

Performance-Based Monitoring: System Evolution

Overview

The move from a cyclical, onsite, non-integrated resource-intensive monitoring system to an overall state evaluation system that is integrated, data-driven, and resource-efficient (with very few onsite visits) will take time and will require implementation in stages.

Performance-based monitoring is one component of the state evaluation system. The other components are: the state accountability system, the federal accountability provisions under the No Child Left Behind Act (i.e., AYP), the School FIRST rating system, fiscal and program compliance monitoring, and other financial audits.

Performance-based monitoring includes two strands: student performance analyses and data integrity analyses. Currently, these two strands are parallel but not integrated. We are planning to begin integration in 2004-05 so that there will eventually be one set of core indicators of program effectiveness.

Student performance-analyses will be conducted for the following program areas:

- bilingual education;
- special education;
- career and technology education;
- Title I, Part A (economically disadvantaged);
- Title I, Part C (migrant education);
- Title II (highly qualified);
- Title III (limited English proficient students); and
- Title IV, Part A (safe and drug-free schools)

Data integrity analyses include:

- annual audit of dropout records (leavers);
- excessive numbers of absences on state assessment*;
- excessive numbers of allowable exemptions from state assessment*;
- extraordinary numbers of placements in DAEPs;
- excessive numbers of students in special education programs assessed through assessment instruments developed or adopted under Section 39.023(b) [SDAA];
- identification of inaccurate disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP) data or failure to comply with DAEP program requirements

* = Proposed for integration into core indicator set for 2004-05

What is Expected to Remain the Same

We expect that the program areas indicated above will continue to be the ones for which analyses are conducted.

We expect that the approach taken this year in terms of a collaborative development effort between agency program area staff and technical staff will continue.

We expect that the effort to coordinate with other agency divisions conducting monitoring activities will not only continue but be enhanced to prevent districts from receiving a fragmented monitoring message.

Planning for the Future: 2005 and Beyond

1. Longitudinal measures of growth and changes from year to year are a key priority for the program areas represented above. These longitudinal measures, however, require time to develop and more than one year of data to analyze. As such, the proposed indicators for 2004-05 contain very limited longitudinal analyses. These types of growth measures, particularly for analyzing the performance of students with limited English proficiency, will be a key focus for 2005 and beyond.
2. In the case of certain student groups represented in performance-based monitoring, it is more difficult to capture “success.” It certainly involves a greater complexity of development and analysis to do this effectively. Students served by special education and students with limited English proficiency are the two most evident examples of this difficulty because once the student is exited/dismissed from these programs, our current data collection structure no longer captures the student’s performance as a student served by special education or a student with limited English proficiency. Unlike ethnicity, a student’s special education and/or limited English proficiency status can change. There is, consequently, a great deal of interest in “cohort analysis” so that evaluations can be made of students who were formerly served by bilingual education or special education to determine the impact of these programs on students’ subsequent performance.
3. When analyzing performance data for student groups, the issue of small numbers can be a challenge. The more the analysis attempts to “tool down” within a student group (LEP students within the career and technology education group, for example), the greater potential impact there is in terms of feasibility for indicator development. We will continue to explore options for small numbers analyses.
4. All of the performance-based monitoring indicators and analyses will need to be examined in light of other changes in the system as a whole. The new state accountability system will be released in the late fall of 2004. A second version of the State Developed Alternate Assessment (SDAA II) is currently under development and will have an impact on performance-based monitoring indicator development.

Interpretations of the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act may have some bearing on the SDAA assessment model itself. The federal Perkins Act, which provides funding for career and technology education, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, are currently undergoing reauthorization. The final re-authorized versions of these pieces of legislation will have an impact on performance-based monitoring indicator development. The Reading Proficiency Test in English (RPTE) continues to undergo redevelopment/expansion in response to the federal No Child Left Behind Act. Changes to the RPTE will have an impact on performance-based monitoring indicator development. The PBM Division itself does not create or collect any of the data it uses to perform its analyses: the division is a user of existing data. As such, any changes to the agency's data collection processes or the data collection processes of individual program areas will also have an impact on our work. Finally, the Texas legislature is scheduled to begin a new legislative session in January 2005. Any legislative changes that come out of that session or any future special sessions may have an impact on performance-based monitoring.

5. In addition to adding new indicators in the area of longitudinal analyses, the evolution of the performance-based monitoring system is also likely to include the revision of existing indicators as needed and the deletion of indicators that may no longer be necessary. The development of a performance-based monitoring system is a dynamic and multi-year process.