

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

The objective for the first meeting of the 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) 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 are 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.
 - ◆ Concerns
 - The priority and focus schools lists were released unexpectedly.
 - There is dissonance between that list and accountability results, such as a case in which a focus school earns distinctions.
- TEA updated the committee on the 2017 accountability ratings appeals process.
 - ◆ Questions
 - Do the Harvey-affected campuses need to be within the disaster counties or just the districts within those counties to qualify for an extended appeals deadline? [Any district with a campus in the affected counties or campus in the affected counties will have until the October 2nd deadline to submit its appeal.]
 - Will campuses and districts be able to appeal ratings other than F under the new system? [No decision has been made.]
 - ◆ Concerns
 - The appeals process presents many learning opportunities for districts, but the results of the appeals and lessons learned are not shared widely. [TEA staff agreed to research the possibility of releasing summaries of appeals by campus type.]
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability School Progress, Part A (Student Growth) domain. The Student Growth portion of this domain measures the percentage of students who met the standard for improvement.
 - ◆ Concerns
 - As proposed, this domain does not appropriately measure success for students who skip a grade.
 - Measuring growth in high school is a challenge with limited tests and many students taking Algebra I in middle school.
 - The Planned Growth Model Matrix challenges campuses with lower-achieving students by not awarding them one point for maintaining performance at the Approaches Grade Level standard.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

- ◆ Suggestions
 - Retester data could be used to show progress.
 - Performance of prior-year non-proficient students could also be used.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability School Progress, Part B (Relative Performance) domain. The Relative Performance portion of this domain measures overall student performance compared to similar districts and campuses.
- ◆ Questions
 - Is it possible to use comparison groups here? [It's possible, but would we use 40 similar campuses, or should the number be larger? The larger the comparison group, the less similar the campuses will be.]
 - Will economically disadvantaged be determined using only testing grades or the entire student body? [TEA staff will model Part B using the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 1–12.]
- ◆ Concerns
 - Schools of choice could be outliers on the regression chart if they serve high-achieving, economically disadvantaged students.
 - This chart is not measuring progress. It is showing performance goals set against bands set over five years.
- ◆ Suggestions
 - Regression line should have a floor and a ceiling: schools with 0% to 10% economically disadvantaged should have the same cut score. Schools with 90% to 100% economically disadvantaged should have the same cut score. For schools with 11% to 89% economically disadvantaged would have separate cut scores based on percentage of economically disadvantaged.
- TEA presented requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The ESSA state plan opened for public comment on July 31, 2017.
- ◆ Questions
 - After the first year of A–F, how will Title I schools be identified if Fs are assigned to less than 5 percent of campuses? [The current plan is to add the lowest-performing D campuses.]
 - Is it conceivable that a Title I school could have stronger performance in the Closing the Gaps domain but be brought down by the Student Achievement and School Progress domains? [Yes]

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

- Mike Morath, Commissioner of Education, addressed the committee with a focus on local accountability systems.
 - ◆ Questions
 - How will campuses with local accountability plans coordinate with TEA to produce ratings in a timely manner? [This has yet to be determined.]
 - Will campuses be tied to their local accountability system? [No decision has been made yet. This is still under discussion.]
 - Will it be possible for the local accountability system to lower a grade? [It's conceivable. Whether it could actually happen, though, depends on when in an accountability year a district must commit to its local accountability plan.]
 - Will elementary schools be eligible for rating under AEA? [Not at this time]
 - ◆ Concern
 - TEA needs to set timelines for implementation of local accountability plans for the first and second years of A–F.
- Local Accountability Plans subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
 - ◆ Concerns
 - The clarity and rigor of these plans are continuing concerns.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Closing the Gaps domain. This domain measures achievement differentials among students, including differentials among students from different racial and ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds and other factors including students formerly receiving special education services, continuously enrolled students, and students who are mobile.
- Closing the Gaps domain subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
 - ◆ Concerns
 - There is a challenge with former special education student populations meeting minimum size requirements.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - This indicator should not be structured to incentivize removing students from special education services.
 - This indicator should be report only.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Student Achievement domain. This domain measures student achievement across all grades and subjects at the Approaches Grade Level, Meets Grade Level, and Masters Grade Level standards on STAAR. For high schools and districts, it also includes indicators of college, career, and military readiness.
 - ◆ Questions
 - What will the military enlistment documentation look like? [This is not something TEA will create. Districts should use their own discretion when it comes to this documentation but should at a minimum keep the enlistment or intent to enlist with the student's record.]
 - Who is sharing information about OnRamps? [OnRamps outreach programs and word of mouth]
 - ◆ Concerns
 - The TSI postsecondary ready indicator as proposed only counts if the student meets the target in both reading and mathematics. It would be better if it were reading OR mathematics.
 - Graduation plan rate is no longer in accountability
 - Modelling with 60 as the cut point for an A shows that very few campuses will earn an A.
 - The removal of CTE Coherent is a big concern especially since, at present, there is not equivalent indicator.
- Student Achievement domain subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
 - ◆ Questions
 - What is the solution for identifying masters level performance for substitute assessments? [TEA is working to address this concern. Cut points identifying masters level performance for each substitute assessment will need to be established as well as a method for reporting performance levels for substitute assessments.]
 - In the absence of CTE credit, how can special education students achieve postsecondary readiness?
 - Why use the most recent SAT/ACT score instead of the highest? [We only receive the most recent record from the College Board and ACT.]
 - Why is passing a dual credit course by itself not sufficient to achieve postsecondary readiness? They need 9 hours of credit to count. [Why not nine hours of any AP course or three hours of core (English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies) AP courses.]

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 18–19, 2017

- ◆ Concerns
 - CCMR is the least reliable indicator of the three for high schools regarding what is purports to measure.
 - Regarding the distribution of grades curve, schools of choice will fill up the top levels pushing more campuses to lower grades.
- ◆ Suggestions
 - There should be better coordination with Performance-Based Monitoring in coding students properly for substitute assessments.
 - The committee unanimously prefers equal weights for the three components of the Student Achievement domain: STAAR, CCMR, and graduation rate.
- Distinctions/Badges subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
 - ◆ Concern
 - Take care not to water down distinctions.
- The committee briefly discussed calculating the overall ratings in 2018.

The next ATAC meeting will take place November 16–17, 2017. TEA staff agreed to have someone from School Improvement and Support available at the November meeting.

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.]
 - 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.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

The objective for the second meeting of the 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) 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.
- Committee members reviewed concerns and recommendations from previous ATAC and APAC meetings.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Where is the mention of school to work transition for special education students? [We are looking into the possibility of including graduation type codes 04, 05, 54, and 55 into the CCMR for special education students.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - There is push back at the district level regarding the inclusion of OnRamps. It is extremely costly with only limited availability statewide.
- TEA presented staff recommendations.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Will credit for CTE coursework be settled before 2018 ratings? [Yes.]
 - Given that 20 percent of graduates would no longer qualify for CCMR without credit for CTE, how are those students distributed across the state? [Our initial review of the data show that rural districts and campuses or campuses with little if any dual credit, AP/IB options are harder hit by the exclusion of CTE than others.] Which districts are impacted and by how much?
 - Will we want to reset cut points annually as CCMR develops? [The goal is to maintain cut points for five-year increments.]
 - Why not set cut scores for campuses next year since 2018 ratings will still be *Met Standard and Improvement Required*?
 - Can districts appeal any rating? [We are still researching this. It's likely that a district or campus will be able to appeal an overall grade of F, D, C, or B but not individual domain grades if an increase in a domain grade would not change the overall grade.]
 - Can the agency get Accuplacer data? [We are looking into this but initial review is no the agency cannot.]

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

- ◆ Concerns
 - This system is supposed to be static for five years, but we will enter the first year with CCMR indicators still in development. This is a problem.
 - State averages do not represent the diversity of educational settings in this state.
 - TEKS streamlining could affect cut points.
 - Districts do not necessarily know if data errors are corrected by ETS. Not all errors are corrected in the CAF after they are identified by districts.
 - When an appeal is granted, it does not retroactively qualify the campus or district for distinctions since distinctions are already calculated based on CAF data. [Rerunning distinctions based on rescored data after the CAF is processed would be problematic.]
- ◆ Suggestions
 - The commissioner should consider applying his authority in areas not defined by statute, particularly in the case of CTE CCMR credit.
 - Consider a five-year transition period for the CCMR component to allow districts to realign their programs. The more abrupt the change to the system, the more likely the Legislature will be pressured to react, which would undermine stability. [We are looking into this.]
 - Build in a reporting mechanism that explains why a campus or district failed.
- TEA reviewed previously compiled recommendations and concerns from advisory groups.
 - ◆ Questions
 - How does one document military enlistment for accountability purposes? [Each district decides how to collect this data. This may be a senior survey, contact with a local recruiter, or any other method. Each district must maintain supporting documentation that the student has enlisted or intends to enlist.]
 - ◆ Concerns
 - With respect to military enlistment, it seems PEIMS managers and Performance Reporting have different positions on whether documented “intent to enlist” is sufficient to qualify.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Student Achievement domain modeling data.
 - ◆ Questions
 - Must one have the substitute assessment score in hand to use it, or can administrators “bubble in” substitute in anticipation of receiving the test result later? **[Yes, substitute assessment results must be in hand.]**
 - How will the agency calculate growth measures using substitute assessments? **[Substitute assessments will not receive a progress measure.]**
 - Will third and fourth year EL students still be included in the Closing the Gaps domain? **[Yes.]**
 - Will the EL performance measure be mentioned in STAAR report cards where applicable? **[No. The EL performance measure is an accountability measure. It is not an assessment measure used at the student level to determine if a student has met the standard.]**
 - ◆ Concerns
 - AP tests will not be useful for substitute assessments if the results arrive in July.
 - Inclusion of substitute assessments will lead to a huge increase in students who don’t take the STAAR tests.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - TEA should ensure the inclusion of substitute assessment results in the Student Achievement domain does not trigger unnecessary data validation monitoring.
 - AP language tests should not be excluded from CCMR, but if this becomes policy, at least TEA should investigate the effect of excluding AP language tests from CCMR to determine the size of the effect.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability School Progress domain modeling data.
 - ◆ Questions
 - How are EOC retesters included? **[Current modeling includes both successful and unsuccessful EOC retesters.]**
 - For the regression component, how did magnet schools affect the model at 70 percent or higher economically disadvantaged? **[Without a specific definition of “magnet school”, this cannot be determined.]**
 - ◆ Concerns
 - We still need to define progress for students skipping grades.
 - Harvey could have significant effect on economically disadvantaged numbers which would affect campus placement on the regression chart.
 - ◆ Suggestions
 - Students who transition from Spanish to English should receive a progress measure.
 - Substitute assessments which have a corresponding STAAR assessment from the prior year should be included and receive a full point.
 - Show the number of campuses above and below the regression line at each interval.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

- Remove outliers at every increment from the line equation to reduce the effect of magnet schools and schools with selective enrollment.
- Evaluate campuses' economically disadvantaged data from previous years to assess the impact of Hurricane Harvey.
- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Closing the Gaps domain modeling data.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Will safe harbor be recalculated every year or calculated once for a given 5 or 15-year timespan? [Safe Harbor will be recalculated each year. The denominator will remain either 5 or 15 depending on which goal is adopted in the ESSA plan.]
 - If the goal is to highlight contrast due to mobility, why not count all students versus all students in the accountability subset? [Statute requires both continuous and mobile students to be measured.]
 - Is it possible to weight the indicators differently in the final Closing the Gaps calculation? [This is one of many options.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - If the minimum size to include an indicator drops from 25 to 10, there will be an explosion in the number of measurable indicators.
 - If there are not data for at least 10 students, the overall rating could be based on one domain.
- TEA opened a discussion on calculating overall ratings.
 - ♦ Questions
 - Will TEA increment the IR year for IR campuses in 2018 even though the accountability system is drastically changing? [No.]
 - Will the rules about PEG remain the same? [HB 22 updated the PEG methodology. Effective for the 2019–20 school year, a campus will be placed on the PEG List if it is assigned an F in both the Student Achievement and in the School Progress domains.]
 - ♦ Concerns
 - The School Progress regression model is based on results with different passing standards. If held constant for five years, we could expect the results to decrease relative to the line as more students are held to higher passing standards.
 - Student Achievement is still a “gimme” for affluent schools, and an A in this domain ensures a campus will never receive an overall grade lower than a B per the proposed grade calculations. They will not feel pressure to improve.
 - ♦ Suggestions
 - Consider running a what-if report based on the old index system. This would be useful for campuses who were rated IR in 2017 to see if they improved or not.

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on November 16–17, 2017

- Small, struggling *IR* campuses are dealing with multiple divisions in the agency and are greatly taxed by their responsibilities to each. The agency should work to reduce the burden.

TEA opened a discussion about distinctions and badges.

- ♦ Questions
 - Are badges required in the new accountability system? [No.]
 - Can the top third of campuses be awarded a distinction rather than top quartile? [Adjustments can be made if they are deemed appropriate.]
 - Can we weight elements of the campus comparison group distance formula differently? [Adjustments can be made if they are deemed appropriate.]
- ♦ Concerns
 - We don't have a "school of choice" indicator that would make comparison groups more equitable.
 - Who qualifies as "postsecondary ready" is not consistent between the accountability system and the distinction designations.
 - Badges shouldn't be participation trophies.
- ♦ Suggestions
 - Remove the attendance indicator from distinction designation calculations.
 - Use Closing the Gaps indicators met / indicators evaluated to calculate the closing performance gaps distinction.
 - Do not award a + to a grade for earning a badge.
 - Award badges for graduation plan and endorsements and zero PID errors.

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.