2023 Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG)

Summary of Meeting on November 16, 2022

The objective of the November 16th TAAG meeting is to review the updates contained in the 2023 Preliminary Framework published last week. TEA will respond to questions/comments that require a response in *italics*. Some questions require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the meeting.

schools/accountability/acas. There are decisions that still are
hat are needed to finalize targets and cut points, e.g., we are waiting on more
on the new Algebra 1 and early graduation proposals.

erage anchored around 78 instead of 75? *In general, average will scale in the*
ge. If average is anchored to a lower number, the system would end up with
Fs.

y districts have 90 percent or more of their students growing more than one
s depends on how we measure growth. We are currently running analyses on
tewide outcomes using our new transition table model, and will use that data to
r goals.

e 88 percent CCMR *A* cut point be implemented for 2023 accountability? *Yes,*
nodeling to make sure this is a rigorous, yet fair expectation.

s the 88 percent? *It is proposed to proceed if the data modeling continues to*
both rigorous and fair. Based on research and baseline data, it appears
ith state postsecondary goals for our students.

everal years for us to get programs and teachers in place. It is important to
grace for us to implement. We need time to align resources. We need a few
t point adjustments would happen immediately for 2023 as they are set stable
xt five years. We could go back to making target adjustments every year, so
rments are smaller, but we have a design commitment to hold cut points steady
iple years. When we hold cut points steady for five years, the increases appear
ificant during the refresh as there were no smaller incremental increases each
CCMR criteria themselves will be phased in with future classes to allow
ning adjustments.

ow when Texas College Bridge was fully implemented? Prior to that year, the
rep classes were not as rigorous. My concern is that we are making decisions
hat isn't really what we think it is because of the lag. *Texas College Bridge was*
nboard during the height of the pandemic.

60 STAAR and CCMR *A* score also originally based off the 60x30 plan? *Yes,*
as aligned with the 60 percent by 2030 goal

- Can we get more modeling on the 88 percent for A CCMR cut point for rural schools? *Yes*
- Comments/Concerns
  - The STAAR cut point is more fair than rigorous. It appears that we are setting the bar too low.
  - 88 percent for an *A* seems rigorous.
  - When the ESSER funds are removed, CCMR may become even more rigorous.
  - The rigor is in the curriculum and how we are asking them to demonstrate proficiency. Five years ago, cut scores were anchored to 60 percent. Given the disruption of COVID, this should remain unchanged.

Academic Growth Discussion Questions

- Why are Did Not Meet assessments included in both denominators? *To focus on this particular subset of* *all types of districts when we model data. We will share this concern with the College, Career, and Military Preparation Division (CCMP).*

- Can you provide a quick update on which previously discussed topics such as capping growth, capping CCMR, college prep courses (CP), and/or IBC? Which previous proposals are still alive versus which ones have been tossed out? *We are not moving forward with the previously discussed CCMR adjustments, because of the feedback to address the issues more 8 Tcadjul3.7 (e)1wn i216.8 (s)17.1 (c)-1v (e i)T1 1 Tf0.273 0 Td( )TjEMC /LBo*

- We want to incorporate as many kids as possible, including those that are mobile, but won't they be excluded if they are not one of the evaluated groups? *ESSA requires campus ratings; they do not require or evaluate district ratings. For Comprehensive Support identifications we only need to use All Students, but for our state system we need the state-required groups in addition to All Students. Targeted and Additional Targeted identifications will continue to focus on the disaggregated data across all those disaggregated groups.*
- Why test students at all if we are not evaluating a test from a student that moves? *Test results are not just for accountability, but also to support parents, educators, and the community in better supporting their students. Data modeling shows an average of 1 percent of tests are lost between the district and campus subsets. That is roughly 0.5 percent of students statewide. It is a very tiny percentage. This is a district administrator messaging piece as the movement has no change on how tests are included for the campuses. These results will be reported in the district's Closing the Gaps data tables.*
- Could we create a "mobile" campus for students from that group and incorporate that campus into the district rating? *We can run data and see the impact of that proposal. This goes back to the balance between fairness and transparency. Are there enough students in districts to consolidate them for reporting and evaluation purposes?*

District Ratings Discussion Comments/Concerns

- It feels like we are gaming the system to get higher scores by using the "better of" domain scores. We are trying to make it fairer, but then the more complicated it becomes, the less transparent it becomes.
- Kids don't take NAEP seriously. That may be one of the reasons for the gap.
- Learning is complex. To me it's not about options; it's about the various ways to measure learning.
- NAEP is a representative stratified sample every other year
- Comparing a low socioeconomic school at 89 percent to a school with no low socioeconomic students is messy. The balance for "accountability" is a challenge.

Student Achievement Algebra I EOC Proposal Discussion Questions

- What about English I and Biology accelerated testers? *We have so few of these statewide.*
- Would the middle and high school receive the score? *Yes, both schools get the results, and the accelerated students must still take ACT/SAT before graduation.*
- What if your high schools don't want those scores? *Most districts would want these counted twice since the passing percentage is higher than for students taking it in 9th grade.*
- Could we not include our SAT/ACT accelerated testers results in the first two domains then? *Yes, we could do that. Those must be included for ESSA under Closing the Gaps.*
- For campuses that are 6–12 or K–12 would they still get to count Algebra I twice as well? *Great question. We have not gotten to that level of detail yet.*
- Comments
  - I would like to incentive this. If you want to do STEM, you need Calculus in high school. They need the rigorous courses early.
  - What is the problem we are trying to solve? This does not seem to target the right areas.