

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on June 8, 2020

The objective of the June 2020 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) and Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) meeting was to solicit possible solutions to address the unique challenges facing the 2021 accountability system and beyond, due to COVID-19. TEA responses to questions and concerns are provided in red. Some questions require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting.

- TEA welcomed the committee members to the virtual meeting.
- The committee discussed possibilities for measuring growth considering the lack of assessment results for spring 2020.
 - Questions
 - Do independent school districts have the authority to submit locally developed growth data or results from norm-referenced assessments such as the NWEA MAP? TEA has not explored incorporating third party norm-referenced assessments as part of the 2021 accountability system. The variation in availability across the state makes this option problematic.
 - Can the agency define what a successful campus looks like in terms of performance and growth given possible disruptions that could occur in the 2020–21 school year? The agency would like to pose that question as a follow-up to the committees. What is the definition of a successful school through the lens of COVID-19 for the 2020–21 school year? How would superintendents define success among their student groups?
 - Concerns
 - If ratings are suspended for 2021, educators could become complacent.
 - A growth measure that is not comparable to previous years may not be interpretable or add value.
 - The “COVID slide” is likely to be significant for many students. This needs to be considered throughout the system.
 - Suggestions
 - Explore the use of optional beginning-of-year and end-of-year STAAR assessment results to calculate growth.
 - Utilize 2019 and 2021 STAAR assessment results to generate STAAR progress measures in 2021.
 - Calculate STAAR progress measures by applying the scale score cut points from 2019 to 2021 STAAR assessments.
 - Consider awarding bonus points to students who exceed progress in 2021.

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on June 8, 2020

- If the agency is unable to calculate progress using STAAR outcomes, then the agency should consider purchasing a product similar to IStation or NWEA MAP Growth to assist in 2021 growth calculations.
- Consider suspending ratings until the accountability reset.
- Assessment results in 2021 should be used to drive instruction and not for accountability. Use 2021 as a diagnostic year in order to set targets for the accountability reset.
- Revert to ratings of *Met Standard* or *Improvement Required* until the accountability reset.
- If ratings are calculated for 2021, Academic Growth should not be a component in those calculations.
- Continue to administer STAAR assessments in 2021 but suspend accountability ratings.
- Meaning needs to be present in accountability ratings. We should not just come up with a revised system to have something.
- Accountability is key for high expectations. We just need to know what's expected as early as possible.
- Take a pause on accountability for now so districts can focus on instructional needs and other crises without the pressure of ratings.
- The committee discussed options for calculating the college, career and military readiness (CCMR) component of the 2021 Student Achievement, School Progress and the Closing the Gaps domains given COVID-19 disruptions.
 - Questions
 - What is the status of the agency's request to receive military enlistment data from the Department of Defense (DoD)? **The last meeting the agency had with DoD Education Activity was in mid-March. We have not received any additional communication from them since then. We will continue to reach out for updates.**
 - When is the latest date we can code a student as being military ready? **You can submit military ready data through the TSDS PEIMS fall resubmission deadline.**
 - When is the latest date we can submit industry-based certifications (IBC) for CCMR? **The agency has published guidance on Reporting of IBCs in the October 17, 2019, To the Administrator Addressed letter.**
 - Concerns
 - The Closing the Gaps domain includes students who did not graduate and were in attendance during the last six weeks of school year. For 2020, most districts marked students as in attendance during the last

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on June 8, 2020

six weeks given disruptions due to COVID-19. This could lead to lower scores.

- Due to COVID-19, districts are not concerned with accountability. Their main priority is their students' social and emotional needs.
- Whether seniors return to take an industry-based certification assessment is dependent on how necessary the certification is for the student to engage in that career.
- Suggestions
 - The University of California has eliminated the requirement of submitting SAT results from prospective students. This should prompt the agency to consider future CCMR requirements.
 - Use the best overall result or the best result by indicator from 2019 and 2020 graduates for 2021 accountability.
 - Use the best overall result or the best result by indicator from 2018, 2019, and 2020 graduates for 2021 accountability.
 - Consider using a hold-harmless provision for CCMR.
 - Expand the data collection window for as many CCMR components as possible.
 - Extend the career and technical education (CTE) half-point through the accountability reset year.
- The committee discussed options for the use of an accurate 2020 graduation rate in the 2021 Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.
 - Questions
 - Will the individual graduation committee (IGC) waiver cease? **While we have not received word on a cessation date, this could be a topic for next year's legislative session.**
 - Can TEA model 2020 attendance data by district size and community type? **We can provide this data.**
 - Concerns
 - More students may be using IGCs this year than in previous years. **We will monitor this, but it would not have a negative impact on 2021 accountability.**
 - Inaccurate 2020 graduation data could impact future five and six-year graduation rates.
 - Suggestions
 - Use the fourth six-weeks cutoff date for the attendance rate when calculating distinction designations next year.
 - Extend the school start window cutoff date to the October snapshot date.

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on June 8, 2020

- Provide districts with flexibility on as many data submission deadlines as possible to recognize the challenges caused by COVID-19.
- The committee discussed options for accurately calculating the 2021 English Language Proficiency (ELP) component in the Closing the Gaps domain with missing 2020 TELPAS data.
 - Questions
 - When is the deadline for waiver submission to United States Department of Education (USDE)? **We would like to submit all waivers to USDE by the end of the 2020 calendar year.**
 - Concerns
 - Using a TELPAS composite rating in 2021 and comparing it to a 2019 rating could raise issues of data validity.
 - Suggestions
 - Establish targets by campus type (elementary, middle, high school and K-12) instead of a statewide target.
 - Allow partial points to be awarded for the ELP component in the Closing the Gaps domain.
- The committee discussed additional modifications for consideration when calculating the 2021 Closing the Gaps domain.
 - Questions
 - Is it possible for committee members to attend the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) meetings? **Currently the CCSSO meetings are limited to state school officers. We can share any relevant information from CCSSO meetings with the committee.**
 - There have been several changes approved by the legislature regarding assessments. Can the agency provide an updated timeline since COVID-19 has likely caused delays? **We are still required to meet the deadlines established in statute. Due to COVID-19, we have not provided updates so districts can address more pressing matters.**
 - What authority does the commissioner have to modify the accountability system? **The commissioner can make modifications to accountability system methodology within the framework that is required by the USDE and Texas state statute.**
 - Concerns
 - Schools with high populations of economically disadvantaged students will see an impact on the Closing the Gaps domain in multiple components.
 - Extra consideration should be given when resetting targets.

2020 Accountability Advisory Committees

Summary of Meeting on June 8, 2020

- We need a more precise economically disadvantaged identifier. A simple yes or no doesn't paint the full picture.
- Suggestions
 - If the accountability reset is meant to be used as a "blank slate" then the disruptions from COVID-19 should be considered when revising targets.
 - Submit a waiver/amendment to the USDE requesting the use of unique required improvement cut points for each Closing the Gaps target to allow for partial credit for improvement each year.
 - 2021 ratings will likely be received unfavorably by parents, educators, and other stakeholders. Data for student group should be made available, but there should not be negative consequences for missing targets.
 - Consider asking districts and schools to close their own unique gaps, instead of setting targets for 2021 accountability.
 - Consider using peer groups to measure Closing the Gaps in 2021.
 - Do not increase the Closing the Gaps targets.
- Committee members discussed future meeting dates.