



Accountability and Assessment Questions for TEA From the Texas School Alliance (TSA)

November 2019

1. Please provide an update on State & Federal Accountability 2020:

- a. As of today, what is changing? What is staying the same?

Answer from TEA: *Please see the attached PPT from the November 5, 2019 Assessment Conference Presentation (attached). We will update any additional changes and/or amendments as information is available via our website and PR listserv.*

- b. What interventions / sanctions will be applied for a campus that is labeled “Additional Targeted” for 3 Years?

Answer from TEA: *As is currently in our state ESSA plan, campuses with three years of Additional Targeted support labeling do not have interventions or sanctions. Target Support campuses who are identified for three years become Comprehensive campuses.*

2. Please provide a HB 3 Update (specific topics listed below):

- a. STAAR Readability Study
- b. Early Literacy, Math, and CCMR Outcome Goals:

- i. The early literacy and math plans and what assessments are included/required. Is the Commissioner planning to limit and/or clarifying which assessments can be used during the November webinar? If so, how do districts set cut points for baseline data if they aren’t already using the assessment(s)?
- ii. The CCMR plans are based on the outcomes bonuses definition of CCMRs and not the accountability systems definition. 1) How do we set baseline data when TEA has not received the actual data from the military. 2) When will TEA provide districts with the modeled data for 2019 CCMR (OUTCOMES) vs. CCMR (ACCOUNTABILITY) in order to set the baseline and 5 year goals for district, every campus, and every student group?

Answer from TEA: *TEA plans to release thresholds for the CCMR Outcomes Bonus in spring upon receipt of data from the National School Clearinghouse and Depart of Defense. Once that data has been processed and merged with the list of annual graduates for a given year, data will be forwarded to districts for review and use. CCMR data for use in accountability will be released to districts in late spring upon receipt of data from various agencies and vendors.*

3. Proposed Rules: Campuses and Districts with an overall rating of “D” Needs Improvement. During last week’s House Public Education committee meeting, the proposed rules for campuses and districts receiving an overall D “Needs Improvement” rating were discussed.

- a. IF no changes are made to 2020 accountability, what does current statute require for a **campus** with an Overall D rating for 2 years (2019 and 2020)?

Answer from TEA: *Current statute will apply. A campus that receives two consecutive Overall D ratings would have interventions similar to a first year Overall F. The campus would be required to develop and submit a Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) to the agency. (Reminder from Dee: This could change depending on the outcome of the Commissioner’s Proposed Rules from July 2019... as per the discussion with the House Public Education Committee on October 28, 2019.)*



Accountability and Assessment Questions for TEA From the Texas School Alliance (TSA)

November 2019

- b. Same question except for a **district** with an Overall D rating for 2 years (2018 and 2019)?

Answer from TEA: *Current statute will apply. A district that receives two consecutive Overall D ratings would have interventions similar to a first year Overall F. The district would be required to develop and submit a Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) to the agency. Additionally, this may impact their accreditation status. (Reminder from Dee: This could change depending on the outcome of the Commissioner's Proposed Rules from July 2019... as per the discussion with the House Public Education Committee on October 28, 2019.)*

- c. IF no changes are made to 2020 accountability, what does current statute require for a campus that improves its' overall rating from an F in 2019 to a D in 2020?

Answer from TEA: *This would be dependent upon the number of consecutive unacceptable performance ratings that the campus had earned previously. For a first year Overall F moving to an Overall D, the campus would be required to develop a Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) and retain it locally. (Reminder from Dee: This could change depending on the outcome of the Commissioner's Proposed Rules from July 2019... as per the discussion with the House Public Education Committee on October 28, 2019.)*

- d. IF no changes are made to 2020 accountability, what does current statute require for a campus with a D in a Domain for 2 years?

Answer from TEA: *The campus would be required to develop a Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) and retain it locally.*

- e. What changes are being considered as a result of the House Public Education committee hearing regarding the above scenarios?

Answer from TEA: *At this time, the agency is reviewing the districts and campuses that would be directly impacted if the proposed rule is not adopted before the next legislative session.*

4. Proposed Rules: Substitute assessments. Current proposed rules regarding substitute assessments will impact accelerated testers.

- a. Please discuss (and provide a graphic organizer that can help districts explain) who, what, when, and how the proposed rules will impact accelerated testers (grades 6 – 8) for state accountability, ESSA accountability, and graduation.

Answer from TEA: *Please see the attached Assessment Conference presentation for guidance related to the questions about substitute assessments and accelerated testers.*

- b. ESSA waiver - can Texas file an ESSA waiver to NOT double test accelerated 6th & 7th graders (approx. 7,500 students)?

Answer from TEA: *We can always propose something to the DOE.*

5. Community Eligibility Provision (CEP).

- a. TSA districts continue to struggle collecting income data for students at the CEP schools prior to the PEIMS snapshot date. Please see the description below from one TSA district:



Accountability and Assessment Questions for TEA From the Texas School Alliance (TSA)

November 2019

- i. TAC regulations prohibit the use of direct certification data to identify eco-disadvantaged students at CEP campuses. A locally-developed survey form had to be used to gather household income data for students attending CEP campuses.

Answer from TEA: See chart on page 34, Section 2 of the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) for guidance pertaining to code '01' and '02' under the CEP column; students on the direct certification can be coded '01' and '02' accordingly. Only those students NOT on the direct certification list need to be surveyed.

- Student is on one of the direct certification lists as eligible for a free lunch/breakfast.
- Student is on one of the direct certification lists as eligible for a reduced-price lunch/breakfast.

- ii. As of the PEIMS snapshot date, approximately 200 students at a non-CEP campuses were included on Household Income Survey forms of a sibling at a CEP campus, and we did not have a Free/Reduced Application Form for them. The students are not on the direct certification list, so we have to gather income data for them through a form. Despite targeted efforts, we were not able to obtain a Free/Reduced Application Form for these students by the PEIMS snapshot date. We believe we should be able to use the Household Income Survey form as evidence that the students are eco-disadvantaged for accountability purposes, but ESC 11 indicates we can't do that.

Answer from TEA: See chart on page 35, Section 2 of the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) for guidance pertaining to code '99' under Traditional Claiming column; these students (those not on a CEP campus but identified on a local form) can be coded '99'.

Student who is determined to be economically disadvantaged through a means other than the official Free and Reduced-Price Meal Application form or direct certification.

This includes:

- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) students,
- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) students,
- and any other student who may be determined to be economically disadvantaged through the use of locally developed income survey forms.

- iii. Through a herculean effort by staff at all 25 CEP campuses and several central departments, we reached eco-disadvantaged percentages at the CEP campuses by the PEIMS snapshot data comparable to percentages at those same schools last year (when they were not CEP). The time and effort spent gathering the forms disrupted instructional work at some of our neediest campuses.
 - iv. The current variations in rules for qualifying eco-disadvantaged students at CEP versus non-CEP campuses creates inequities between schools for **accountability and funding purposes**. The variations are confusing to district personnel and parents and extremely inefficient.
- b. How can this data collection process be improved for both accountability and funding purposes?**

Answer from TEA: I believe this is something we can discuss as part of our APAC/ATAC/and superintendent meetings as well as PEIMS coordinator sessions.



Accountability and Assessment Questions for TEA From the Texas School Alliance (TSA)

November 2019

6. Can the STAAR datafile include a field showing if a student achieves 110% in a STAAR content area?

Answer from TEA: *Yes. At a minimum, TEA can provide a look-up table for the reading and math tests in grades 3-8 for each test and test versions 110% cut point. We will explore other options as well.*

7. Can TEA provide districts with **CCMR files** for cohorts 9th-12th grades each year?

Answer from TEA: *The agency plans to provide districts a suite of CCMR tools one of which will be a cohort tracker. These will begin to roll out in spring 2020. We will update timelines in the PR listserv.*

8. Can TEA include the 0-100% scale score along with the component score on the Accountability reports?

Answer from TEA: *Yes*

9. **STAAR Alt 2:** if a district has students who fail SA2 2 years in a row, will it trigger a monitoring activity? If yes, where can we find it? PBMAS manual? Accountability Manual? Proposed Rules?

Answer from TEA: *From the proposed RDA manual posted on the Commissioner's Rule website as "proposed rules with closed public comment periods":*

Special Education (SPED)

In 2019, the only new indicator is SPED Indicator #5: SPED STAAR® Alternate 2 Overall Participation Rate. Both SPED Indicator #4: SPED STAAR® Alternate Participation and SPED STAAR® Alternate 2 Overall will be report-only indicators. No performance level will be assigned for either indicator. Performance levels for significant disproportionality SPED Indicators #9-#16 will be assigned using significant disproportionality (SD) (Year 1), SD (Year 2), SD (Year 3), or SD (RP) for any racial/ethnic group if the racial/ethnic group's risk ratio exceeds 2.5. As required by federal regulations under 34 CFR Part 300, each LEA's indicator for SD will be based on disaggregated data by the following racial and ethnic groups: (1) Hispanic/Latino; (2) American Indian or Alaska Native; (3) Asian; (4) Black or African American; (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; (6) White; and (7) Two or More Races. Reasonable Progress will also be applied to determine SD.

SPED Indicators have been moved from Section 1 to the introduction of the SPED Indicators in Section III.

10. **Interim Assessments:** do you anticipate districts being charged for interim assessments?

Answer from TEA: *No*

11. Please provide a **HB 3906 (86th legislative session) Update**

Answer from TEA: *Please see the attached Assessment Conference presentation.*