2019 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on February 5, 2019

The objective for the second meeting of the 2019 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) was to recommend improvements for the 2019 accountability system and beyond, primarily regarding alternative education accountability (AEA) campuses and the 3 of 4 *F=F* rule. 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 and introduced members.
- Committee members reviewed AEA and dropout recovery school options.
    - Questions
        - How many charters are AEAs? [There are 147 charter AEA campuses. There are 37 AEA districts that are comprised solely of AEA campuses.]
        - Why was September 28th set for school start date? Could we move this to be the same date as the fall snapshot? [The last Friday in September is set as the end of the school-start window by TSDS PEIMS. The date is necessary in order to collect and report certain TSDS PEIMS data in the fall submission.]
        - Would it be possible to do bonus points the way we use to, where you can get points from a variety of different ways, with a maximum amount set? [We could recommend that.]
        - How many districts or charters did not get an *A* overall as they had an AEA campus that received an overall *Improvement Required* rating? [One district received an 89 overall as the district had an AEA campus with an *Improvement Required* rating.]
        - How many Texas students attend AEAs? [Between 50,000–60,000 students attended AEAs in 2017–18.]
    - Concerns
        - Most dropout recovery programs do not have CTE programs.
        - Some charters may be using AEA status for lower targets.
        - AEAs are all very different; there is a need for different options, similar to college, career, and military readiness (CCMR). [The "or logic" for CCMR is per student, and you can't do that here. There has to be a standard.]
        - There was a concern that the required improvement in four-year federal graduation rates for districts and campuses at or above 90.0% may make meeting the target unattainable over time.
    - Suggestions
        - Prioritize to maximize points.
            - Graduation plan
            - Course completion
            - CCMR growth
        - AEA campus ratings should not affect district ratings.
        - We should limit the number of bonus points to a maximum of 10.

- We should let the data drive cut points (look at AEA data to set goals).
- Use a 6-year graduation rate for AEAs.
- Explore what other states are doing with regards to AEAs.
- We should focus on proficiencies: CCMR, performance of previous failers, and 4-year graduation rate.
- Bonus points should be available to everyone regardless of raw score, without caveats.
  - Immediate recommendations (APAC members seconded the recommendations of ATAC.)
    - AEA Bonus Points for:
      - Prior failers
      - RHSP/DAP FHSP-E/FHSP-DLA
      - Excluded students credit
      - Grade advancement/course completion
    - AEA campus outcomes should not affect district ratings
    - Potential scaled score/target adjustments for AEAs
  - Future recommendations
    - Statutory adjustments to address AEA needs
    - ESSA amendment to address AEA needs
- TEA will make an adjustment to the graduation rate scaling. A 100 percent graduation rate will scale to 100. A 99.9 percent graduation rate will still scale to 95.
- Committee members reviewed the Step 10 (3 out of 4 *F=F*) rule.
  - TEA proposes three options:
    - Leave the rule as it is.
    - Look specifically at the Student Achievement domain—if a *C* or better, then let the overall rating remain.
    - Look specifically at the Student Achievement domain—if a *D* or better, then let the overall rating remain.
  - Concerns:
    - The only way to make this right is to be consistent across the board.
    - It is important to show the public the true picture not use artificial calculations.
    - Showing the score, along with the letter grade, is a must. The scores give context. 79 is much different than 72.
  - Suggestions:
    - Make the 3 out of 4 rule consistent across the board. Three *B*s and an *A* should equal a *B*.
    - Let consequences for 3 out of 4 come by way of interventions, not a change in letter grade.
    - Make the score as prominent as the letter grades on reports.
  - Recommendations (APAC members second the recommendations of ATAC.)
    - The committee voted to eliminate Step 10 (3 out of 4 *F=F* rule) completely.

- - o If this is not an option, keep 3 out of 4 for interventions only, but allow math to show the true grade.
    - o The Austin Chamber of Commerce does not support the elimination of this rule.
- Committee members reviewed identification and exit criteria for comprehensive, targeted, and additional targeted support and improvement status.
  - ◆ Questions
    - None of these labels impact the overall grade, right? [Correct.]
    - Is comprehensive the only one who gets funding? [Yes.]
    - Will the U.S. Department of Education ever say anything about having too many campuses identified? [That is possible, yes.]
  - ◆ Recommendations (APAC members second the recommendations of ATAC.)
    - Amend the ESSA plan to remove the possibility that a single cell can lead to targeted identification. Adjust to a proportionality of indicators for targeted identification.
    - Increase minimum size criteria for student groups.
    - When a student falls into multiple student groups, limit the student's impact on the system.
    - Revise the methodology to a campus must meet minimum size and miss the indicator for three consecutive years or the consecutive years restarts.
    - Use only Academic Achievement indicators for targeted support and additional targeted support, if evaluated.
    - Remove the exit criteria of meeting 50 percent of indicators from additional targeted support. Keep the focus on meeting both the Academic Achievement reading and mathematics targets.