

## 2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

### Meeting Objective

The objective for the second meeting of the 2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) was to finalize recommendations for 2016 accountability and continue discussing topics related to the implementation of HB 2804.

### Welcome

TEA staff reviewed the agenda and the purpose of the meeting. Staff also explained the purpose of the Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability and reviewed the updated 2016 accountability development calendar.

### 2016 Accountability—Options for Setting 2016 Index Targets

ATAC members reviewed the decision points for the 2016 performance indices. Staff explained that mathematics, grades 3–8, would be included in accountability in 2016. ATAC members reviewed tables showing the gradual increase in the STAAR performance standards from 2016 to 2022. They also reviewed the index performance targets and corresponding percentiles over the past three years. Staff provided models of what district and campus results would have been in 2015 (using most recent data not available at the September meeting) if mathematics, grades 3–8, STAAR A and STAAR Alternate 2 (STAAR Alt 2) had been included. The models showed index scores for districts and campuses broken down according to geographic and demographic information.

ATAC members began with discussing how to integrate STAAR A and STAAR Alt 2 into accountability in 2016. Some members expressed concern about including these two assessments in Index 3. Some members said that the assessments should be included eventually, but that this year is too soon. Others asked if it were possible to develop a progress measure specifically for these assessments. Staff said that it might be possible in the future, but it could not happen this year.

Members then turned their attention to the inclusion of ELLs in accountability. For ELLs with parental denials and those who have graduated from an ELL progress measure plan, the members decided to stay with their September recommendation, as shown on the next page.

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee  
 Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

| Years in U.S. Schools  | Index 1 | Index 2* | Index 3 | Index 4 |
|--|---------|----------|---------|---------|
| ELLs With Parental Denials for Instructional Services or<br>ELLs without an ELL Progress Measure due to Years in U.S. Schools Exceeding<br>ELL Plan Year |         |          |         |         |
| First year of enrollment in U.S. schools   |         |          |         |         |
|  |         |          |         |         |





|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## 2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

Members discussed the difficulty inherent in assessing elementary campuses for Domain IV. Since STAAR results cannot be used in Domain IV, it is difficult to identify college and career readiness indicators for elementary school students. The committee discussed a student survey that would require extensive psychometric work and would have to be administered by TEA to ensure consistent measurement across all districts and campuses.

The members agreed with the APAC that an indicator that awards credit to campuses for its students that take high school courses by grade 8 would be an effective measure of postsecondary readiness.

### HB 2804 Accountability—Options for Domain I Methodology

TEA staff presented a document for discussion that modeled different options for calculating a numerical score for Domain I. The models build on previous calculations used in the current four-index accountability model. Working together in groups, committee members discussed the options.

Option 1 is similar to how the score for Index 2 is currently calculated. It gives one point for each percentage of tests at the satisfactory standard and two points for each percentage of tests at the college-readiness standard and adds the two together before dividing by the total number of possible points. Option 2 is similar to how the score for Index 4 is currently calculated and gives one point for each percentage of tests at the satisfactory standard and one point for each percentage of tests at the college-readiness. These two are then averaged using weights.

Members discussed a third option: adding the percentage of tests at the satisfactory standard to the percentage of tests at the college-readiness standard. This option was discarded, though, because it could result in a score greater than 100, making the scores unintuitive.

By a vote of 18 to 6, the committee recommended option 2 and weighting that score as follows: 90% for satisfactory standard and 10% to college-readiness standard.

Discussion shifted to the question of how to assign letter grades. TEA staff presented three models for consideration.

ATAC members discussed tables showing two options:

Option 1: A campus would receive an A if it meets a certain target or if it is in the top 10 percent of its campus comparison group.

Option 2: A campus would receive an A if it meets a certain target. A campus that misses the target could still receive an A if it meets the target for a B and is in the top 10 percent of its campus comparison group, essentially receiving a one-letter-grade increase for being in the top 10 percent of its campus comparison group. Campuses

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting on December 2-3, 2015

2016 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee  
 Summary of Meeting on December 2–3, 2015

Overall A–F Example

| Weights <sup>1</sup> |                         | Cut Points                    |    |    |    |     |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----|----|----|-----|
|                      |                         | A                             | B  | C  | D  | F   |
| 15%                  | Domain I                | 68                            | 56 | 37 | 32 | 0   |
| 25%                  | Domain II               | 60                            | 50 | 40 | 30 | 20  |
| 15%                  | Domain III              | 40                            | 35 | 30 | 25 | 20  |
| 35%                  | Domain IV               | 80                            | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40  |
| 10%                  | Domain V                | District assigns letter grade |    |    |    |     |
|                      | A–F Scores <sup>2</sup> | 100                           | 89 | 79 | 69 | 59  |
|                      | Overall                 | 90                            | 80 | 70 | 60 | <60 |

1.

| Example 1*                |     |    | Example 2**               |     |     |
|---------------------------|-----|----|---------------------------|-----|-----|
| 58                        | B   | 89 | 58                        | A   | 100 |
| 55                        | B   | 89 | 55                        | B   | 89  |
| 33                        | C   | 79 | 33                        | C   | 79  |
| 79                        | B   | 89 | 79                        | B   | 89  |
| A                         | 100 |    | A                         | 100 |     |
| Weighted average=<br>88.6 |     |    | Weighted average=<br>90.3 |     |     |
| Overall Rating: B         |     |    | Overall Rating: A         |     |     |