

Texas Through-Year Assessment Pilot (TTAP)
Year 2 Pilot Addendum
2023–2024 School Year

Published December 1, 2024

Executive Summary

- This is an addendum to the Texas Through-year Assessment Pilot (TTAP) report published August 2024. As part of House Bill 3906, during the 86th Legislature in 2019, TTAP was created and the first year of the pilot was the 2022-23 school year. The implementation plan for TTAP included the 2023-24 school year, as well as this current school year and the 2025-26 school year with reports back to the Legislature at the end of every even-numbered year. For more details on the pilot context and design, visit <https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/assessment-initiatives/texas-through-year-assessment-pilot>.
- The four test titles offered in the 2022–23 school year were the same offered in 2023–24: grade 6 math, grade 7 math, grade 5 science, and grade 8 social studies. Over 50,000 students participated in the pilot across 93 local education agencies (LEAs).
- For the first time, an efficacy study was performed as a preliminary analysis on the assessment pilot’s impact on student end-of-year performance. In Grade 7 mathematics and grade 5 science, there was no statistically significant difference in performance for students who participated in TTAP and those who did not. In Grade 6 math and Grade 8 social studies, participants in TTAP showed a small, statistically significant improvement in their performance. These initial findings are in line with academic research that points to positive effects of interim assessment products on student outcomes. It is difficult to know the potential impact of tying these assessments to summative scores, as participating LEAs are using these assessments for internal progress-monitoring rather than summative purposes.
- In the 2024–25 and 2025–26 pilot years, TEA plans to:
 1. expand test titles to include grade 3 students and the reading language arts (RLA) content area, in order to evaluate operational and assessment policy implications across all grades and content areas. It is important to note that, due to field testing constraints, Spanish RLA titles cannot adopt a through-year model and would therefore not be part of this pilot.
 2. continue exploring the feasibility of using a cumulative scoring model, which uses scores from all three testing opportunities to inform final scores. The current analyses remain inconclusive regarding the integration of scores from all three testing opportunities.
 3. request considerable stakeholder input to draft proposed policies to support operational implementation of TTAP (e.g., missing scores).
- Beyond pilot years, TEA may need additional time to solidify its conclusions should additional research needs surface.

For more technical detail on the pilot, see the [2023–24 TTAP Technical Report](#).

Year 2 TTAP Overview

Pilot Year 2 Logistics and Execution

In Year 2 of the pilot (2023–24 school year), 93 LEAs participated (see appendix). Seventy of these districts returned to the pilot after participating during the 2022–23 school year. The progress monitoring system incorporated three distinct, short testing opportunities during the fall (Opportunity 1), winter (Opportunity 2), and spring (Opportunity 3).

TEA offered the same four test titles in Year 2 that were offered the first year: grade 6 math, grade 7 math, grade 5 science, and grade 8 social studies; all administered online. The grade 5 science assessments included a Spanish version for eligible students. In Year 2, all assessments included content and language supports, but paper, braille, and American sign language versions of the assessments were not available. LEAs were advised to administer locally determined interim/benchmark assessment alternatives to students who require special versions of assessments. Opportunities 1 and 2 were designed to be completed in one sitting with a testing time (excluding setup) of approximately 40–75 minutes. Opportunity 3 was projected to take 80–120 minutes to complete. When scheduling, testing personnel also needed to consider the time needed to set up the testing environment and provide test instructions. In total, there were 53,122 students who were administered at least one TTAP assessment, and 44,940 students who partook in all three testing opportunities. The student sample collected was largely representative of the state population and was sufficient for data analyses purposes.

As in Year 1, teachers of record for pilot participants were required to complete four training modules focused on assessment literacy and the proper use of pilot data. These trainings were enhanced from Year 1 to Year 2 and offered both synchronously and asynchronously. The modules helped establish foundational best practices for assessment, which can be extended to other assessment programs outside of TTAP. In addition to the trainings, TEA expanded resources and support for pilot participants in 2023–24, including streamlined reports and administration instructions, plug-and-play resources for professional learning communities (PLCs), and the availability of office hours.

Pilot Year 2 Special Study Results

Seven special studies were conducted in Year 2 of the pilot contributing to ongoing refinements. A summary of the most relevant studies is below:

- **Comparability Study:** In comparing the psychometric properties of TTAP Opportunity 3 and STAAR®, the study affirms that both assessments provide comparable interpretations of on-grade level student ability when administered within the same testing window. TTAP Opportunity 3 demonstrated similar reliability and classification accuracy to STAAR, but with the added benefit of greater efficiency due to its shorter test length. After consultations with content specialists and other Texas educators, this finding is now being applied to the Science STAAR assessments in the 2024–25 school year, where a shorter test, without reporting categories, will be operationalized.
- **Efficacy Study:** An efficacy study was conducted to investigate whether student participation in TTAP impacted corresponding STAAR assessment performance. Preliminary

findings show mixed results. In Grade 7 mathematics and grade 5 science, there was no statistically significant difference in performance for students who participated in TTAP and those who did not. In Grade 6 math and Grade 8 social studies, participants in TTAP showed a small, statistically significant improvement in their performance. These findings suggest that the current pilot design, which includes required assessment literacy training for educators and assessments used by educators and LEAs for progress-monitoring, may contribute to stronger outcomes for students. These findings are in line with other academic research that points to positive effects of progress-monitoring interim assessments on student outcomes.¹ It is difficult to know the potential impact of tying these assessments to summative scores, as participating LEAs are using these assessments for internal progress-monitoring rather than summative purposes.

- **Cumulative Scoring Study:** A study investigating approaches for establishing a final summative score of record on TTAP was replicated with some updates, using 2023–24 data. This study is an extension of previous work on this topic (Gianopoulos et al., 2024) using data from Pilot Year 2 with method modifications based on feedback from the Texas Technical Advisory Committee. Eight various methods were evaluated across multiple measures, including stability of measures of student performance, accuracy of estimations to STAAR, psychometric soundness, and student motivational advantages. Linear composite models, maximum score, and help-not-hurt (HNH) methods each offer a mix of advantages and drawbacks, requiring policymakers to balance the risk of "gaming" the system with the benefit of allowing students multiple opportunities to impact their final score. Findings also showed that missing TTAP scores were not missing at random and were non-ignorable, as students with one or more missing TTAP score scored lower on STAAR. Additional considerations for further studies and discussion include a deep dive into demographic differences and missing score policy considerations.
- **Growth Model Study:** A study on growth models was performed, investigating the following models – simple, categorical, student growth percentiles, and multivariate. The literature review revealed that there is not a consensus among experts on which model best supports a high-quality standardized assessment program, and that growth measures are too unreliable to be used for individual student reporting. For continuity purposes of the pilot, TEA will continue using the gain score model, as it is most easily interpretable by the field and acknowledges within-year growth at the individual and aggregate levels.
- **Routing Study:** A series of research questions were investigated around the multi-stage adaptive model used by the TTAP assessments, including the impact of incorrect routing decisions on ability estimates. The study found that if routing errors occurred at stage 1, the student ability estimate was generally recovered in stage 2.

Pilot Year 2 Stakeholder Feedback

TEA gathered feedback from Year 2 participants, including teachers, administrators, and students, through surveys, advisory committee meetings, and LEA site visits. Teacher and administrator surveys (n=1,166, spring survey) showed satisfaction gains across all areas, including score reporting, administration, and training. Notably, teachers reported a 15+

¹ Konstantopoulos, Spyros, Wei Li, Shazia R. Miller, and Arie van der Ploeg. 2015. "Effects of Interim Assessments across the Achievement Distribution." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 76 (4): 587–608. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164415606498>.

percentage point increase in satisfaction regarding the accessibility, timeliness, and informativeness of score reports and gain scores. These improvements are likely due to enhanced communication and training on accessing data, as well as the return of districts from Year 1. Sixty-five percent of stakeholders (teachers, administrators, testing coordinators) felt that TTAP was a better alternative to STAAR, a 5-percentage point increase from Year 1. Sixty percent believed TTAP could replace long-term interim assessments (e.g., MAP Growth, STAAR Interim Assessments, district benchmarks). Students (n=26,128, spring survey) also showed increased confidence, with an 11-percentage point gain in their ability to answer test questions. Additionally, 57% of students felt more prepared for STAAR due to the three TTAP testing opportunities, and 73% preferred the TTAP model over STAAR. Grade 5 Science students reported the highest satisfaction, while Grade 8 Social Studies students reported lower satisfaction (a 7-percentage point difference on average).

District leaders and educators highlighted the value of tracking student-level growth throughout the year, noting it serves as a useful tool for discussions with students, parents, and educators. However, educators expressed concerns about the lack of item releases for the pilot and questioned the full scope model's effectiveness. These issues could be alleviated if the model were to replace STAAR, once a long-term budget is established and decisions are made about which content areas are best suited for a through-year summative model and how many items can be released after each administration. While feedback was largely positive, participants also raised challenges with regards to the logistics of replacing STAAR with a three-times-a-year assessment. Given the pilot nature, some concerns—such as the increased number of test administrations and security requirements—may not be fully understood until the model is implemented more broadly.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Year 2 of TTAP indicated mixed results on the performance impact for TTAP participants on STAAR compared to non-participants. Additionally, the viability of a mandatory through-year assessment that contributes to the final accountability score remains uncertain. Moreover, the administrative burden and impact on instructional time have recently increased. For the 2024–25 school year, TEA adjusted the pilot test structure from 20-20-30 questions to a uniform 30-30-30 format. This change follows the finding that shorter 20-question tests do not meet the reliability threshold to contribute to summative scores. TEA will need to assess the effects of this significant change, including its impact on administration and stakeholder satisfaction, as test lengths have increased by approximately 50% in the fall and winter.

As the 89th Texas Legislative Session approaches, several key insights from the TTAP program can inform the future of through-year assessments:

1. **Multistage Adaptive Design Updates:** TTAP's current multi-stage adaptive design, where the starting point of Opportunity 2 (winter) is informed by performance in Opportunity 1 (fall), also has the potential to be applied to an updated STAAR Interim Assessments model.
2. **Test Reliability for Opportunity 3:** TTAP's Opportunity 3 (spring) test is sufficient to serve as a standalone summative assessment. As a result, the Science TEKS (Texas

Essential Knowledge and Skills) implementation in the 2024–25 school year utilizes an abridged test length, similar to the TTAP Opportunity 3 test. This new model, which excludes reporting categories, also has the potential to be adopted through the alternative and abridged summative assessment path.

3. **Assessment Literacy Modules:** The 4 core modules on assessment literacy, developed for the TTAP pilot, along with supplementary materials, could be expanded to other Texas assessment programs, such as STAAR Interim Assessments. These modules were essential for effectively integrating through-year assessment data with other classroom data, given the unique information shared with stakeholders through the pilot.
4. **Cumulative Scoring Model Challenges:** The feasibility of creating a cumulative scoring model that uses scores from all three testing opportunities to inform a final score continues to be uncertain. The technical challenges of accounting for missing data, due to Texas' highly transient student population, pose significant barriers—such as students who either do not participate or participate under a different LEA. These challenges are compounded by differences in special population test formats (e.g., paper, Braille, and ASL versions), particularly when using a cumulative scoring model.
5. **Limitations to a three-times-a-year model:** As mentioned in the August 2024 report, through-year models are less efficient for end-of-course exams, as those corresponding courses can be completed within a single semester, and the need for re-testing overcomplicates the testing process and could overburden students needing to graduate. Therefore, a through-year model can only be applied to some general education 3-8 assessments. In preparing for the RLA pilot in 2024–25, the agency has identified a new constraint to administering Spanish RLA assessments – the number of available students for field testing is not robust enough to support the development of a three-times-a-year assessment model on an annual basis. Therefore, Spanish RLA will also not be part of the pilot. The agency is also working to measure and observe the utility of a TTAP model for science and social studies. Factors include the structure of the curriculum standards, potential for longitudinal data, potential for progression throughout the year, and overall testing burden.

TEA will continue to explore the model for the 2024–25 and 2025–26 school years. These years will feature updated test designs as well as the addition of grade 3 math and the incorporation of the RLA content area. With accumulated data spanning multiple years, TEA aims to assess the stability of findings longitudinally and explore the feasibility of generating a cumulative score that aligns with the pilot's objectives.

The alternative option to implementing through-year assessments through new, shorter summative assessments and pairing it with an updated interim assessment model is a finding from the pilot that we share here as a consideration for the legislature. More details can be found in the last report produced in August 2024.

For more information about TTAP, refer to the TTAP webpage at <https://tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/assessment-initiatives/texas-through-year-assessment-pilot>.

Appendix

2023–2024 TTAP Participating LEAs

A+ UNLIMITED POTENTIAL – 101871
ALVORD ISD – 249901
AMARILLO ISD – 188901
ANAHUAC ISD – 036901
ANTHONY ISD – 071906
ARCHER CITY ISD – 005901
BASTROP ISD – 011901
BELLVILLE ISD – 008901
BETTY M CONDRAS SCHOOL FOR EDUCATION INNOVATION – 152806
BOERNE ISD – 130901
BRONTE ISD – 041901
BURLESON ISD – 126902
BURNHAM WOOD CHARTER SCHOOL DISTRICT – 071801
CALLISBURG ISD – 049905
CARRIZO SPRINGS CISD – 064903
CENTRAL ISD – 003907
CISCO ISD – 067902
COLDSPRING-OAKHURST CISD – 204901
COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD – 020907
COMFORT ISD – 130902
CORRIGAN-CAMDEN ISD – 187904
COTULLA ISD – 142901
CROSS ROADS ISD – 107904
DAYTON ISD – 146902
DELL CITY ISD – 115903
DEW ISD – 081906
DORAL ACADEMY OF TEXAS – 105804
DUMAS ISD – 171901
EAGLE PASS ISD – 159901
EL CAMPO ISD – 241903
EL PASO LEADERSHIP ACADEMY – 071810
ELECTRA ISD – 243902
EVANT ISD – 050901
FALLS CITY ISD – 128904
FLORESVILLE ISD – 247901
FRUITVALE ISD – 234909

GLEN ROSE ISD – 213901
HAMILTON ISD – 097902
HARLINGEN CISD – 031903
HARROLD ISD – 244901
INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF TEXAS (ILTEXAS) – 057848
JACKSBORO ISD – 119902
JARRELL ISD – 246907
JASPER ISD – 121904
JIM NED CISD – 221911
LAKE TRAVIS ISD – 227913
LEXINGTON ISD – 144902
LIVINGSTON ISD – 187907
LORENZO ISD – 054902
MCDADE ISD – 011905
MCGREGOR ISD – 161909
MIDWAY ISD – 161903
MUNDAY CISD – 138903
NEWCASTLE ISD – 252902
NEWTON ISD – 176902
NOVA ACADEMY SOUTHEAST – 057827
O'DONNELL ISD – 153903
ODYSSEY ACADEMY INC. – 084802
PFLUGERVILLE ISD – 227904
RICARDO ISD – 137902
RIVER ROAD ISD – 188902
ROBINSON ISD – 161922
ROGERS ISD – 014907
ROOSEVELT ISD – 152908
ROUND ROCK ISD – 246909
S AND S CISD – 091914
SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CISD – 233901
SAN MARCOS CISD – 105902
SHELBYVILLE ISD – 210903
SPRING ISD – 101919
STAFFORD MSD – 079910
STOCKDALE ISD – 247906
STRAWN ISD – 182905
TENAHA ISD – 210904
TEXARKANA ISD – 019907
TEXAS CITY ISD – 084906
TOLAR ISD – 111903
TRINITY ISD – 228903

TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD – 178912
TWO DIMENSIONS PREPARATORY ACADEMY – 101840
VALERE PUBLIC SCHOOLS – 227824
VALLEY VIEW ISD – 049903
VAN VLECK ISD – 158906
VIDOR ISD – 181907
VISTA DEL FUTURO CHARTER SCHOOL – 071809
WAELDER ISD – 089905
WEBB CISD – 240904
WELLINGTON ISD – 044902
WESTWOOD ISD – 001908
WHARTON ISD – 241904
WINDTHORST ISD – 005904
WORTHAM ISD – 081905
YSLETA ISD – 071905