance Index 4:</b></p> <p><b>Type of EOC Performance Indicator included in Performance Index 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Students meeting the Level III standard</b></li><li>• <b>Only first attempt EOC tests would be included in this measure</b></li><li>• <b>This would include, STAAR-M, Alt, and L. Usage for STAAR L will be based on the ELL workgroup recommendations</b></li></ul>	<p><b>Rationale – Performance Index 4:</b></p> <p><i>Policy:</i> This EOC indicator measures advanced academic performance.</p> <p><i>Incentives:</i> This measure complements Performance Index 2 to give campuses an incentive to help student move from Level II performance to Level III performance.</p> <p><i>Instruction:</i> The measure would ensure quality instruction by complementing Performance Index 2 and give campuses an incentive to create instructional programs to help students achieve in all four content areas.</p> <p><i>Communication:</i> This measure will parallel STAAR 3-8 and will be transparent to stakeholders within the system.</p> <p><i>Development and Implementation:</i> This would be implemented for all areas and parallel implementation for STAAR 3-8.</p>
---	--