

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on December 4, 2017

The objective for the second meeting of the 2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) was to review accountability models prepared by TEA and continue crafting recommendations for the new A–F accountability system established by House Bill (HB) 22. TEA responses to questions and concerns given during the meeting are provided in red. Some questions will require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting.

- TEA welcomed the committee.
- TEA reviewed goals for this meeting and opened discussion on previously raised concerns and recommendations.
 - ◆ Questions
 - Will the accountability system still use the most recent SAT/ACT scores instead of the best scores? [The agency is working on this. There will be a cost associated with each administration for some of the data. Research will also need to be done on how many years of data are feasible to store.]
 - Why wouldn't AP foreign language tests be counted for CCMR? [The agency is reviewing data on which AP tests are associated with one year of college completion.]
 - Will dual credit be counted for CCMR for all subjects or just English and math? [Current modeling is using 9 hours in any subject or 3 hours in ELA/Math.]
 - How will the accountability system measure admission to a postsecondary program? [This is TBD.]
 - When will the list of approved industry certifications that are started but not completed in HS be finalized? [This is TBD.]
 - What happened to endorsements? [Graduation plan rates were removed from accountability calculations under HB 22.]
 - Should “acquire gainful employment” be on the CCMR indicator list?
 - How will the accountability system calculate progress for PK–3 campuses? [These campuses will not have a School Progress, Part A domain rating.]
 - Can the minimum size for the Closing the Gaps domain be not just a minimum size but also a minimum percent of student body? [This is TBD pending ESSA plan negotiations with the USDE.]
 - ◆ Concerns
 - Setting up the new accountability system with an incomplete list of industry certifications will disincentivize those certifications added later because credit will be delayed.
 - Different areas have different employment needs. The industry certification list should reflect this.
 - We should keep in mind that there are plenty of good careers that don't require a certification.
 - ◆ Suggestions

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on December 4, 2017

- The state of Texas should negotiate from a position of strength to acquire Texas student SAT/ACT results at minimal cost.
 - The decision to exclude AP foreign languages from CCMR calculations should be based on supporting research.
 - Level of student interest is important and should play some role in selecting industry certifications.
 - While not every CTE sequence leads to a certification, we should give CCMR credit for CTE coherent sequence.
 - Graduation is an important goal of education and therefore graduation rates should take a prominent place in the accountability system
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Student Achievement domain modeling data.
 - ♦ Questions
 - What is the rationale for awarding half credit for CTE? [Many of the current CTE graduates are earning one of the 74 industry certifications. The assumption is that as the list grows over time more CTE graduates will earn industry certifications and CTE plans will be better defined.]
 - How do years in HS affect how IEP grads would be counted? [IEP graduates will be included in the annual graduates denominator for the year they graduate.]
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability School Progress domain modeling data.
 - ♦ Questions
 - How will we calculate growth measures on substitute assessments? [The current models only include students with calculated growth measures.]
 - Can the PSAT be used to demonstrate college readiness? [Currently, no. We can continue to research this.]
 - Will districts be informed which intervals their campuses fall into on the regression chart? [Yes.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - Charters often have high levels of economically disadvantaged students and also use selective enrollment. They could skew the regression model.
 - ♦ Suggestions
 - Run a model of the regression chart where the outliers at each interval are excluded.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Closing the Gaps domain modeling data.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Could there be a 5-year safe harbor for some indicators and a 15-year safe harbor for others? [The goal is to have one type of goal, long-term or interim but not both.]
 - Has TEA conducted research that shows “continuously enrolled” is a meaningful performance qualifier? [Our initial model data shows that statewide, outcomes for continuously enrolled students are higher than

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on December 4, 2017

for students who are mobile. This, however, is nothing new as mobile student outcomes have always been lower than non-mobile students.]

- ◆ Concerns
 - Holding EL and special education students to the same standards as the general student body is unrealistic.
 - Having a single student with particular demographic characteristics count multiple times can be unfair and damaging.
 - Larger campuses are more likely to meet the minimum size requirements for challenging demographic groups.
- ◆ Suggestions
 - Consider different targets for different groups. We could also report the percentages of economically disadvantaged, special education, and EL students in each aggregate student group.
 - Consider weighting the All Students group at 50 percent then combine the results of every other group and weight that at 50 percent.
 - Consider a sliding scale based on the number of indicators evaluated.
 - Apply weights according to the percentage of at-risk, continuously, and economically disadvantaged in each student group.
 - Use the better of academic achievement or growth measure by student group.
 - Model both percentage met and quadratic regression analysis for large, medium, and small campuses and districts.
 - Keep it simple with a total indicators met divided by total indicators evaluated calculation.
 - Weight Achievement 30%, Growth 25%, ELP 25%, and Quality/Success 20%.
- TEA opened a discussion about distinctions and badges in the 2018 accountability system.
 - ◆ Questions
 - What is the difference between a badge and a distinction? [We are developing working definitions for both of these.]
 - Is an acceptable accountability rating required to be eligible for a badge? [While the final decisions regarding badges has yet to be made, the current plan is that any campus (regardless of rating) can earn a badge.]
 - ◆ Concerns
 - The value of a coherent sequence of courses is in showing completion. It does not demonstrate knowledge gained.
 - Badges add a new level of complexity and could water down distinctions.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - The School Progress domain is school progress while the distinction is student progress, so use Part A of School Progress only for the distinction.
 - Mirror the postsecondary component of Student Achievement for the postsecondary ready distinction.

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on December 4, 2017

- Perhaps local accountability systems could award badges.
- Badges could be awarded for limiting class sizes, highly experienced teachers, funding levels, etc.
- TEA opened a discussion about calculating overall ratings.
 - ◆ Questions
 - Has there been discussion about grades with pluses or minuses? [The current plan is to only provide domain and letter grades of A, B, C, D, or F with no differentiation such as an A+ or B-. Keep in mind that all grades will have a numeric equivalent.]
 - ◆ Concerns
 - With the 70/30 breakdown between the best of Student Achievement or School Progress plus Closing the Gaps, the relative performance regression chart could become a target for tampering by manipulating economically disadvantaged numbers. We should keep this in mind.