

## 2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 11–12, 2017

The objective for the first meeting of the 2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) was to review the preliminary 2017 accountability results, discuss topics related to 2018 accountability, and consider options for the implementation of the A–F 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 presented new department leadership and organizational structures.
- TEA presented the 2017 accountability ratings and results.
- TEA presented an overview of the new accountability system.
  - ◆ Questions
    - Where did the certification list come from, and is it fixed? [The list of industry-based certifications was developed by the College, Career, and Military Prep Division through a rule adoption process. While the list is set for use in 2018 accountability, the list will be periodically reviewed and updated.]
    - How will admission to a postsecondary industry certification program be tracked? [This is still to be determined.]
    - For OnRamps, do students need to earn the dual credit or just complete the course? [Completion of the course. Districts have noted some difficulty with getting transcripts to validate dual credit. Because of that, the completion of the course will be sufficient.]
    - Will the cut points remain the same after year one? [The goal is to create a stable system where the cut points remain stable for five years.]
    - How is a parent or taxpayer supposed to know if the grade is from a local rating or from the state? [Any summary accountability reports and tools created will have a distinction between the state grade, a local grade, and any combination of the two.]
    - Will districts have to commit to multiple years for their local accountability systems? [This decision is still to be determined.]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - Not all career and technical education (CTE) coursework terminates with one of the approved certifications. This could disincentivize CTE.
    - The average person will not have the kind of sophistication to understand local versus state accountability.
  - ◆ Suggestions
    - Consider adding indicators for internships and work experience in college, career, and military readiness (CCMR).
    - It would be appropriate to have a phase-out period for CTE since students are already enrolled in specific CTE certification programs.

## 2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 11–12, 2017

- TEA presented the first domain, Student Achievement, in the new accountability system.
  - ◆ Questions
    - Are there avenues for parent input? [Yes, [feedbackAF@tea.texas.gov](mailto:feedbackAF@tea.texas.gov).]
    - Why aren't PSAT scores used in this system? [PSAT is not in HB 22.]
    - Why require nine hours of dual credit? [The total number of dual credit hours is still to be determined. TEA is looking at college persistence data, SAT/ACT scores, and dual credit subject areas to try and make this determination.]
    - Is OnRamps exclusive to UT Austin? Are there similar programs in development elsewhere? Would those programs qualify as well? [Texas Tech University also has an OnRamps program, and those students would qualify.]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - The value of a diploma is diminished by minimizing the value of graduation rates in the new accountability system. Dropout recovery centers exist now because the accountability system demands it.
    - The diminished value of graduation rates may push emphasis away from all students and toward students who can achieve CCM readiness.
    - Being ready to enlist is not equivalent to being prepared for first year classes at the University of Texas.
    - Why do we use the most recent SAT/ACT score instead of the best score?
    - This is unfair to rural schools who cannot offer AP and dual-credit courses due to resource limitations.
    - Some of these certifications would not lead to local jobs.
  - ◆ Suggestions
    - Parents should be told of changes to the performance label descriptors and what counts as passing.
    - Figure out how to use the best SAT/ACT scores instead of the most recent.
    - Incorporate something for transitional programs for student receiving special education services.
    - Use acceptance to a four-year college or university as an indicator in CCMR.
    - Phase-in the list of 74 certifications to allow students already pursuing certifications not on the list to qualify.

## 2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 11–12, 2017

- The Commissioner of Education, Mike Morath, addressed APAC on the topics of Hurricane Harvey and Local Accountability Systems (LAS).
  - ◆ Questions
    - Is there any plan for a public informational campaign regarding LAS?
    - Is there any thought to incentivizing teaching for particular certification areas?
  - ◆ Concerns
    - Local Accountability Systems introduce problems of grade inflation.
    - Establishing uniformity where a C means the same thing statewide will be a challenge.
    - Districts of innovation are not not so innovative anymore. Concerned LAS will be the same.
  - ◆ Suggestions
    - Think about regional offerings and how CTE fits into that. Educated cowboys can be primed for success without state certifications.
- TEA presented the second domain, School Progress, part A, in the new accountability system.
  - ◆ Questions
    - What happened to two points for masters grade level performance? [The maximum number of points a student can contribute is one.]
    - How is retester data incorporated? [Currently, the denominator for this part of the domain is based on students who have progress measures. EOC retesters do not receive progress measures. TEA is exploring with ETS the feasibility of having progress measures for retesters.]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - We can't measure progress until fourth grade.
    - High schools miss out when successful students take algebra I in 8th grade.
    - Students who take algebra I in 7th grade have no opportunity to show growth in 8th grade.
  - ◆ Suggestions
    - Lower performance should only be identified if statistically significant. Missing one more question than the previous year should not be sufficient.
    - Consider using retest performance in high school for Part A. Progress happens when a failing student passes.

## 2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 11–12, 2017

- TEA presented the second domain, School Progress, part B, in the new accountability system.
  - ◆ Questions
    - Is there a way to take into account continuous enrollment? [Continuous enrollment is currently not part of the methodology for part B, only economically disadvantaged student percentage.]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - These equations are not easily understood.
    - The only way to call this growth is to see this plotted over several years. It doesn't seem appropriate for the School Progress domain.
- TEA presented the third domain, Closing the Gaps, in the new accountability system.
  - ◆ Questions
    - Is it just the PEIMS snapshot that determines who counts here? What about EL students? [No. Data related to STAAR is the combination of PEIMS snapshot and assessment documents. For other indicators it is based on PEIMS data.]
    - Are we recalculating safe harbor every year? [Yes.]
  - ◆ Concerns
    - It will be difficult to keep these students and their codes straight year over year especially with mobile populations.
    - Recalculating targeted and comprehensive campuses every year could mean funding is only available one year at a time. This is not very sustainable.
    - Moving in and out of safe harbor eligibility based on a one percent change in performance predicates big consequences on not-significant differences.
  - ◆ Suggestions
    - Make student information more available across districts, maybe via a student portal.

APAC voted to recommend weighting all three components of the Student Achievement Domain for high schools and districts equally.