

Guidance for Districts Using the TX-KEA Assessment

As the Student Growth Measure for Kindergarten Teachers in Their Teacher Incentive Allotment Local Designation System

TX-KEA provides assessment benchmarks for each of the three waves of the test that specify the minimum score required for students across three different proficiency levels: In Need of Support, In Need of Monitoring, and On Track. For example, districts could use the assessment benchmark scores from Wave 1 to set expected growth targets locally for where they expect students to be by the end of Wave 3 and then use the Wave 3 score to determine whether students met their expected growth or not. There are several subtests that comprise TX-KEA and it is up to districts to decide which subtests they want to include as part of their growth measure for kindergarten teachers.

Review the [TX-KEA Assessment Benchmarks](#).

Districts will need to decide which subtests that make up TX-KEA they want to use, if not all of them. While it is not required to use all the possible subtests, best practice is to use at least three or more subtests.

SAMPLE METHODS DISTRICTS COULD USE TO SET EXPECTED GROWTH TARGETS LOCALLY*

**These are possible methods a district could choose to use, not a list of pre-approved required methods.*

Note: For some districts, deciding to use the nationally normed point gains from Wave 1 to Wave 3 on the TX-KEA test, results may yield overall student growth that is much higher than other assessments the district may be using, and that is not in alignment with the Teacher Incentive Allotment Statewide Performance Standards for student growth. In this case, districts might consider adjusting the required point gained needed within their local district context to yield student growth rates that are not inflated. This is a local decision.

Note: because the Wave 3 tests are significantly more complicated than the Wave 1 tests, the minimum score required to be “On Track” for the Wave 3 tests is lower than the minimum score for the Wave 1 tests in many cases.

Method A: Moving up a band, or remaining On Track

Districts could choose to define meeting expected growth targets as moving from a lower band to a higher band at the end of the year. For example, a student who was “Needs Support” at

Wave 1 but ended in Wave 3 at “Needs Monitoring” would have moved up one band of growth,

meeting expected growth targets. Similarly, a student who started the year at the “Needs Monitoring” level and ended the Year “On Track” would be considered to have met expected growth. Finally, in this method, a student who started the year On Track, and ended the year On Track could be considered to have met expected growth if the score that represents On Track at the end of Wave 3 represents growth compared to the On Track score at Wave 1. See the chart below.

Letter Names Subtest	
Wave 1 On Track (English)	7
Wave 3 On Track (English)	11

In this method, students would be considered to have met expected growth if they a) moved up a performance band or b) ended Wave 3 at or above the On Track cut point.

Method B: Create a composite score of the three subtests that make up the literacy screener (Vocabulary, Letter Names, Spelling) at the beginning of the year, and compare to end of year scores on these same three subtests

The literacy screener at the beginning of the year is comprised of three subtests: Vocabulary, Letter Names, and Spelling. Districts could average students’ scores on these three subtests to come up with a composite score for the beginning of the year literacy. Then at the end of the year, districts could give these same three subtests and calculate an end of year composite score. The district could calculate the average growth of all their students who took the TX-KEA when comparing their beginning of year (BOY) composite score to their end of year (EOY) composite score. Any student who met the district’s average growth from BOY to EOY would be considered to have met their expected growth target.

Example:

Texas Sage ISD

Average district BOY composite literacy score	Average district EOY composite literacy score	Average growth points for Texas Sage ISD
15	30	15 points

Student	Actual BOY literacy composite score	Targeted EOY Score (actual score +15 points)	Actual EOY literacy composite score	Met Growth
A	14	29	27	No
B	12	27	27	Yes
C	21	38	40	Yes
D	21	38	36	No
E	9	24	25	Yes

Note: this method also is referred to as the Flat Rate growth model. In this example there is a required “flat rate” of 15 points required, regardless of starting point, for students to be considered to have met their growth targets.

Reports

Individual Student Level Summary Reports are available. They can be viewed by wave(s) to compare data and analyze challenges for proficiency and growth needs. More information can be found at [TX KEA User Guide](#).

Viewing reports can provide evidence of students’ learning for teachers to adjust ongoing instruction. [CLI Engage data reporting](#) features provide snapshots of student skill levels at the individual, group, class, school, and district levels.

These reports use clear visual indicators to flag students who fall below established benchmarks.

- The **Completion Report** tracks completion of selected assessments.
- The **Growth Report** allows users to view their student’s growth over time.
- The **Summary Reports** allows users to view student performance across all domains.
- The **Parent Report** informs families of assessment results and connects them to activities that enable them to support their children at home.
- The **Group Report** groups students with scores below age-related benchmarks and recommends interventions and provides lesson plans for further skill development.