The Implementation of House Bill 22

Collaborating to Build a Better Accountability System
House Bill 22, 85th Texas Legislature

“The commissioner shall evaluate school district and campus performance and assign each district and campus an overall performance rating of”

A – F Accountability: Legislative Context

A B C D or F
House Bill 22, 85th Texas Legislature

“The commissioner shall solicit input statewide from persons . . . , including school district boards of trustees, administrators and teachers employed by school districts, parents of students enrolled in school districts, and other interested stakeholders.”

Feedback Opportunities
- Will solicit input on the aspects over which commissioner has authority
- Won’t solicit input on aspects that are required by statute
Three Domains: Combining to Calculate Overall Score

Best of Achievement or Progress

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps

Minimum 30%

Feedback Opportunities

- Certain methodology decisions in each domain
- Cut points for each grade in each domain
- Weight (30% or more) to Closing the Gaps Domain
“The commissioner shall ensure that the method used to evaluate performance is implemented in a manner that provides the mathematical possibility that all districts and campuses receive an A rating.”

We WANT stability in the model; we do not want the bar to keep changing. We want to commit to something so the bar will remain static for five years, so the rules don’t change.

Design Approach: Philosophical Commitments

No forced distribution

Law switched from annually to periodically
A–F Accountability: New Labels/Grades

A = Exemplary Performance

B = Recognized Performance

C = Acceptable Performance

D = In Need of Improvement

F = Unacceptable Performance
Student Achievement: Performance

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25–34 will have a certificate or degree.

**Student Achievement: Calculating Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tests</strong></td>
<td>3,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Approaches Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>2,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Meets Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Masters Grade Level</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Approaches Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meets Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Masters Grade Level</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of 3:

\[
\frac{92.7 + 60.6 + 27.3}{3} = 60.2
\]

Student Achievement Score: A
Student Achievement: Calculating Score

- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School

- College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
- Graduation Rates

Feedback Opportunity
Weighting of three high school components
Student Achievement: CCMR Indicators for HS

**College Ready**
- Meet criteria on AP/IB exams
- Meet TSI criteria (SAT/ACT/TSIA) in reading and mathematics
- Complete a college prep course offered by a partnership between a district and higher education institution as required from HB5
- Complete a course for dual credit
- Complete an OnRamps course
- Earn an associate’s degree
- Meet standards on a composite of indicators indicating college readiness

**Career Ready**
- Earn industry certification
- Be admitted to post-secondary industry certification program

**Military Ready**
Enlist in the United States Armed Forces
School Progress: Growth

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
School Progress: Two Aspects to Progress

Student Growth

Relative Performance

Feedback Opportunities
- Better of the two
- Average of the two
- Greater weight for one of them
**Student Growth: Measuring Advancement**

**Feedback Opportunity**
What percent of students should meet growth target to get an A?
Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

A campus with fewer economically disadvantaged students on average has higher levels of student achievement.

A campus with more economically disadvantaged students tends to have lower levels of student achievement.
Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

Higher Levels of Student Achievement

Student Achievement Domain Score for All Students

% Economically Disadvantaged Students

Higher Rates of Economically Disadvantaged
Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educational Equity

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educational Equity

All Students

- Race/Ethnicity
- Special Education
- Continuously Enrolled and Mobile
- English Learners (ELs)
- Economically Disadvantaged
Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educational Equity

**Student Groups**

- All Students
- African American
- Hispanic
- White
- American Indian
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Two or More Races
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Current and Former Special Education
- Current and Monitored English Learners
- Continuously Enrolled/Non-Continuously Enrolled

**Indicators**

- Academic Achievement in Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science and Social Studies
- Growth in Reading and Mathematics (Elementary and Middle Schools)
- Graduation Rates
- English Learner Language Proficiency Status
- College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance
- At or Above Meets Grade Level Performance in Reading and Mathematics
Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educational Equity

Student Group | Achievement Target
---|---
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

% of Subgroups that meet target

Overall Grade
Local Accountability Plan

Local Accountability

- Example
  - Extra-Curricular Activities
- Example
  - Local Assessments

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
Local Accountability Plan: Purpose and Requirements

**Purpose**
To allow districts (at their option) to rate campuses using locally developed domains and accountability measures

**Requirements for Districts**
- Local plans must include the TEA-assigned three domain performance ratings (at least 50% of the overall rating).
- Locally developed domain and measures must provide for the assignment of A–F grades, and be reliable and valid.

**More Requirements for Districts**
- Auditable Calculations
- Campus score card that can be displayed on TEA’s website
- Publicly available explanation of the methodology used to assign ratings
- Plans submitted to TEA for approval

**Feedback Opportunity**
Volunteer to participate in the pilot program.
Local Accountability Plan: Getting the Plan Approved

Authority
The commissioner has authority to develop the process to approve requests to assign campus performance ratings.

Requirements for Approval
• The agency determines whether the plan meets the minimum requirements.
• An audit conducted by the agency verifies calculations included in the plan.
• A review panel approves the plan.

One Condition
A locally developed accountability system can only be used for campuses not assigned an overall rating of D or F by TEA.

Feedback Opportunity
Volunteer to participate in the pilot program.
New Indicator: Extracurricular/Cocurricular

Feasibility Study

• Determine the feasibility of incorporating indicators that account for extracurricular and cocurricular student activity.
• The commissioner may establish an advisory committee.

Report

A report to the legislature on the feasibility of these indicators is due by December 1, 2022, unless a similar indicator is adopted prior to December 1, 2022.

Feedback Opportunities

• Make suggestions for extracurricular or cocurricular Indicator
• Volunteer to serve on a committee
HB 22 Passed by the 85th Texas Legislature (May 2017)

Rules adopted for local accountability system and application window opens (Fall 2018)

Rules finalized for three domain system (Spring 2018)

Three domain system rates all campuses and districts. Takes effect as follows:

- **Districts:** A–F Rating Labels
- **Campuses:** Improvement Required or Met Standard (August 2018)

Takes effect as follows:

- **Districts:** A–F Rating Labels
- **Campuses:** Improvement Required or Met Standard (August 2018)

"What If" report on campus performance, based on data used to assign 2018 ratings. (January 2019)

Campuses: A–F labels take effect and local accountability system is incorporated (August 2019)

Task Force launches on how to incorporate extracurricular activities (Winter 2017)

Start of pilot group to design local accountability (Fall 2017)

A–F Timeline: Implementation of HB 22
## A–F Timeline: Domain Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Timeline</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aug.–December 2017</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholder feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATAC and APAC monthly subcommittee meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Sessions with ESC: HB 22 Overview and Student Achievement Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Sessions with ESC: School Progress Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Sessions with ESC: Closing the Gaps Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 18–19, ATAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 11–12, APAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November, ATAC meeting (final recommendations for 2018 A–F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December, APAC meeting (final recommendations for 2018 A–F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January–April 2018</strong></td>
<td>Continued stakeholder feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner final 2018 A–F decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May–June 2018</strong></td>
<td>2018 A–F accountability manual creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public comment on A–F accountability manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018 A–F Manual adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# A–F Timeline: Local Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Timeline</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aug.–December 2017</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholder feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATAC and APAC monthly subcommittee meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 18–19, ATAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 11–12, APAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launch of Local Accountability System Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November, ATAC meeting (final recommendations for 2018 A–F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December, APAC meeting (final recommendations for 2018 A–F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January–April 2018</strong></td>
<td>Continued stakeholder feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner final 2018 A–F decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing Local Accountability System Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May–June 2018</strong></td>
<td>2018 A–F manual creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public comment on A–F manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018 A–F manual adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing Local Accountability System Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2018–April 2019</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing Local Accountability System Pilot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
End of A-F Overview
Student Achievement

Student Achievement

School Progress

Closing The Gaps
Domain Indicators

Elementary School

Middle School

High School

- College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
- Graduation Rates
# Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25–34 will have a certificate or degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAAR Component</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Tests</td>
<td>3,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Approaches Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>2,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Meets Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Masters Grade Level</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Approaches Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meets Grade Level or Above</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Masters Grade Level</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of 
\[ \frac{92.7 + 60.6 + 27.3}{3} = 60.2 \]
STAAR Component

- All tests (STAAR with and without accommodations and STAAR Alternate 2) combined
- All subjects combined
- ELs (except in their first year in US schools)
- Specific EL performance measures for year two in US schools only

- Three Performance Levels
  - Approaches Grade Level and Meets Grade Level are required by HB 22.
  - Masters Grade Level standard encourages districts and campuses to push high performing students to excel more.
  - The average of three levels is very close to the percentage of students who achieve the Meets Grade Level standard.
  - Meets Grade Level equates to a 60% chance of completing one year of college without remediation. Masters equates to a 75% chance.
This scatterplot shows the correlation (.982) between Domain I score (average of three PLDs) and the percentage of tests (by campus) that achieve the Meets Grade Level standard.

- The y-axis is the Domain I score; the x-axis is the percentage of tests at the Meets Grade Level standard.
- Each dot represents one campus.
- Dots are colored by campus type.
STAAR Component: High Schools/Districts

- College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
- Graduation Rates
CCMR Indicators

College Ready

- Meet criteria on applicable AP/IB exams
  - 3 on AP exam
  - 4 on IB exam
- Meet TSI criteria
  - Both reading and mathematics
  - SAT, ACT, or TSIA
- Complete a college prep course offered by a partnership between a district and higher education institution as required from HB5

- Successfully complete a course for dual credit
- Successfully complete an OnRamps course (beginning in school year 2018-19)
- Earn an associate’s degree (beginning in school year 2017–18)
- Meet standards on a composite of indicators indicating college readiness (beginning TBD)
CCMR Indicators

**Career Ready**

- Earn industry certification (list released August 21, 2017)
- Be admitted to post-secondary industry certification program (beginning TBD)

**Military Ready**

Enlist in the United States Armed Forces

**Computational Logic**

- Denominator is annual graduates.
- Student who accomplishes any one is in numerator.
- All CCMR indicators lag by one year. (CCMR data used in 2017–18 accountability will be from the 2016–17 school year.)
Calculating the Score: Current Model

- Elementary School
  - STAAR
  - College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
  - Graduation Rates
  - 100% of domain score

- Middle School
  - STAAR
  - College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
  - Graduation Rates
  - 100% of domain score
Calculating the Score: Current Model

Elementary School

Middle School

High School

• STAAR = 45% of domain score
• CCMR = 45% of domain score
• Graduation Rates = 10% of domain score

All three components available
Calculating the Score: Current Model

- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School

- STAAR = 50% of domain score
- CCMR = 50% of domain score

Only STAAR and CCMR available
Calculating the Score: Current Model

- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School

Only STAAR and graduation rates available

- = 100% of domain score
- Graduation Rates
Calculating the Score: Stakeholder Input

Elementary School

Middle School

High School

- STAAR = 100% of domain score
- STAAR = 100% of domain score
- STAAR = ?% of domain score
- CCMR = ?% of domain score
- Graduation Rates = ?% of domain score

Different weights or logic?
Q: In the Student Achievement domain, to earn credit for TSI, must a student pass both mathematics and reading or pass either mathematics or reading?
A: Both reading and mathematics

Q: Will state exclusions be used for graduation rates?
A: Yes, graduation rates (with exclusions) will be used in the Student Achievement domain.

Q: Will the ELL progress measure be in the Student Achievement domain?
A: No.

Q: Will there be a new ELL progress measure?
A: No, an EL-specific performance measure will be developed for ELs in year two in US schools.

Q: In 2018 when districts receive A–F ratings and campuses receive Met Standard or Improvement Required ratings, will campuses be evaluated using the three domains or the current indices?
A: Campuses will be evaluated using the same three domains that will be used to evaluate districts.

Q: Will campuses receive Met Standard or Improvement Required ratings for each domain and overall?
A: Yes.
Common Questions: Student Achievement Domain

Q: Is TEA planning to release another “What if” report in January 2018?
A: No.

Q: Are graduation plan rates included in the Student Achievement domain?
A: No, but they will continue to be used to award postsecondary-readiness distinction designations.

Q: If a student meets any one of the CCMR indicators, are they considered college ready?
A: Yes.

Q: Can a student meet TSIA on STAAR?
A: No, STAAR does not have a TSIA threshold.

Q: For the TSIA indicator, must a student meet the criteria in reading and mathematics on the same test?
A: No, a student can meet the reading criterion on one text and the criterion for mathematics on a different test.

Q: Do you anticipate changes in how SSI and EOC re-testers are included in accountability?
A: No.

Q: Will a grade of D invoke interventions?
A: Yes. For information, please contact the Division of School Improvement and Support (512) 463-7582.
Questions and Feedback

Feedback

• https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/D7GQ68N
• feedbackAF@tea.texas.gov

Resources

• http://tea.texas.gov/A-F
• http://tea.texas.gov/accountability
• performance.reporting@tea.texas.gov
• (512) 463-9704