

## **2015 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee**

### **Summary of meeting on Dec. 8–9, 2014**

#### **Meeting Objective**

The objective for the first meeting of the 2015 Accountability Technical Advisory committee (ATAC) was to review the 2014 accountability results and to begin discussing changes for the 2015 ratings.

#### **Overview of Accountability Results**

Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff shared the 2014 accountability results, including the outcomes of the 2014 appeals. A request was made for an additional report to be provided at the next meeting that summarized the ratings by school type.

#### **Feedback on 2014 Performance Indexes and Distinction Designations**

ATAC members expressed concern that under the current system, a district will be rated *Improvement Required* if it fails to meet the requirements of any one of the four indexes. The members discussed whether the results of state assessments could be de-emphasized in the accountability system but expressed concern that doing so could negatively affect the reliability of the measures and the equity of the system. The members also briefly discussed incorporating TELPAS results by including students whose progress is demonstrated by skipping a proficiency level. Regarding the complexity of the accountability system, ATAC members noted that complexity is inherent in the system because of the need for reliable and equitable accountability ratings.

#### **Review changes to Assessment Program for 2014–2015**

Staff explained the changes to the assessment program for 2014–2015. ATAC members reviewed information on the 2015 bridge study for accountability. Members also received copies of correspondence from TEA to district administrators describing the changes to the assessment program.

#### **State Assessments in 2015 Performance Indexes**

Staff reviewed how each of the STAAR, STAAR Modified, STAAR Alternate and EOC tests were included in the performance index framework in 2013 and 2014. Staff also explained the planned changes to STAAR, STAAR Accommodated, and STAAR Alternate 2 that affect the performance indexes for the 2015 accountability ratings. For Index 1, the consensus among ATAC committee members was to include the STAAR Accommodated and STAAR Alternate 2 results in the Index

## **2015 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee**

### **Summary of meeting on Dec. 8–9, 2014**

I calculations and apply a hold-harmless feature that adjusts the rating outcome if Index 1 fails to meet the target solely because of the inclusion of the results from STAAR Accommodated and STAAR Alternate 2.

For Index 2, a majority of ATAC committee members favored evaluating the index based on available student progress measures. For Index 3, ATAC committee members discussed possible modifications that will be further explored at the next ATAC meeting. For Index 4, ATAC members recommended no changes to the methodology used for the STAAR component.

There was a consensus that STAAR Accommodated and STAAR Alternate 2 should be excluded from Index 2, Index 3, and Index 4 in 2015.

The ELL workgroup will meet to develop recommendations for policies for the inclusions of ELLs. The recommendations will be considered at the upcoming February ATAC meeting.

### **Recommendations on 2015 Targets and Options for Required Improvement**

ATAC members recommended evaluating the target for either Index 1 or Index 2 to determine accountability ratings. As a result, districts and campuses would only need to meet three of the four indexes in 2015.

ATAC members discussed the possibility of changing the targets for Index 2 and Index 3 from a percentile to a specific cut score. Consensus among ATAC members was not to apply required improvement in 2015 because comparisons cannot be made between 2014 and 2015 STAAR results.

### **Index 4 Transition to Foundation High School Program (FHSP) and Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Requirements**

Staff provided an overview of the current calculations for Index 4, followed by an explanation of the FHSP, including the school years when specific endorsements would be available to graduates. Following their discussion, ATAC members made two preliminary recommendations for the current year: 1) for the graduation *rate*, include 2013–14 FHSP graduates in the *graduation-rate* numerator and 2) for the graduation *plan*, exclude 2013–14 FHSP graduates from the *graduation-plan* denominator since FHSP graduates cannot receive an endorsement in 2013-14.

## 2015 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of meeting on Dec. 8–9, 2014

In 2016 and 2017, the ATAC members recommended the development of an integrated diploma plan indicator that will span RHAP/DAP and FHSP. Beginning with 2018, the indicator will use FHSP only. A College-Ready Graduates (CRG) workgroup will be formed to develop recommendations for transitioning to future TSI requirements. The recommendations will be considered by ATAC at a future meeting.

### Index 4 Options for Additional Postsecondary and Career Readiness Indicators

Staff provided an overview of the postsecondary readiness indicators currently being used in Index 4. Following their discussion, the consensus among ATAC members was to modify the Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment completion indicator to measure only grades 11 and 12. Additional indicators discussed for inclusion in Index 4 were CTE course completion, industry certifications, CTE graduate concentrator, and graduates of Texas schools that attend Texas institutions of higher education. Some concern was raised about the reliability of data for these indicators. The ATAC recommended adding a fifth component to Index 4. Each component could be weighted equally to produce an overall Index 4 score.

Components	Weight
STAAR Component	20%
Graduation Component	20%
Graduation Plan Component	20%
College-Ready Graduates	20%
Additional Postsecondary Indicators	20%

Two options discussed for a fifth component, additional postsecondary indicators, are as follows:

Option 1: Select the best of three (3) new indicators

- 1) Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion: Currently reported on the Texas Annual Performance Report (TAPR), this indicator is based on a count of students who complete and receive credit for at least one advanced course in grades 9-12. The committee recommended modifying this existing indicator to include students in grades 11 and 12 only.
- 2) CTE Graduates: This is a new indicator briefly defined as the percent of annual graduates for the 2013-14 school year that are enrolled and/or completed the CTE Coherent Course Sequence.
- 3) Graduates Enrolled in TX Institution of Higher Education (IHE): Also currently reported on the Texas Annual Performance Report (TAPR).

## 2015 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of meeting on Dec. 8–9, 2014

Option 2: Create a single indicator of the percent of annual graduates for the 2013–14 school year that

number of graduates (School Year 2012–13) reported as either:

- 1) Complete and receive credit for at least one advanced course or dual enrollment course **OR**
- 2) Enrolled in Texas Institution of Higher Education **OR**
- 3) CTE Coherent Sequence

---

number of graduates reported for School Year 2012–13

### **AEA Provisions for 2015 Including Additional Postsecondary Indicator**

Staff provided a review of the AEA provisions for campuses and charter districts that meet the alternative education accountability registration criteria and presented options for including an additional postsecondary indicator in the Index 4 calculation. The consensus among the ATAC members was to use any new postsecondary indicator to AEA provisions as bonus points in Index 4.

### **Preliminary Options for A–F Ratings Beginning in 2016–2017**

Working in small groups and understanding that much more work will need to be done to develop the new rating system, the ATAC members expressed the following preliminary thoughts about how such a rating system could work. The charts on the following page describe each option that was discussed.

For each grade rating, the requirement listed in each column must be met to earn that rating. For example, in Option 1, to earn a *B*, a district that is rated on all four indexes must meet three of the indexes; there are no requirements for safeguards or distinctions. In Option 3, to earn a *C*, a district that is rated on three indexes must meet at least two and meet at least 70% of system safeguards.

## 2015 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of meeting on Dec. 8–9, 2014

Option 1						
Rating	Index Target Count of Indexes Evaluated				Safeguards Met	Distinctions Count of Distinctions Earned
	4	3	2	1		
A	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	Not specified	Not specified
B	●●●○	●●○	—	—	Not specified	Not specified
C	●●○○	—	●○	—	Not specified	Not specified
D	●○○○	●○○	—	—	Not specified	Not specified
F	○○○○	○○○	○○	○	Not specified	Not specified

● Index met | ○ Index not met | — No rating available

Option 2*						
Rating	Index Target Count of Indexes Evaluated				Safeguards Met	Distinctions Count of Distinctions Earned
	4	3	2	1		
A	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	≥ 90%	Not specified
B	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	70%–89%	Not specified
C	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	50%–69%	Not specified
D	●●●○	●●○	●○	○	≥ 50%	Not specified
D	●●○○	●○○	—	—	≥ 50%	Not specified
D	●○○○	—	—	—	≥ 50%	Not specified
F	○○○○	○○○	○○	○	< 50%	Not specified

\*Additional variations could permit a rating of B or C despite missing one or more indexes.

● Index met | ○ Index not met | — No rating available

Option 3						
Rating	Index Target Count of Indexes Evaluated				Safeguards Met	Distinctions Count of Distinctions Earned
	4	3	2	1		
A	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	100%	Two
B	●●●●	●●●	●●	●	90%–99%	One
C	●●●○	●●○	●○	—	70%–89%	None
D	●●○○	●○○	●○	—	50%–69%	None
F	○○○○	○○○	○○	○	< 50%	None

● Index met | ○ Index not met | — No rating available

### Discussion on Texas School Accountability Dashboard

Staff provided an overview of the statutory requirements for the Texas School Accountability Dashboard and provided ATAC members with samples of the dashboard reports that will be posted online in early January 2015.

## **2015 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee**

### **Summary of meeting on Dec. 8–9, 2014**

#### **Next Steps**

ATAC members agreed to a one-day meeting on Thursday, February 5, 2015. At the February meeting, ATAC members will address further topics related to the 2015 accountability ratings, including a review of possible modifications to Index 3, review data and develop recommendations related to index targets, and considering recommendations from the ELL workgroup.