

ATAC Student Progress Measure Workgroup Proposal

Introduction:

The Progress Measures Workgroup is tasked with developing and recommending the following systems and measures:

1. Student progress measures used in Index 2: Student Progress, and possibly Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps,
2. Appropriate measures of performance gaps for Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps, and
3. The form of Required Improvement (RI) that must be included in the new state accountability system.

The Progress Measures Workgroup developed this proposal based on the following tenets.

- The student progress measure developed must have these characteristics and abilities:
 - Measure progress at individual student level
 - Determine if a student made progress when results arrive in May (not necessarily the first year in 2013)
 - Easy to understand and explain to parents
 - Easy to compute and transparent
 - Can be replicated by the students, teachers, and stakeholders
 - Can use vertical scale score (optional)
 - Can use horizontal scale score [for transition from grade 8 to end-of-course (EOC) or Algebra I to Geometry or Algebra II]
 - Not of predictive nature where future proficiency is estimated
- Because the new graduation guidelines require that students must successfully complete 15 State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) EOC assessments, historically underperforming students, as well as students not on track to meet these standards, must be identified early and monitored until their performance is significantly above the satisfactory standard in all subject areas.

The progress measure proposals and rationales for Index 2 and Index 3 are outlined on pages 2 – 13 followed by a summary of the workgroup's meeting agendas and discussion notes on pages 14 – 22.

Workgroup Proposal for Index 2: Student Progress

The Progress Measures Workgroup strongly proposes a Value Transition methodology as the progress measure. Students will be identified based on their prior performance and supports the school improvement process by enabling schools to track the progress of students over time as they transition into higher cognitive levels. As students are identified by achievement bands for progress, measuring progress by each of the ethnicity/race categories will likely not include all students after the minimum size requirements are applied. Thus, the proposal recommends that in addition to each ethnicity and race category, the “All Students” group be evaluated for student progress.

<p>Type of Student Progress Measure included in Performance Index 2</p> <p>Percent of students that increased their achievement level by transitioning into a higher achievement band. For students in the highest achievement band, percent of students that maintained the achievement at the same level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across Grade Level (4, 5, ...) • By Subject (All Math assessments in one measure, etc.) • Include All Student group as well as all seven ethnicity/race groups that meet minimum size (20 students) • Available for Reading I, II, and III (combined into one measure as Reading) • Available for Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II (combined into one measure as Math) • Possibly available for Writing II and III • Not available for grade 4, 7, and Writing I • Not available for science • Not available for social studies • Not available for grade 3 students 	<p>The measures will be computed across grade levels for a school. At the district level, it is computed at Elementary, Middle, and High levels. The detailed report used for school improvement will include the accountability measures computed at each grade level to identify the grades, subjects, and achievement levels that require improvement.</p> <p>Achievement Bands Based on performance on that subject area the prior year, students will be designated to an achievement band. Individual student progress will be measured by how students transition to higher achievement bands in the current year.</p> <p>Example: K-5 Reading Assume there are 6 achievement bands on the STAAR scale. All current 4th and 5th grade students will be designated into an achievement band based on their prior scores in Reading. The progress measure will measure what percent of students transitioned to a higher band: from Band 1 to Band 2+, Band 2 to Band 3+, ..., Band 5 to Band 6, and Band 6 to Band 6 (maintained level). If the campus had students in bands 2, 3 and 4 across grades, then the progress measure for Reading will be how many of these students collectively transitioned to bands 3, 4, and 5 respectively. This measure will be computed for All students as well as each of the seven Race/Ethnicity groups (minimum size of 20).</p> <p>Number of Measures: Elementary: 1 - 8 (All + 7) x (Reading, Math) = 2-16 Middle: 1 - 8 (All + 7) x (Reading, Math) = 2-16 High: 1-8 (All + 7) x (Reading, Math) = 2 -16 If Writing is included, 1-8 additional measures.</p> <p>Minimum Size of 20 There is no minimum size requirement for the All student group. To include as many student groups as possible the workgroup recommends a minimum size of 20 for the race/ethnicity groups. As each percentage is</p>
--	---

	<p>added to the index, an outlier score in the positive or negative direction by itself will not yield a lower rating for a school or district.</p> <p>Grades 5 and 8 Retests: For students performing at Level I on the first administration and retaking the STAAR on the second administration, the higher of the two assessment levels will be used as the current level of performance.</p> <p>EOC Level To accommodate multiple EOC administrations, the accountability year will be defined as July 1 to June 30. Within a subject area, progress will be measured from highest prior year performance to highest current year performance within the EOC subject area.</p> <p>All EOCs or STAAR assessments for a subject area from the prior accountability year will determine the prior achievement level. Thus, prior achievement level will be the highest level of all assessments taken within the subject area. All EOCs for the same subject area for the current accountability year will determine the current achievement level. Thus, the current achievement level will be the highest EOC level for the subject.</p> <p>Example for multiple assessments for Math in a year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A student takes STAAR 8 in April 2013, Algebra I in July 2013 and Geometry in May 2014. The prior accountability year is July 2012 to June 2013. Thus, he has one prior level from STAAR 8. The student has two current Math scores from 2013 July and 2014 May. The current Math Level will be determined by the higher of the two achievement levels from Algebra I and Geometry. • A student takes Algebra I in Dec 2012 and Geometry in May 2013. In July 2013, he retakes Geometry and in May 2014 he takes Algebra II. His prior level will be determined using the Dec 2012 Algebra and May 2013 Geometry. His current level will be determined using July 2013 Geometry or May 2014 Algebra II.
--	---

TEA Comments for Performance Index 2: Student Progress

The subjects and grades for which student progress measures can be calculated will be discussed at the August meeting. (This discussion will be relevant to both Index 2 and Index 3.) In order to include all subjects in Index 2, an option would be to use cross-sectional improvement for subjects/grade spans that do not have a student progress measure, similar to the cross-sectional improvement measures for Grade 3 included in Index 3.

Matrix of measures included in the Progress Measures Index at district level:

	Percent of Students Transitioning to Higher Achievement Bands									Index Points	Maximum Index Points
	Elementary		Middle School		High School						
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	EOC	EOC	EOC	EOC	EOC		
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Ma	ELA	Wr	Sci	SS		
All											
African American											
American Indian											
Asian											
Hispanic											
Pacific Islander											
White											
2 or More											
Total Index Score											
Percent of Maximum Points											

Workgroup Proposal for Index 3: Closing Performance Gap

Students will be identified to be included in this workgroup based on their prior performance on STAAR assessments. Using the achievement bands identified from the transition table, students that did not meet the satisfactory standard and students performing at Low Satisfactory level in any STAAR assessment from the prior accountability year will be identified as the student to be included in Index 3.

As statewide assessments are not available for non-repeating grade 3 students, closing the performance gap will be based on cross-sectional (annual) improvement.

<p>Type of Achievement Measures included in Performance Index 3</p> <p>Percent of Gap Students that attained satisfactory passing standard (Level II)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Percent of students performing at Level II in Reading ● Percent of students performing at Level II in Mathematics ● Percent of students performing at Level II in Writing in grades 4 and 7 ● Percent of students performing at Level II in Science in grades 5 and 8 ● Percent of students performing at Level II in Social Studies in grade 8 ● Percent of students performing at Level II in each of the EOC strands ● By Grade Level and Across Grade Levels ● Minimum size of 20 will apply 	<p>This measure uses the transition bands defined for the Progress Measure to identify students that are Not-Satisfactory or in the Low-Satisfactory achievement bands for accountability monitoring and improvement. Gap Students will be identified for each grade level (4-11) across subject areas. If a student met the Gap criteria based on Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science, or Social Studies, the student is considered a Gap student for his current grade level. His progress will be monitored in all subject areas.</p> <p>Example: Middle School (Grades 6-8) Identify the Gap Group for each of the grades. There will be 3 Gap Groups: Grades 6, 7, and 8. Measure the Level II performance for each Gap Group in the tested subjects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grade 6, 7, & 8: Reading (3 measures), Math (3 measures) ● Grades 6 – 8 combined: Reading, Math ● Grade 7: Writing ● Grade 8: Science, Soc. Stu. <p>Thus, 11 measures from STAAR will make up the Gap Index for this campus. If 3 EOCs were administered at the campus, these three EOC will be combined into the respective subject area.</p> <p>Example: High School Example (Graduating Cohort) Identify the Gap Group for each grade level based on failing a STAAR assessment the prior year. If a student took a particular EOC multiple times, then the highest EOC score will be used to determine Gap Identification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cohort 2015, 2016, 2017, & 2018 (typical 9-12 high school): Reading, Writing, Math, Science, & Social Studies (4 x 5: 20 measures) ● Campus (all Gap Students): Reading, Writing, Math, Science, & Social Studies (5 measures)
---	--

<p>Type of Student Progress Measures included in Performance Index 3</p> <p>Progress for Gap Students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in Reading • Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in Mathematics • Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in each of the EOC strands • Across Grade Levels • Minimum size of 20 will apply 	<p>These measures ensure that students identified as Gap Students demonstrate progress from year to year.</p> <p>For students identified for the Gap Group, the progress measures will be computed in Reading and Mathematics similar to the measure used in Index 2. Thus, this is a specific progress measure for students in the lowest 3 bands in a 6-band Value Transition Table.</p> <p>Number of Measures: Elem: 2 measures Middle: 2 measures High Schools: 2 or more measures</p>
<p>Type of Student Progress Measures included in Performance Index 3</p> <p>For Grade 3, the following cross-sectional (prior Grade 3 versus current Grade 3) will apply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent increase in Level II performance of Economically Disadvantaged students in Reading • Percent increase in Level II performance of Economically Disadvantaged students in Mathematics • Minimum size of 20 will apply 	<p>The identification of the Gap Students is based on prior STAAR performance and grade 3 students are excluded by definition. To ensure accountability for this grade group, the workgroup proposes a cross-sectional performance improvement of Economically disadvantaged students. This is not student progress, but a measure of systemic improvement in grade 3 instruction from year to year.</p> <p>Number of Measures: Campuses with Grade 3: 2 measures</p>

<p>TEA Comments for Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps</p> <p>Comment 1: The proposal does not present a detailed rationale for the inclusion of by-grade measures for Gap Group Percent Met Level II. Following are some observations about the inclusion of the by-grade measures in the index.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The by-grade measures introduce a new grouping not required by statute to further disaggregate results for a student group (Gap Group). The by-grade disaggregation only affects Reading and Mathematics results for campuses with the most common elementary and middle/junior high school grade configurations. – If the campus or district meets minimum size criteria, results from a single assessment for an individual student are included twice in the Gap Group Percent Met Level II indicators, by grade and across grades. – Increasing the number of measures reduces the weight of each measure in the index. As a result of the by-grade measures, the Gap Group Percent Met Level II indicators contribute more to the index score than the Gap Group Student Progress indicators.
--

Comment 2: The proposal for Index 3 does not include indicators focused on Level III performance gaps. An option would be to change the student progress measures (the second block of indicators described) to Level III indicators. Level III Gap Group could be defined as students whose prior year performance is in the top two bands for Level II on the value/transition table (assuming three performance bands for Level II), and who are economically disadvantaged. As in the proposal, the progress measures would be calculated for STAAR Grade 3-8 Reading and Mathematics, and for EOC for all five subjects, and the indicator defined as percent of Level III Gap students who progressed to a higher achievement band.

Matrix of measures included in the Gap Index at the district level:

Percent of Gap Students Performing at Level II						Index Points	Maximum Index Points
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Social Studies		
Grade 3							
Grade 4							
Grade 5							
Grade 6							
Grade 7							
Grade 8							
HS Cohort I							
HS Cohort II							
HS Cohort III							
HS Cohort IV							
All							
Subtotal Index Score							
Percent of Gap Students who Transitioned to a Higher Achievement Band							
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Social Studies		
3-8 Campuses							
High Schools							
Subtotal Index Score							
Percent Increase of Grade 3 Level II Performance							
	Reading		Math				
Economically Disadvantaged							
Subtotal Index Score							
Total Index Score							
Percent of Maximum Points							

Workgroup Proposal for Required Improvement (RI):

Under a multiple index framework, where there will be a standard for accountability for each of the indexes, RI will apply if a school or district does not meet the accountability standard for one or all indexes. RI is how a school or district can satisfy the accountability standard by showing overall progress towards the standard for a particular index in two years. The base index will be determined by prior individual index score (for example Index 4) and if the current year’s index score demonstrate progress to meeting the standard half-way, the school or district will fulfill the RI criteria for accountability for that index. As the accountability standard is increased, meeting RI will be based on making progress half-way to the new standard.

<p>Type of Required Improvement in the Accountability System – Each Index</p> <p>Will apply only to indexes that do not meet the accountability standard. If the index score shows sufficient progress such that if similar progress is achieved the next year, the accountability standard would be met, then the school will fulfill RI requirement for the index.</p>	<p>Example applied for Index 1:</p> <p>The standard for 2013 for Index 1 = 40%.</p> <p>2012 Index 1 Score: $30/200 = 15\%$</p> <p>2013 Index 1 Score: $60/200 = 30\%$</p> <p>Required Improvement: $(40 - 15)/2 = 13$</p> <p>Actual Improvement: $(30 - 15) = 15$</p> <p>Actual Improvement (15) > RI (13)</p> <p>Campus/District met Required Improvement for Index 1.</p>
--	---

<p>TEA Comments for Required Improvement</p> <p>Required Improvement is a topic on the agenda for the November ATAC meeting, along with other features such as three-year average performance, that are required by statute to be included in the accountability system. The Progress Measures Workgroup proposal for Required Improvement will be included in the discussion in relation to the overall framework and each of the indexes.</p>
--

RATIONALE

POLICY

The proposed Required Improvement, Progress Measure, and Gap Closure Framework addresses stated policy goals as follows:

- *Advanced Academic Performance:* Performance Index 2 and Index 3 include progression toward postsecondary readiness as measured by student progress toward Level III performance as well as maintaining Level III performance on STAAR assessments.
- *Closing Achievement Gaps among Groups in Advanced Academic Performance and Graduation:* The Progress Measure framework measures progress at the individual student level allowing for metrics of systemic progress toward gap closure among student populations. Student progress is measured and thus monitored at all levels so that students not on track to graduate can be identified early until their performance is significantly above standard in all subject areas.
- *Progress for All Students:* A Progress Index indicates individual student progress, as well as progress by race and ethnicity groups toward meeting academic achievement goals. Overall campus progress can also be determined for those campuses which fail to meet the accountability standard for one or all indexes. Using the proposed Required Improvement methodology will show how a school or district can satisfy the accountability standard by showing overall progress towards the standard in two years.

INCENTIVES

Use of the proposed Required Improvement, Progress Measure, and Gap Closure Framework provides the following **incentives**:

- The proposed Required Improvement methodology mirrors that of the previous state accountability system and thus should be easy to understand and communicate.
- Calculating Required Improvement at the Index Level was most feasible since accountability targets would be set at this level. Required improvement would only be applied to those indexes that did not meet standard.
- The use of the proposed Value Transition Model as the methodology for the Progress Measure Framework is very straightforward, fully transparent, and can be used with vertical and horizontal scales.
- Progress based on Transition Tables can be established in 2012 and can be reported on time from 2013 forward.
- The Progress Measure Framework is tailored to the individual student and thus adapts well to instruction.
- The proposed Value Transition methodology identifies students based on prior performance and supports the school improvement process by enabling schools to track student progress over time as they transition to higher cognitive levels represented by their transition to higher achievement bands
- The proposed framework allows for measuring students at various achievement levels. With multiple bands within Level I and Level III performance categories, student progress can be measured within the lowest and highest levels.
- The proposed framework is not of a predictive nature where future outcomes are estimated.
- The reauthorization of ESEA may include growth measures for students and the transition table methodology has previously met U.S. Department of Education approval as a growth measure.

- Similar to TAKS-Alt transition tables for progress, the transition table methodology can be applied to STAAR ALT, STAAR M, and if necessary TELPAS. Having a common methodology for measuring progress will help all educators, students, and stakeholders to understand the overall system.
- By defining performance Index 3 (Closing the Performance Gap) as monitoring the performance of a historically underperforming group to itself over consecutive years, the Index can be modeled similar to Index 1 and 2 by measuring the overall Level II proficiency rate and progress of students identified for the “Gap Group”.
- By measuring the performance of a “Gap Group” there is no need to estimate a benchmark to measure the degree of gap closure.
- Similar to Performance Index 2, Index 3 can include progress measures for students included in the Gap Group. In addition to the measurement of performance Level II and Level III, the progress of the historically underperforming group can also be monitored.
- Creating a Gap Group to not only include prior Level I students, but also those students that narrowly met the Level II standard allows for monitoring these students in the following years to ensure that they make progress to a higher level of achievement.
- The proposed framework defines the accountability year to start July 1 and to end June 30 so that all assessments taken in this window will belong to either the current year or prior year. The achievement level will be determined by the highest level of assessments within the subject in that accountability year if multiple assessments are administered for a subject within that year. This methodology was necessary to simplify the computation and include multiple administration of the EOC while not having to differentiate for various reasons of re-testing and different course taking sequences.

DISINCENTIVES

The proposed Required Improvement, Progress Measure, and Gap Closure Framework for Performance include the following **disincentives** and potential unintended consequences:

- The calculation of Required Improvement at the index level could mask significant school/district improvements for a specific student group or subject area due to the lack of improvement in other groups or subjects.
- The proposed Value Transition Model as the methodology for the Progress Measure Framework is not as accurate as a prediction model. But, empirical data (progress from 2012 to 2013 STAAR) can be used to set standards for required progress rates for students. The Progress Measure Framework assumes a progression of levels of knowledge within a sequence of EOC assessments within a subject strand.
- A Progress measure may not be available for subjects that are not measured yearly such as writing in grades 4 and 7, Science for grades 5 and 8, Grade 8 Social Studies, and Grade 3.
- The disadvantage to evaluating whether or not a school or district is closing the achievement gap by defining a “Gap Group” is that this methodology does not directly measure the performance difference between historically underperforming students and other higher performing groups. If the performance of the higher performing groups improves along with the “Gap Group” then the gap could widen.

INSTRUCTION

The proposed Progress and Gap Closure measures within the performance index framework will inform schools and impact instruction in the following ways:

- A Transition Table approach to progress is tailored to each individual student allowing instructional interventions to be specific to each subject and focused at a specific achievement level where progress is not being made.
- Detailed reports can be disaggregated for each student population so that the specific needs of each group can be met with the appropriate instructional intervention.
- Providing reports by student expectation for each achievement band will also allow for educators to focus staff development on the specific content that students fail to master.
- The “Gap Group” identification will not only force attention to students who did not perform at the Level II standard, but require schools and districts to monitor the progress of students that narrowly met the Level II standard.

COMMUNICATION

The proposed Required Improvement, Progress Measure, and Gap Closure Framework contributes to an understanding of school performance by parents, teachers, school administrators, policy makers, and the general public in the following ways:

- The measure of Required Improvement will allow stakeholders to not only determine if schools met an established standard, but also if improvement toward each of the four accountability targets was made. Stakeholders have come to know and understand this process; thus by mirroring the concept of the previous state rating system, additional confusion is avoided. Parents and policy makers will be able to clearly identify areas of improvement in addition to those areas that fail meet standard and fail to improve.
- The Progress measure framework provides a measure of student progress that is both quantifiable and interpretable for the identification of specific student strengths and challenges. Parents and the community would be able to see if the needs of the lowest performing students are being addressed as well as if our highest performing students are being challenged. Designing a progress measure that is easy to understand and communicate will help to inform parents and policy makers if money spent on targeted intervention is truly cost effective.
- The Gap closure framework will allow for a deeper understanding of the performance and progress of this targeted group. By shedding light on the performance of previous STAAR failers as well as those who narrowly met Level II standard, community stakeholders will be able to determine possible strengths and weakness of district/campus RTI processes.

ACCOUNTABILITY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The advantages and disadvantages of the proposed Required Improvement, Progress, and Gap Closure measures in the performance index framework in relation to next steps in development of the accountability system are as follows:

- An advantage to proposed Required Improvement provision as part of the new accountability system is that it is very similar to the previous provision which allowed districts and campuses who fail to meet the set standard to show progress toward meeting the standard in two years thus recognizing and encouraging schools/districts to move forward.
- A disadvantage to the proposed Required Improvement provision applied at the Index level is that a campus/district could be rated solely based on the significant impact of one low performing subject or group which masked any improved performance of a subject or group.

- An advantage to using the proposed Progress Measure framework in the new accountability system is that the Transition Table model will work for all special education assessments as well as to determine the progress of our ELL population. The State would have one method, one system, for multiple populations which focuses on increasing individual student achievement levels.
- An advantage to using the Gap closure framework in the new accountability system is that the standards for performance and progress can mirror those set in Index 1 and 2. Using this design would not require additional standard setting in order to measure the degree of gap closure.
- A disadvantage to the Gap closure framework as part of the new accountability system is that it fails to truly measure if a campus or district is closing the gap between low performing and high performing groups.
- As an accountability standard, the Minimum Size will be set at 20 students with no percentage requirement. The purpose of this recommendation is to ensure that as many student group categories are included in accountability and thus in school improvement process. As several elementary campuses feed into a single middle school and several middle schools feed students to a single high school, the accountability system must ensure that this accumulation of students do not have a unexpected accountability impact. At middle and high schools levels, the large feeder system guarantees that most student subgroups are included in accountability that was not part of accountability at the elementary level. An approach to remedy this is to set the minimum size standard at 20 students irrespective of the proportion. In an index framework, multiple indicators will contribute performance measures to the index and the accountability standard will be at the individual index level. Thus as each measure is added to the index, an outlier score in the positive or negative direction by itself will not significantly impact the individual index.
- The student groups included in the Progress Measures Index and Gap Index are the All Students group and/or the seven Race/Ethnicity Groups. An overall goal was to design a system that does not include results from a single assessment multiple times for an individual student. The system as currently proposed attempts to avoid this multiple inclusion of students by carefully limiting the student groups in the system. For Index 2: Student Progress, each of the seven ethnicity/race categories is included with a minimum size requirement. The All Students group is included to ensure that no students are excluded from the progress measure. With the addition of Index 3: Gap Index, the identification of students for the Gap Group will ensure that all students that did not meet the Satisfactory standard and students that narrowly met the standard are monitored and included as an accountability measure. The students identified for Gap Index will include student groups that have traditionally underperformed in state accountability and thus will not necessitate the additional inclusion groups such as Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, and students receiving special education services. The detailed school improvement reports should include all possible student groups in addition to the accountability groups to identify and focus school improvement efforts.

Meeting Agenda and Discussions**June 12, 2012 4:00 – 5:00 PM**

Attending: Darrell Brown (Eagle-Mountain Saginaw), Beth Dunavant (Pittsburg), Lisa Diserens (Temple), Janet Wallace (Midland Academy Charter), Kelly Solis (Region I), Lucy Larrison (Bryan), Elvia Noriega (Richardson), Theresa Urrabazo (San Antonio), and Dash Weerasinghe (Plano).

The initial meeting of the ATAC Progress Measures Workgroup was held via conference call. The workgroup discussed the need to review all three student progress measures. They had a discussion on the handout from Pearson presented at the May 30, 2012 ATAC meeting. This handout details student growth models approved by the U.S. Department of Education to be used for growth in AYP. Discussed in detail the last page of the proposals where Pearson compared the difference between the three models. The workgroup agreed to review the Pearson documents for the next meeting.

The Index Workgroup proposal was not to include “All Students” as a group. As for student groups, we came to the consensus on the need for an All Student group and to use all seven ethnicities/races if they meet the minimum size.

We wanted clarification from TEA on what changes we can recommend to the work already done by the Performance Index Workgroup. TEA informed us that we can recommend changes to the indicators. Further, the first agenda topic for the August 29 ATAC meeting is Assessment Indicators which will include a review of the proposed assessment indicators for each of the indexes.

June 26, 2012 4:00 PM – 5:20 PM

Attending: Janet Wallace (Midland Academy Charter), Kelly Solis (Region I), Lucy Larrison (Bryan), Elvia Noriega (Richardson), Theresa Urrabazo (San Antonio), and Dash Weerasinghe (Plano).

The participants reviewed the tasks assigned by TEA and reviewed the decision made during the first conference call.

Student Groups Included in Progress Measures:

The decision to include the “All students” as a progress measure group in addition to race/ethnicity based groups was reviewed. The justification for including “All Students” was based on the fact that with minimum size requirements, not all students will be included in a race/ethnicity group. As an alternative, discussed grouping all students in race/ethnicity groups that did not meet minimum size requirements to be included in an “other” group. The outcome can complicate the descriptions as different schools and districts will have different race/ethnicity students in the “other” group.

Required Improvement:

The task was to define the form of Requirement Improvement (RI) that “must” be included in the accountability system. TEA recommended three possible levels at which RI can be applied within an index framework:

- Indicator level,
- Index component, and
- Overall index.

The Progress Measures workgroup’s interpretation of these three levels was as follows. RI at the indicator level is applying RI to each measure or indicator, which is included in the index. For example, Performance Index 1: Student Achievement has five measures, then RI will be computed for each of the five measures. If the final accountability proposal has subgroups based on race/ethnicity or demographics added to it, then RI may be applicable for all subjects and groups.

Index component level is at a higher level than the indicator (measure) level. This could be aggregated at the subject level of all measures for a subject that comprises the measure. For example, if reading measure includes All as well as 5 other student groups, RI can be applied to Reading overall.

Index component can also be interpreted as applying RI to each of the indexes in the accountability system. As it is designed now, this involves designing RI models for four indexes.

RI for the overall index was interpreted under the assumption that the four indexes are combined to arrive at one overall index.

The discussion commenced with deciding under which circumstances RI will be needed and applied. The understanding is that for schools and districts that do not meet absolute standard for accountability, there should be a mechanism in place to show that progress is being made towards the standard. If RI can be defined as above, then how RI applies under the new accountability system will be based on how the accountability standards are defined. Under a multiple index framework, where there will be a standard for accountability for each of the indexes, RI will apply if a school or district does not meet the accountability standard for that particular index. RI is how a school or district can satisfy the accountability standard by showing overall progress towards the standard in two or more years. If for Index 1, the standard is 60 points out of 200 possible index points or 30%, then RI is showing progress towards arriving at this standard in 2 or more years.

Another factor that needs to be accounted for is the gradual increase of standard for accountability for each index and the phase-in of the Level II and Level III standards. As TEA recommended, we agree that the accountability system should be designed based on the Recommended Standards. This will require applying RI only to yearly phase-in of the index standard.

The group did reach consensus that applying RI at the measure/component level, similar to the prior state rating system, is not feasible as each measure or component does not have an accountability target. The same reasons are applicable to the subject level component of an index. Discussion focused on how to apply RI at the individual index or overall index level.

The Performance Index workgroup did provide a framework for accountability standards. One of the recommendations was how a school will be rated "Needing Improvement." One possible scenario is a school or district will be rated "Needing Improvement" if it does not meet the required standard in at least two out of the four indexes. Under such a system, RI needs to be applied only to the indexes that did not meet standard. Thus the rational option is to apply RI at the individual index level. If the accountability system will be designed on a combined index, where the four indexes are combined, then RI will be applied to the overall index.

The design of the RI will be similar to the RI used in the prior state rating system. The workgroup discussed the required number of years that will be permitted to meeting the standard. It was decided that meeting the standard in two years was the acceptable solution. Thus, RI will be defined as progress to meeting the accountability standard in two years. The base index will be determined by prior individual index score and if the current year index score shows progress to meeting the standard the next year, the school or district will fulfill the RI criteria for accountability for that index. As the accountability standard is increased, meeting RI will be based on making progress half-way to the new standard.

The group did discuss the deficiencies of required improvement at the index level. Schools with a very high proficiency or progress rate in a specific student group or subject could suppress lower proficiency rates or lack of progress in other groups or subjects. The consensus was that detailed reports for the

indexes will highlight these strengths and weaknesses for school improvement purposes. The workgroup believes that the simplicity of RI in the new system will be welcome.

Student Progress Measure:

The participants had reviewed the documents provided by Pearson on May 30, 2012. The discussion on student progress was focused on individual student growth in terms of knowledge standards. The idea of having a progress measure that is quantifiable and interpretable was considered useful for the classroom, for progress monitoring, and parents.

At the first workgroup meeting we discussed the strengths, weaknesses, and timeline of availability of Pearson reviewed models. Today, we reviewed prior discussions and discussed the need for a standard based progress measure that is also instructionally beneficial. The requirements of a student progress measure must meet the following criteria:

- At the individual student level
- Can determine if a student made progress when results arrive in May (not necessarily the first year in 2013)
- Easy to understand and explain to parents
- Easy to compute and transparent
- Can be replicated by the students, teachers, and stakeholders
- Can use vertical scale score (optional)
- Can use horizontal scale score (for transition from grade 8 to EOC or Algebra I to Geometry or Algebra II)
- For the ability show a growth trajectory
- Not of predictive nature where future outcome is estimated

The model that seems to fit the above criteria is a Value/Transition Table methodology. Instructionally, knowing what the next level (not STAAR Level I, II, or III, but finer) where the student needs to progress will be a great tool for students to know, teachers to understand, and parents to be aware of.

The strands for progress were discussed in detail and we believe that:

- In Reading, we can build a transition table for grades 3 to 8 and then EOC Reading I, II, and III.
- We do not believe that a writing progress measure is feasible. Very difficult to justify and explain to parents growth with no information in grades 5 and 6 or in grade 8.
- It may not be workable to include Grade 4 to Grade 7 Writing or Grade 7 to EOC Writing I in the growth measure. The factors that influence this progress path are: students transition from an elementary school to middle (assigning accountability), not an annual measure of progress, and may be instructionally not relevant due to the large gap.
- In Mathematics a transition table could be built for grades 3 to Algebra I, Algebra I to Geometry, and Algebra I to Algebra II.
- For Science and Social Studies we are not knowledgeable of the alignment between grades, proportioning of accountability to different schools and grades, and if vertical scale scores are available.

The workgroup is working on defining achievement bands within Levels I, II, and III on the STAAR scale. Based on Raw Score Conversion tables released by TEA, at the recommended level there is hardly any room in Level II to have achievement bands. The goal is to define 3 or 4 achievement bands within Levels I and 2 or 3 bands within Level II and Level III each. The number of bands within each level will be consistent across all subjects/strands. The number of achievement bands within each level will be based on knowledge standards required to transition students to higher cognitive abilities. This could be based on Standard Deviations or Standard Errors of Measurements.

Information Needed from TEA to Define Progress Measures:

1. Based on TEKS, is it valid to measure progress from Algebra I to Geometry and Algebra I to Algebra II?
2. Can TEA provide data on student progress from operational EOC data from 2011 Algebra I to 2012 Geometry?
3. Input from TEA ELA department how progression of student knowledge and skills align in writing from Writing I, to Writing II, to Writing III. Considering how open-ended questions and essays are weighted, does it make sense to define progress?
4. Will there be a vertical scale score for Writing for grade 4 to grade 7 and to Writing EOCs?
5. Will there be a vertical scale score for Science from grade 5 to 8 and from grade 8 to Biology EOC in Grade 9?
6. For Algebra I, the raw cut scores for recommended standards on May 2012 assessment are: 34/54 (4000) for Level II and 42/54 (4333) for Level III. To determine how to partition the transition table, some insight is needed levels of knowledge is required for a student to score 4100, 4200, 4300, etc. Is there a significant difference between a 4100 student and a 4200 student? Similarly, is there a significant difference between a 3861 (30 items) student vs. 3791 (28 items) student? This can be in terms of Standard Deviations or Standard Errors of Measurement (SEM). Also, it may be purely be a standard based answer for each grade level. The reason this level of detail is relevant is to determine how many levels of transitions Level I will have? It does not seem feasible to divide Level II into 3 partitions when only 8 items span Level II to Level III?

Updates as of July 3, 2012

TEA (Ester Regalado) provided a summary of gap measure as it relates to Colorado, Connecticut, and Florida. Lucy Larrison from Bryan ISD provided additional research on Colorado. These documents were shared with the PM Workgroup on July 3.

July 5, 2012 4:00 – 5:30 PM

Attending: Beth Dunavant (Pittsburg), Lisa Diserens (Temple), Janet Wallace (Midland Academy Charter), Kelly Solis (Region I), Lucy Larrison (Bryan), Elvia Noriega (Richardson), and Dash Weerasinghe (Plano).

Agenda

1. Review the documents posted from the Academic Achievement Distinction Designations Committee on (AADDC) June 25
2. Performance Gap measure – review of other states
3. Propose and measures to be used in the Performance Gap index
4. Assessments and performance subjects to be included
5. The level where the gap is measured: Level II, Level III, or Levels II and III
6. Will the “Gap” index include assessment performance results such as gaps in graduation, dropout, attendance, participation in college readiness testing in grade 8, 10, and 11/12, honors/AP/IB enrollment, etc.?

AADD Indicators

The PM Workgroup discussed the meeting notes from June 25 posted by TEA on AADD indicators. The committee was interested in IF or HOW these measures will be integrated into the accountability system developed by the ATAC. Are these distinction indicators completely outside the accountability indicators? Would there be a way to include these distinction measures related to accountability into

the indexes? Will they appear in the reports in a detailed manner that is beneficial for “school improvement” process?

AADD Indicators that could be in ATAC Indexes:

- Greater than expected student growth on the state assessment
- Participation and performance on the ELA and mathematics sections of the Grade 8 (EXPLORE) and Grade 10 (PSAT, PLAN) college readiness assessments
- Participation and performance on the ELA and mathematics portions of the SAT or ACT
- Participation and performance of students taking advanced placement (AP) or international baccalaureate (IB) ELA or mathematics courses and examinations and percentage of students completing and receiving credit for at least one ELA or mathematics advanced or dual enrollment course
- Attendance Rate

Gap Measures Discussion

The “gap” can be measured in two methods:

1. A measure of differential performance between a historically underperforming group and a comparison group, OR
2. Monitor the performance of the historically underperforming group to itself over consecutive years.

The first methodology is monitoring if the “gap” is being narrowed. If this measure is to be successful, the historically underperforming group must show increases at a rate higher than the control group. In most cases the control group is the “All Students” group. Another scenario is to benchmark a campus or district gap measure to the statewide gap measure. Researching how other states have implemented the Gap Measure, the workgroup recognized that Colorado and Connecticut implemented the Gap Measure by first identifying the Gap Group, and then monitoring this group’s performance. The PM Workgroup considered the second approach as a more clear way to monitor the progress of a historically underperforming group.

This second approach has several advantages over a simple gap measure.

- a. The index can be modeled similar to Index 1 or 4 by measuring the overall Level II and Level III rates of the identified student group.
- b. There is no necessity to estimate a benchmark to measure the degree of gap closure. Thus, do not need prior data to estimate the baseline gap or what a significant gap closure is.
- c. Similar to Index 2, can include growth measures for students included in the Gap Group. That is, in addition to performance of Level II and Level II, can include growth as a measure to monitor the progress of the historically underperforming group. This growth can be based on the exactly the same transition table as the “Growth Index.”

The disadvantages of this methodology are:

- a. Does not directly measure narrowing of the gap. If the “all” group increases their scores at a higher rate than the gap group, then the gap could widen.

The workgroup discussed possible criteria for identifying the “Gap Group”:

- a. Lowest 25%: Students performing in the lowest 25% of the distribution in any one or more subject area from prior year.
An advantage of this group is that all schools and districts will have a Gap Group. But, in a high scoring school, most of these students may be Satisfactory or possible Advanced.
- b. Prior Non-Satisfactory: From prior year’s STAAR, any student that performed at Level I.
This group could be very small or non-existent for certain campuses and districts.

- c. Group A: From prior year, students that performed at or below the Minimum Standard on any one or more STAAR assessments. For STAAR 3-8, a level analogous to EOC Minimum will be determined from the vertical scale.
and
Group B: From prior year, students that performed above Minimum and below a specific cut score within the Level II range on any STAAR assessment. The cut score will be set above the Satisfactory Scale Score.
- d. The concept is that Group A are students that are significantly below satisfactory and Group B are students that need to be closely monitored for sufficient growth.

For the Gap group or groups above the following **Gap Proficiency** measures are proposed to be included in the Gap Index:

1. Percent of students performing at Level II in Reading
2. Percent of students performing at Level II in Mathematics
3. Percent of students performing at Level II in Writing in grades 4 and 7
4. Percent of students performing at Level II in Science in grades 5 and 8
5. Percent of students performing at Level II in Social Studies in grade 8
6. Percent of students performing at Level II in each of the EOCs

For the Gap group(s), compute growth measures similar to what is included in the Growth Index. This growth measure is only for Gap Students, thus, if these growth measures are higher than that for “all” students, the outcome is that, historically underperforming students have higher growth rates than all students, thus the gap is being narrowed. Having the same growth measures for the Gap Group(s) will make it easier on the communication part as well.

As the Gap Measures are defined above, grade 3 will not be include in measures as the mode of identifying the gap group is based on prior achievement on a STAAR assessment. If a Gap Group could be identified using prior test scores (from end-of-year grade 2), then above measure could be applied. But the lack of a statewide measure from grade 2 to identify the gap group and lack of consistent and reliable local measure led the workgroup to believe that grade 3 should be an exception. The group discussed in detail the possible options for grade three and the recommendation is not to have a Gap closure measure for grade 3. This is similar to not having a Growth Measure for Grade 3 as well. As a contingency, grade 3 gap closure measure could be a cross-sectional gap closure, similar to Required Improvement in the prior accountability system. There are several possible options to compute a measure.

- a. Compute the satisfactory rate of the lowest 25% of students for the prior and current year. Then, compute the percentage change. A positive measure indicates that the lowest 25% has more students meeting the Satisfactory Rate than prior year.
- b. Compute the satisfactory rate for Economically Disadvantaged Students from prior year and current year and compute the increased percentage.

July 10, 2012 4:00 – 5:30 PM

Attending: Beth Dunavant (Pittsburg), Lisa Diserens (Temple), Janet Wallace (Midland Academy Charter), Kelly Solis (Region I), Lucy Larrison (Bryan), Elvia Noriega (Richardson), Theresa Urrabazo (San Antonio), and Dash Weerasinghe (Plano).

Agenda

1. Update from TEA on the development of the Growth Measures
2. Review prior discussions on Gap Group and measures

3. Formally write the recommended measures for Growth and Gap Measures

Update on the development of Growth Measure – Ester Regalado (TEA)

The conference call commenced with an update from Ester Regalado on the development of the Growth Measure by TEA. The ATAC PM Workgroup proposed using a transition table approach with multiple achievement bands within Level I, Level II, and Level III for the growth measure as part of the Growth Index and to measure gap closer in the Gap Index. The PM Workgroup will have to use the Growth Measure developed by the TEA Student Assessment Division and Pearson, and incorporate measures resulting from the final Growth Model into the index. The timeline for the development of the growth model extends to 2013 and the Growth Index will not be able to be implemented until 2014 spring.

The PM Workgroup discussed the implications of this process. The reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) may include growth measures for students. The transition table methodology has previously met Department of Education approval (Delaware, Iowa, Minnesota, and Michigan) as a growth measure. Thus, the ATAC Progress Measures workgroup would like TEA to consider the recommendation for the transition table approach as a first possibility for the growth measure for STAAR assessments. Similar to TAKS-Alt transition tables for growth, the transition methodology can be applied to STAAR-Alt, STAAR-Modified, and if necessary for TELPAS. Having a common methodology for measuring growth will enable all educational personal, students, and stakeholders to understand the overall system.

Gap Group and measures

The workgroup reviewed the discussions from the July 5th conference call and engaged in the selection of students to be included in the Gap Group. Identifying the lowest 25% was considered as not viable option. All schools will have a “lowest 25%” group. Having a lowest 25% group does not mean that this group is academically underperforming or have common traits that yield to underperformance. In some schools and districts, all students may be at Level II whereas in others all students could be Level I. Thus, the index may falsely measure students with varied performance as a gap index. The PM Workgroup believes that is not a fair comparison to be made.

The second option was identifying prior unsatisfactory students (in any subject) as the Gap group. This option is getting closer to the appropriate identification of a gap group. A disadvantage is that students that narrowly met the Level II standard may not be identified by this definition.

The general consensus was to identify prior Level I students and expand the group that narrowly met the Level II standard. For consistency, the definition of narrowly met will be defined as performing within the lowest band of the transition table in Level II. The concept of narrowly passed is to monitor students in the following years to ensure that they make progress to higher level of achievement. This concept is similar to ELL Monitored 1 and Monitored 2 categories. There will be one (1) Gap Group, identified across all subject areas based on prior performance. Non-retained Grade 3 students will not have prior performance measure and thus will not be in the Gap Group.

The Gap Measures are listed below for the Gap Group. Each of these percentages (Level II performance) will contribute to the overall index score.

1. Minimum size requirements will apply. 20 students.
2. For the Gap group
 - a) Percent of students performing at Level II in Reading
 - b) Percent of students performing at Level II in Mathematics
 - c) Percent of students performing at Level II in Writing in grades 4 and 7
 - d) Percent of students performing at Level II in Science in grades 5 and 8
 - e) Percent of students performing at Level II in Social Studies in grade 8

- f) Percent of students performing at Level II in each of the EOCs
- 3. For Grade 3, the following cross-sectional (prior Grade 3 vs. current Grade 3) will apply
 - a) Percent increase in Level II performance of Economically Disadvantaged students in Reading
 - b) Percent increase in Level II performance of Economically Disadvantaged students in Mathematics
- 4. Growth Transitions for students included in Gap Group (Implemented in 2014 Spring)
 - a) Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in Reading
 - b) Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in Mathematics
 - c) Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in Writing (4 and 7)
 - d) Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in Science (5 and 8)
 - e) Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in Social Studies (8)
 - f) Percent of students that progressed to a higher achievement band in each of the EOCs

July 17, 2012 4:00 –5:00 PM

Attending: Beth Dunavant (Pittsburg), Janet Wallace (Midland Academy Charter), Lucy Larrison (Bryan), and Dash Weerasinghe (Plano).

Agenda

1. Review the formal proposal for Index 2 – Growth Measure
2. Review the formal proposal for Index 2 – Gap Index
3. Review Required Improvement System

The discussions involved different scenarios and application of minimum size, especially for student groups. We reached consensus on Growth Measure to be across grade levels to ensure that all student groups are included in contrast to measures based on each grade. Each grade measures could be available in a detail report for school improvement.

The workgroup reviewed the draft proposal and discussed the need for specific examples of the measures. Discussed the need to include an example of how RI will be implemented.

July 24, 2012 4:00 – 6:00 PM

Attending: Kelly Solis (Region I), Elvia Noriega (Richardson), Theresa Urrabazo (San Antonio), and Dash Weerasinghe (Plano).

Agenda

1. Review the formal proposal from the PM Workgroup.
2. Rationale for PM Workgroup

Index 2 Review

Reviewed how many measures a typical elementary, middle, and high school could have. Added sections to the proposal to describe Grades 5 and 8 retests. Added a section on EOCs to accommodate multiple assessments and retests. The system defines the accountability year to start on July 1 and to end on June 30. All assessments assessed in this window will belong to either the prior year or current year. If within the current year or prior year multiple assessments are administered within a subject, the achievement level will be determined by the highest level of assessments within the subject in that accountability year. All EOC retests, for prior failure or for higher cumulative reasons, will be included in the progress measure. The goal was to make the computation easier, not having to differentiate various reasons for retesting, availability of multiple administrations of EOC, and different sequence of course taking of students.

Index 3 Review

Percent of Gap Students that attained satisfactory passing standard (Level II): The first measure was changed to include each grade level and across grade levels. The rationale was to ensure that all students that belong to the Gap Group are part of the accountability system. If a middle school has 15 students in each grade that are in the Gap Group, then with a minimum 20 size, the campus will not have an accountability measure for these two groups. With the addition of the across grade level measure, the minimum 20 criteria will be met and the group now is evaluated in the Gap Index.

Added a section for high schools on identifying Gap Students if an EOC was taken multiple times. If Geometry was assessed in July 2013, Dec 2013, and May 2014, then the highest of the three assessments will be used to determine if Gap criteria was met. In addition, the concept of grade level is applicable for grades 4-8, but the workgroup will introduce the concept of graduating cohort for high schools. Satisfactory rates of the Gap Group will be evaluated for each graduating cohort as well as the complete campus.

Growth for Gap Students: Removed growth measure for Writing, Social Studies, and Science from the prior version. This measure is similar to Index 2 Growth Measure, but calculated for the Gap Group only.

TEA requested the group to provide a rationale for our proposal.

July 31, 2012 4:00 – 5:20 PM

Attending: Darrell Brown (Eagle-Mountain Saginaw), Lisa Diserens (Temple), Janet Wallace (Midland Academy Charter), Kelly Solis (Region I), Lucy Larrison (Bryan), Elvia Noriega (Richardson), Theresa Urrabazo (San Antonio), and Dash Weerasinghe (Plano).

Agenda

1. Review "Rationale" for PM Workgroup proposal
2. Finalize the formal proposal from the PM Workgroup.

The workgroup reviewed the Rationale section. Decided to include additional information on the selection of the Minimum Size criteria and reviewed the accountability philosophy on why student groups such as Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, and ELL were not specifically included as accountability measures. Added a section to the Accountability Implications section on the Rationale to clarify the philosophy.