

The State of Texas embarked on a major change to the state accountability system in 2017 as a result of HB 22, offering the perfect opportunity to satisfy a goal long held by both legislators and educators alike - to create a single system that would meet the state's educational standards as well as those required by the U.S. Department of Education outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act.

However, the ESSA plan deadline of September 18, 2017 created both an opportunity, as well as a problem, in that it afforded Texas the opportunity to combine the two systems, but created a short timeline to develop an integrated system, given that the details of HB 22 were not signed into law until June of 2017. TEA submitted the State of Texas ESSA plan on September 25, 2017 and feedback from the USDE and other peer reviewers was received on December 21, 2017; and a revised ESSA plan was submitted to USDE on January 8, 2018. Since that time TEA and the USDE have been in ongoing conversations to answer questions and revise specific provisions. TEA submitted the final ESSA state plan to USDE on Tuesday, March 6.

Specific highlights of the final consolidated state plan (as per the March 7 press release) include:

- Maintaining rigorous, yet achievable goals for all student groups
- Creating stronger alignment between all state and federal program areas;
- Shifting the proficiency level for students from the "Approaches" label on State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) to the "Meets" label; and
- Better aligning of federal funding with priorities within TEA's strategic plan.

As a reminder, the indicators in the ESSA plan are as follows:

- Academic Achievement in Reading and Mathematics
- Growth in Reading and Mathematics (Elementary and Middle Schools)
- Graduation Rates (High Schools, K-12)
- English Language Proficiency
- School Quality or Student Success
 - Domain 1 Performance (Elementary and Middle Schools)
 - College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance (High Schools, K-12)

The table on the following pages is a summary of the various revisions made to the final State of Texas ESSA plan that was submitted to U.S. Education Secretary DeVos on March 6. There is no announced timeframe for a final decision by the Secretary.

WHAT'S OUT? of the September 2017 plan	WHAT'S IN? the January 2018 plan	WHAT'S FINAL? in the March 2018 plan
Grade Level Proficiency defined as Approaches Grade Level	Grade Level Proficiency defined as Meets Grade Level	Grade Level Proficiency defined as Meets Grade Level
Academic Achievement Indicator: Includes STAAR Reading, Math, Writing, Science and Social Studies	Academic Achievement Indicator: Includes STAAR Reading and Math Only	Academic Achievement Indicator: Includes STAAR Reading and Math Only
School Quality / Student Success Indicator: Includes STAAR Reading and Math only at Meets Grade Level	School Quality / Student Success Indicator: Student Achievement Domain STAAR component (includes R, M, Wr, Sci, SS at Approaches, Meets, and Masters Grade Level)	School Quality / Student Success Indicator: Student Achievement Domain STAAR component (includes R, M, Wr, Sci, SS at Approaches, Meets, and Masters Grade Level)
Identical interim and long-term goals for all student groups	Long-term goals for each student group that represent a 30 percent growth over baseline scores from the 2016-17 school year (see Appendix A for specific student group targets)	<p>Long-term goals: <i>“TEA’s goal is to have all students increase 50 percent to at least 60 in the Meets performance level by 2032, thereby closing the gap for all student groups to meet the 60x30 plan adopted by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.” pg. 16</i></p> <p>Long term goal for Academic Achievement: <i>“The long term (15 year) goal for the Academic Achievement reading and mathematics indicators is a 50 percent reduction in the gap between the baseline values for 2017 and 100 percent proficiency. For example, the All Students baseline for reading is 44 percent at the meets grade level standard. There is a gap of 56 between 44 and 100. Half of that gap is 28 percentage points. Adding 44 and 28 gives you a 15-year 50 percent growth target of 72.” pg. 16. See Appendix A for NEW student group targets.</i></p> <p>Long term goal for Graduation Rates: <i>“The long term statewide goal for the four-year graduation rate is 94 percent. Student groups that are at or above interim or long-term targets will be required to exceed that rate in the following year(s).” pg. 17. See Appendix A for student group targets.</i> NOTE: five- and six-year graduation rates and targets have been removed from the final ESSA plan.</p>

WHAT'S OUT? of the September 2017 plan	WHAT'S IN? the January 2018 plan	WHAT'S FINAL? in the March 2018 plan
		<p>Long term goals for Growth in Reading and Mathematics, CCMRs, and Domain I Performance: For each student group it represents 30 percentage point growth over baseline scores from the 2016-17 school year. See Appendix A for specific student group targets.</p>
<p>Test participation rates included on the Closing the Gaps Domain report. Campuses that do not meet the 95 percent rate will address participation rates in the Campus needs assessment.</p>	<p>If test participation rates for the all students group or any student group fall below 95 percent, the denominator used for calculating academic achievement will be adjusted to include the necessary students to meet the 95 percent threshold. (i.e. artificial failers if test participation rates drop below 95%.)</p>	<p>The methodology for test participation rates are clarified in the Academic Achievement Indicator section on page 20:</p> <p><i>“Academic Achievement outcomes on STAAR grades 3-8 and EOC assessments in ELA/reading and mathematics. Calculations for academic achievement (proficiency) are based on scored tests (i.e., the denominator is scored tests only and does not include tests scored as “absent” or “other”).</i></p> <p><i>Participation is determined using a separate calculation of scored tests over all submitted test answer documents (i.e., scored, absent, and other). The numerator from the participation calculation is the denominator for the academic achievement (proficiency) rate calculation. Should the participation level for the all student groups or any student group fall below 95 percent, the denominator used for calculating academic achievement (proficiency) will be adjusted to include the necessary students to meet the 95 percent threshold.”</i></p>
<p>8th grade Math Exception: The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment</p>	<p>8th grade Math Exception: The State will require students who take Algebra I in middle school to also take SAT, ACT or TSIA in high school so that their results can be used in the accountability system</p>	<p>8th grade Math Exception: The State will require students who take Algebra I in middle school to also take SAT or ACT in high school so that their results can be used in the accountability system (pg. 7)</p>
<p>English Language Proficiency (ELP): EL Performance Measure</p>	<p>English Language Proficiency (ELP): EL Progress Measure</p>	<p>English Language Proficiency (ELP): EL Progress Measure</p>

WHAT'S OUT? of the September 2017 plan	WHAT'S IN? the January 2018 plan	WHAT'S FINAL? in the March 2018 plan																					
<p>Overall A-F Grade Calculation for Campuses and Districts: Not specified</p>	<p>Overall A-F Grade Calculation for Campuses and Districts Clarified: The overall campus/district A-F grade is weighted by taking the better score of the Student Achievement domain or School Progress domain, which will account for 70 percent of the overall rating. The additional 30 percent will be comprised from the Closing the Gaps domain.</p>	<p>The NEW methodology for the Closing the Gaps A-F Grade Determination is found on pages 24-25.</p> <p><i>"The campus A-F grade for Closing the Gaps is determined using weighting for indicators as described below.</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1094 423 1766 881"> <thead> <tr> <th>Campus Type</th> <th>Indicator</th> <th>Weight</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="4">Elementary and Middle Schools</td> <td>Academic Achievement</td> <td>40 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Growth</td> <td>40 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Learner Language Proficiency</td> <td>10 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Student Achievement Domain Score</td> <td>10 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">High Schools and K12</td> <td>Academic Achievement</td> <td>50 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4-Year Graduation Rate</td> <td>10 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Learner Language Proficiency</td> <td>10 percent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>College, Career, and Military Readiness</td> <td>30 percent</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>If a campus is missing an indicator, the missing indicator weight will be distributed evenly among the remaining indicators. For example, if an elementary campus has no growth, the weight will be equally added to academic achievement, English learner language proficiency, and Student Achievement domain indicators.</i></p> <p><i>The Closing the Gaps score will be computed based on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a weighted average of the indicators computed from the number of items meeting targets divided by the number of items evaluated</i> <i>the weighted average will be scaled to grades A (90-100), B (80-89), C (70-79), D (60-69), and F (0-60) by creating grade cut points based on 2017 data and using an approximate distribution of 10% A's, 20% B's, 40% C's, 20% D's, and 10% F's.</i> <i>the scaled score will be used to determine the comprehensive schools (lowest 5%) a rank ordering method based on the Closing the Gaps domain score of campuses as outlined in Section (v). The Agency will identify at least the lowest five percent scoring</i> 	Campus Type	Indicator	Weight	Elementary and Middle Schools	Academic Achievement	40 percent	Growth	40 percent	English Learner Language Proficiency	10 percent	Student Achievement Domain Score	10 percent	High Schools and K12	Academic Achievement	50 percent	4-Year Graduation Rate	10 percent	English Learner Language Proficiency	10 percent	College, Career, and Military Readiness	30 percent
Campus Type	Indicator	Weight																					
Elementary and Middle Schools	Academic Achievement	40 percent																					
	Growth	40 percent																					
	English Learner Language Proficiency	10 percent																					
	Student Achievement Domain Score	10 percent																					
High Schools and K12	Academic Achievement	50 percent																					
	4-Year Graduation Rate	10 percent																					
	English Learner Language Proficiency	10 percent																					
	College, Career, and Military Readiness	30 percent																					

WHAT’S OUT? of the September 2017 plan	WHAT’S IN? the January 2018 plan	WHAT’S FINAL? in the March 2018 plan
		campuses that receive Title I, Part A funds for comprehensive support.”
<p>Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement: [Title I] “Campuses that do not rank in the bottom five percent for two consecutive years will be considered as successfully exited.” pg. 28</p>	<p>Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement: [Title I] “Campuses that do not rank in the bottom five percent for two consecutive years and have a “C” letter grade or better in the Closing the Gaps Domain...will be considered as successfully exited.” pg. 29</p>	<p>Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement: [Title I] “Campuses that do not rank in the bottom five percent of the Closing the Gaps domain for two consecutive years and have increased a letter grade (for example, from F to D or from D to C) on the Closing the Gaps domain will be considered as having successfully exited comprehensive support status.” pg. 27</p>
<p>Additional Targeted Support and Improvement Schools: Any campus that is not identified for comprehensive or targeted support, and receives an “F” rating in the Closing the Gaps domain will be identified for additional targeted support.</p> <p>Exit Criteria for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement Schools: “Targeted support campuses will exit when they no longer meet identification criteria in the Closing the Gaps domain. Campuses are expected to exit within three years.” pg. 28</p>	<p>Additional Targeted Support and Improvement Schools: Any campus that is not identified for comprehensive or targeted support will be identified for additional targeted support if any individual student group misses all indicators in the Closing the Gaps Domain.</p> <p>Exit Criteria for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement Schools: “Campuses will exit additional targeted support when the identified student group meets at least 50 percent of the indicators in the Closing the Gaps domain within three years.” pg. 29</p>	<p>Additional Targeted Support and Improvement Schools: “Any campus that is not identified for comprehensive or targeted support will be identified for additional targeted support based on the weighting outlined on page 27, is at or below the percentage for comprehensive support campuses in that rating year. For example, if the cut point for a campus to be identified for comprehensive support is 25 percent, then any campus with a student group that has an overall percentage of 25 percent or less will be identified for additional targeted support. Identification will begin with the August 2018 school ratings and will occur on an annual basis.” pg. 26</p> <p>Exit Criteria for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement Schools: “To exit additional targeted support status, a student group must meet at least 50 percent of the indicators evaluated and meet the targets for the Academic Achievement indicator in both reading and mathematics.” pg. 28</p>
<p>Required Improvement Measure: Safe Harbor – All students or any student group that fails to meet the ESSA indicator target for a specific</p>	<p>Required Improvement Measure: N/A</p>	<p>Required Improvement Measure: N/A</p>

WHAT'S OUT? of the September 2017 plan	WHAT'S IN? the January 2018 plan	WHAT'S FINAL? in the March 2018 plan
measure will be afforded Safe Harbor via a required improvement measure.		

Regarding minimum number of students (N-size): *“Results for accountability purposes will be reported for any student group that meets accountability minimum size criteria of 25 tests (for assessment related indicators) or 25 students (for graduation and non-assessment related indicators).*

To ensure that campuses and districts with a very small number of students or assessments are still evaluated for accountability purposes, the All Students group minimum size criteria is reduced to at least 10 assessments (for assessment related indicators) or 10 students (for graduation and non-assessment related indicators). Small numbers analyses are conducted when there are fewer than 10 test results or 10 students results. A three-year uniform average is computed based on the current year, prior year, and prior-prior year results. If there are 10 or more test results or students available when all three years are combined, then the three-year uniform average is used to evaluate the All Students group.” Pg. 10

Subscribers are also encouraged to review TEA’s final plan for additional ESSA plan revisions regarding Resource Allocation Reviews and Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators; and to review Appendix H which outlines the *“implementation of the State’s standardized procedure for EL identification/program entry/program exit, in accordance with the ESSA State Plan.”*