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Session Overview – Focus Area 1
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  - Absolute Measures
  - Absolute Measures + Progress Measures
  - Absolute Measures + Progress Measures + Attainment Measures

- Transition to the Next Generation of Assessment and Accountability
  - HB 2804 Implementation
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- Focus Area 1 – Absolute Measures
  - Performance Index 1 Model Transition to Domain 1 Model
  - Student Achievement Levels of Performance Expectations

- Strategic Planning for 2016-2017 and Beyond
  - Quality Framework for Professional Development Supports
Expanded Measures of Student Achievement
Through the Lens of Texas K-12 Accountability
Early accountability and assessment in Texas was designed to measure:

- Proficiency of learning expectations
- Student learning gauged through a single reference point
- Student achievement through an **absolute measure** of learning.
Transition in Accountability to Align Instruction and Assessment

• **Texas Assessment of Basic Skills (TABS)**
  • The primary purpose of TABS was collection of school-level information through assessment of basic skill competencies.

• **Texas Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS)**
  • TEAMS focused on assessment of curriculum-specific minimum basic skills.

• **Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)**
  • Emphasis of TAAS was on school accountability of student performance and included content linked to the core curriculum Essential Elements also known as EE’s.

• **Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)**
  • TAKS introduced a more rigorous accountability system aligned with the state-mandated curriculum the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

• **State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR)**
  • With the advent of STAAR, end-of-course assessments (SB 1031 in 2007) and grade 3-8 assessments (HB3 in 2009) were implemented in 2011-2012 having a greater emphasis on increased rigor and stronger focus on college and career readiness.
## AEIS Campus Rating: Recognized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Base Indicators</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAKS Passing (Measures)</td>
<td>TAKS Commended</td>
<td>ELL Progress</td>
<td>Completion Rate</td>
<td>Annual Dropout Grades 7-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading 70/80/90</td>
<td>Writing 70/80/90</td>
<td>Math 65/80/90</td>
<td>Science 60/80/90</td>
<td>Social Studies 70/80/90</td>
<td>Math Na/15/25</td>
<td>ELAR NA/15/25</td>
<td>60% RE/EX</td>
<td>75/85/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Features:
Absolute Measure: Singular Measure for Accountability Rating

• School district/Campus ratings were dependent on a single area of weak performance instead of a more a comprehensive measurement of district performance.

• Districts and campuses must have met 25 separate assessment standards. This was informally known as “Death by Cell” as a District/Campus could have received an Academically Unacceptable rating if they failed to meet minimum expectations for one subgroup.
PROGRESS
MEASURES
The Texas accountability system has evolved to a more comprehensive rating system making use of multiple indexes focusing on:

• strength-based student achievement (absolute measure) and

• placing stronger emphasis on student growth, group gap closure, and readiness for college and careers (progress measures).
Performance Index Framework

Overview of 2016 State Accountability System

Index 1: Student Achievement
- STAAR Satisfactory Performance
  - All students
  - Combined over all subject areas evaluated
  - Credit given for meeting Level II Satisfactory Standards on STAAR reading, mathematics, writing, and social studies (excluding Spanish versions where applicable)
  - STAAR A
  - STAAR Alternate 2
  - EOC assessments administered in the spring and previous fall and summer
  - STAAR L (incompletely assessed) included through the ELL progress measure.

Index 2: Student Progress
- Student Progress to Satisfactory or Advanced Performance Levels
  - Ten student groups evaluated
  - All students
  - African American
  - American Indian
  - Asian
  - Hispanic
  - Pacific Islander
  - White
  - Two or more races
  - Students served by special education
  - Current and monitored English Language Learners (ELLs)
  - Combined across subjects
  - STAAR and ELL progress measures for reading and mathematics in grades 4-8, Algebra I, and English I EOCs
  - ELL progress measure only for reading and mathematics in grades 3 and English I EOC
  - Credit based on weighted performance across all subject areas
  - One point given for each percentage of tests meeting the Level II Satisfactory Standard or above
  - One point given for each percentage of tests meeting the Level III Advanced Standard

Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps
- Achievement Gaps Measured for Satisfactory and Advanced Levels
  - Economically disadvantaged students and two lowest-performing racial/ethnic groups based on the Student Group to be Evaluated in 2016
  - Closing Performance Gaps report posted December 15, 2015, in TEASC
  - Same assessments used in Index 1 (excluding STAAR L)
  - Credit based on weighted performance by subject
  - One point given for each percentage of tests meeting the Level II Satisfactory Standard or above
  - One point given for each percentage of tests meeting the Level III Advanced Standard

Index 4: Postsecondary Readiness
- Measures Postsecondary Readiness
  - Credit based on postsecondary components
  - STAAR Postsecondary Readiness
  - Right student groups evaluated: all students and each race/ethnicity
  - Credit given for meeting postsecondary readiness standard (Final Level II) on two or more subject-area tests

High School Graduation Rates
- Four-year or five-year graduation rate (or annual dropout rate if no graduation rate)
- Ten student groups evaluated: all students, each race/ethnicity, students served by special education, and ELL (at any time in high school)

High School Diploma Rates
- Percent Recommended High School Plan, Distinguished Achievement (Advanced) Plan (RHSP/ADAP), or Honors RHSP/ADAP and Foundation High School Plan Rate with Endorsement (RHSP-E) or General Level of Achievement (RHSP-GLA) graduates
- Eight student groups evaluated: all students and each race/ethnicity

Distinction Designations for Student Progress, Closing Performance Gaps, and Postsecondary Readiness
- Campuses earn distinctions for outstanding academic achievement on indicators, such as STAAR participation performance, STAAR participation performance, and advanced (Level III) performance on STAAR in four subjects.

Additional Postsecondary Indicators
- Percent of annual graduates that either
  - Met College Readiness Graduates criteria
  - Earned credit for two advanced courses/credit courses, or
  - Completed in a coherent sequence of two or more career and technical education (CTE) courses as part of a four-year plan of study.

System Safeguards
- Evaluate performance by individual student groups and subject areas and require interventions focused on specific areas of weak performance.

Source: Texas Education Agency
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Performance Index Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
<th>Student Progress</th>
<th>Closing Performance Gaps</th>
<th>Postsecondary Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index 1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index 2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index 3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index 4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX 1
Student Achievement

INDEX 2
Student Progress

INDEX 3
Closing Performance Gaps

INDEX 4
Postsecondary Readiness

STAAR ACCOUNTABILITY
Index 1: Student Achievement

All Student Groups + All Subjects → Index 1 Performance
Index 2: Student Progress

Individual Student Growth

Reading, Mathematics and Writing

10 Student Groups
Index 3: Closing Performance Gaps

- All Subjects
- Level II & Level III Performance
- Economically Disadvantaged & Lowest Race and Ethnic Groups
Transition to Multiple Metrics of Evaluation

Beyond Assessment

- Absolute Performance Measures
  - Progress Measures
  - Rigor with College Readiness
  - Academic Attainment
  - Extended Educational Program Opportunities
A new generation of assessment and accountability in Texas begins in 2017–18 and continues to be inclusive of:

- student achievement (absolute measures)
- student growth (progress and gap closure measures)

and integrates measures of

- academic attainment
- community/Student Engagement
State Accountability Transition

Performance Index Framework to Five Domain Framework

2015 - 2016

Fall 2016
Rating based on Performance Index Framework & Met Standard/ Improvement Required

2016-2017

Fall 2017
Rating based on Performance Index Framework & Met Standard/ Improvement Required

2017-2018

Fall 2018
Rating based on 5 Domain Framework & A – F Rating System for Districts and Campuses
Next Generation of Assessment and Accountability: Domain Framework and Implementation Timeline
Five Domain Framework

House Bill 2804, 84th Texas Legislature
Domains of Indicators

**Domain I: Student Achievement**
- STAAR satisfactory standard
- STAAR college-readiness standard

**Domain II: Student Progress**
- Progress measure expectations for STAAR satisfactory standard
- Progress measure expectations for STAAR college-readiness standard

**Domain III: Closing Performance Gaps**
- Academic achievement differentials among students from different racial and ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds

**Domain IV: Postsecondary Readiness**
- Districts and High Schools
  - Dropout rate
  - Graduation rate
  - College and Career Readiness
  - Other indicators as determined by the commissioner
- Middle/Junior High Schools
  - Student attendance
  - Dropout rate
  - Students receiving instruction in preparing for high school, college, and career
  - Other indicators as determined by the commissioner
- Elementary Schools
  - Student attendance
  - Other indicators as determined by the commissioner

**Domain V: Community and Student Engagement**
- Three indicators from Community and Student Engagement Ratings chosen by the district
- Three indicators from Community and Student Engagement Ratings chosen by the campus

HB 2804 does not prescribe how each of the first three domains is to be individually weighted to calculate the combined 55%.

55% of Overall Rating

35% of Overall Rating
For districts and high schools, graduation rate is 10%; the remaining indicators are 25%.

10% of Overall Rating
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Accountability Implementation Timeline

**Current Accountability System**
- ATAC Sept 2016
- ATAC/APAC Jan 2017
- 2017 Ratings Aug 2017
- APAC Oct 2016
- COE Final Decisions Feb 2017

**ESSA (Proposed Regulations)**
- ESSA Dec 2015
- Comments Due (Reg) Aug 2016
- Stakeholder Meetings Oct 2016
- Stakeholder Meetings Oct 2016
- Assign 2017-2018 ESSA Ratings Sept 2017
- Proposed Regs May 2016
- Final Regs Oct 2016
- Stakeholder Meetings Sept 2016
- State Plan Submitted March 2017

**HB 2804**
- June 2015
- TCNGAA Report to Governor and legislature Sept 1, 2016
- TEA Issues What IF A-F Ratings Report Jan 1, 2017
- Distincts & Campuses assign to themselves A-F for Domain V Spring 2018
- TCNGAA Winter-Summer 2016
- TEA Adopts A-F Indicators Dec 1, 2016
- Districts and Campuses report to TEA three CSHI indicators for Domain V Summer 2017
- TEA issues A-F Ratings for 2017-2018 school year Aug 2018
## House Bill 2804: Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2016</td>
<td>Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability prepares and delivers report to governor and legislature that recommends statutory changes to improve systems of student assessment and public school accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2016</td>
<td>Commissioner of Education must adopt a set of indicators to measure and evaluate school districts and campuses with A–F ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2017</td>
<td>TEA must provide a report that shows the rating that each district and campus would have received for the 2015-2016 school year for each for the first four domains if the A–F ratings had been in place that year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 15, 2018</td>
<td>Districts and campuses are assigned A–F ratings beginning with the 2017-18 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 1, 2016</td>
<td>TEA releases indicators for Domains I–IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 16, 2016</td>
<td>TEA releases unmasked data tables and planned methodologies for determining ratings to districts via TEASE (This release will not include ratings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 30, 2016</td>
<td>TEA sends provisional A–F report (with ratings) via email to Texas Legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 4, 2017</td>
<td>TEA releases provisional A–F report (with ratings) to districts on TEASE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 6, 2017</td>
<td>TEA releases provisional A–F report (with ratings) to public on TEA website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOMAIN I: Student Achievement Model
Domain I: HB 2804 State Accountability Requirements

Measures of Satisfactory Level Performance and College-Readiness Level Performance
Domain I Model (Draft Discussion)
(ATAC/APAC HB 2804 Requirements)

Weighted score of all grades and subject Tests at Satisfactory Standard and Final Level II Standard.

Generate weighted score.

Establish range of targets for letter grades of A-F

Assign letter grades

Compare weighted score results to weighted score outcomes for 40 campus in a comparison group. Those who are in the top quartile receive a one letter grade bump (e.g. a B becomes an A, a C becomes a B, etc.).
Domain I: HB 2804 and Commissioner Recommendations

Measures of Satisfactory Level Performance, College-Readiness Level Performance, and Advanced Level Performance
Domain I Model (Draft Discussion) (Commissioner Recommendations)

Performance Index Framework
Index 1 Level of Performance 2016-2017

Index 1

Level II Satisfactory Standard

Five Domain Framework
Domain I Levels of Performance 2017-2018

Domain I

Advanced Level III

Final Level II

Level II Satisfactory Standard
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# Domain I - Elementary

*Draft Discussion - Example*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain I</th>
<th>Percent Met</th>
<th>Points 1 point for each percent</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level II Performance</td>
<td>P1 %</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Level II Performance</td>
<td>P2 %</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Academic Performance</td>
<td>P3 %</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points: \( P1 + P2 + P3 \)

*Total Domain Score*  
\[
\frac{(P1 + P2 + P3)}{300}
\]

- \( \geq \text{Range 5} \)  
- \( \text{Range 4} \)  
- \( \text{Range 3} \)  
- \( \text{Range 2} \)  
- \(< \text{Range 1} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Domain Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \geq \text{Range 5} )</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Range 4} )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Range 3} )</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Range 2} )</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt; \text{Range 1} )</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domain I  A-F Rating Draft Recommendation

Campus Level Templates
DOMAIN I Required Improvement Option for Letter Grades of D or F

• A required improvement option could exist for campuses and districts with a letter grade of D or F.

• The campus of district must have shown enough improvement to be able to meet a Level II Satisfactory Performance Standard of 90 percent in five years.

• Methodology:
  • Actual Change: (2016 Level II SP – 2015 Level II SP)
  • Required Improvement: (Level II SP Standard of 90 – 2015 Level II SP) / 5
  • Actual Change ≥ Required Improvement
DOMAIN II:
Student Progress Model
Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability

TEA A–F Domain Rating – Draft Recommendation

Domain II: Student Progress Model

Transition Table Growth Measures (Options 1 - 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Year Test</th>
<th>Far Below Level II Standard (0)</th>
<th>Below Level II Standard (1)</th>
<th>Level II Standard (2)</th>
<th>Final Level II (3)</th>
<th>Advanced Level III (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Below Level II Standard (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Level II Standard (1)</td>
<td>-1/0/0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II Standard (2)</td>
<td>-2/0/0</td>
<td>-1/0/0</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Level II (3)</td>
<td>-3/0/0</td>
<td>-2/0/0</td>
<td>-1/0/0</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Level III (4)</td>
<td>-4/0/0</td>
<td>-3/0/0</td>
<td>-2/0/0</td>
<td>-1/0/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOMAIN III: Closing Performance Gaps Model
Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability

TEA A–F Domain Rating – Draft Recommendation

Domain III: Closing Performance Gaps Model

Domain III Closing Performance Gaps:
- Economically Disadvantaged +
- Identified Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Groups [3(2 selected), 2(1 selected), 1(None Selected)]

Domain III Letter Grade Designation Methodology
- Performance Gap Score:
- Percent of Tests at Final Level II or Above from Threshold of 60 for ED and Identified R/E Groups
  (Sum of Gaps/Number of Groups Evaluated)

Domain III Required Improvement:
- Option where Campus or District’s Projected Improvement Average from Prior Year to Current Year is greater than or equal to the Current Year Domain III Score
Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability

TEA A-F Domain Rating – Draft Recommendation

Domain I and II: Impact of Domain III, Part B Model

Domain I, Part B:
Perform Regression on Domain I results for the lowest performing racial/ethnic group by percentage of economically disadvantaged students

Domain III, Part B:
D grade leads to a 0.5 point penalty to the best of outcome between Domain I and Domain II

Domain III, Part B:
F grade leads to a 1.0 point penalty to the best of outcome between Domain I and Domain II

Domain I
Student Achievement

Domain I
Letter Grade Designation Methodology

Domain II
Student Progress

Domain II
Letter Grade Designation Methodology

Division of Instructional, School Improvement and College Readiness Support
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Domain III  A-F Rating Draft Recommendation

Campus Level Templates
DOM\-AIN III Required Improvement Option for Letter Grades of D or F

• A required improvement option could exist for campuses and districts with a letter grade of D or F.

• The campus of district must have shown enough improvement to be able to meet a Level II Satisfactory Performance Standard of 90 percent in five years.

• Methodology:
  • Projected Improvement Average:
    • Step 1: Determine Performance Difference: 2016 Final Level II Performance – 2015 Final Level II Performance for each of Domain III Student Groups Evaluated
    • Step 2: Determine Improvement Average: Sum of Differences from Step 1 / # of Student Groups Evaluated
    • Step 3: Determine Projected Improvement Average: Multiply Improvement Average by 5
    • Determine difference in Final Level II per(2016 Level II SP – 2015 Level II SP)
  • Projected Improvement Average \(>\) Domain III Score
A-F Academic Accountability System: Key Considerations Roundtable Discussions
Reaching High Levels of Achievement for All Students

- Domain I: Proficiency + Mastery
- Domain II & III: Progress + Gap Closure
- Domain IV & V: College Readiness Attainment + Engagement
Mastery for All Students
Collective Goal

Meeting the Needs of all Students In every Classroom

What does mastery learning look like on my campus?
Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness

Learning System Supports

- Attainment
- Progress
- Proficiency
Quality Framework for Comprehensive Professional Learning System
Texas Commission on Next Generation of Assessments and Accountability (TCNGAA): Legislative Summary Report on Accountability Recommendations
Summary of TCNGAA Recommendations

1. Implement an individualized, integrated system of Texas designed state assessments using computerized-adaptive testing and instruction aligned with the state’s curriculum framework.

2. Allow the commissioner of education to approve locally developed writing assessments.

3. Support the continued streamlining of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

4. Limit state testing to the readiness standards.

5. Add college-readiness assessments to the indicators of the state’s accountability system in Domain IV (Postsecondary Readiness) indicators and recommend appropriate available funding for a broader administration of college-readiness tests.
Summary of TCNGAA Recommendations

6. Align the state accountability system with ESSA requirements.

7. Eliminate Domain IV from state accountability calculations for elementary schools.

8. Place greater emphasis on student growth in Domains I–III in the state accountability system.

9. Retain the individual graduation committee option for graduation as allowed under TEC, §28.0258.
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