TAAG Meeting Minutes

Date: April 29, 2025
Time: 9:00 AM - 11:30 AM

Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Minutes

Meeting Minutes for April 29, 2025

The purpose of the April 2025 TAAG meeting was to continue to gather initial feedback on enhancements to the *A-F system* considered for the 2028 *A-F* Refresh. First TAAG was provided with an update on the status of public comment received on the *Proposed Accountability Rating System Manual* for 2026 ratings. The 2028 *A-F* discussion closed out previously shared proposals for recognition of accelerated testers in middle school, proposals related to high school accelerated testers, and a proposal to include different campus demographic variables in Domain 2B: Relative Performance. Initial feedback was gathered regarding a proposal for differential weighting of College, Career, and Military Readiness indicators. Additionally, TEA provided TAAG with data analysis of changes to *A-F* methodology implemented during 2023 *A-F* system refresh. The meeting concluded with a review of future topics and meeting dates.

Topic 1 – 2026 Proposed Commissioner's Rules Public Comment

Summary:
During the meeting members were informed that TEA would post responses to public comments received on the *Proposed Accountability Rating System Manual* for 2025 ratings on the [2025 Accountability Manual](#) webpage. TEA reminded members that public comments for the *Proposed Accountability Rating System Manual* for 2026 ratings would close on May 19, 2025. This timeline allows for the adoption and publication of the rules for 2026 ratings to be completed prior to the start of the 2025-26 school year and a full year in advance of 2026 ratings. TEA shared that any comments that impact the adoption of the *Accountability Rating System Manual* for 2026 ratings would be reviewed at a meeting after the close of the public comment period.

Topic 2 – 2028 *A-F* Refresh Initial Consideration Close Out and Update

Summary:
TEA reviewed the status of initial TAAG recommendations to Commissioner Morath. Specifically, TAAG recommended that Special Education not be used as a variable for calculating Domain 2B: Relative Performance. Additionally, TAAG recommended adding an extra point to the Domain 1A and Domain 2B calculations for each student below grade nine who achieves an Approaches or better performance level on any end-of-course (EOC) exam. Also suggested was an updated table for ACT and SAT cut scores aligned with STAAR, as presented at the March meeting. TAAG recommended no changes to assessments or the timing for meeting accelerated testing requirements.

Proposals in development to be addressed at future meetings include considerations for Distinction Designations, differential weighting of CCMR performance, integration of RDA into the *A–F* system, and updating targets and cut scores using a new baseline data.

Topic 3 – 2028 A–F Refresh Consideration: Inclusion of prior year performance as variable for Relative Performance

Summary:

In response to public comments, TEA investigated utilizing prior year STAAR performance instead of economically disadvantaged percentages in Domain 2B. That investigation found that inclusion of past STAAR performance in Domain 2B resulted in outcomes very similar to Domain 1. Additionally, Domain 2A already measures academic growth and accounts for different starting points. Economic disadvantage rate provides greater explanatory power, and therefore, prior year performance will no longer be considered as a variable for Domain 2B.

Discussion:

Members agreed that the contribution of Domain 2B to the *A-F* system to address the relationship between ratings and poverty is important to maintain. Members asked about the possibility of utilizing weighted census block data in place of a percentage of economically disadvantage to even more specifically differentiate for the varying levels of student poverty. Members inquired if utilization of census block data would be more accurate. Some members shared concerns that weighted census block information would make the system more complicated and pose a challenge for districts doing internal calculations.

TEA Response:

TEA will present the modeling of utilizations of census block information at a future meeting.

Topic 4 – 2028 A–F Refresh Consideration: Differential Weight of CCMR Indicators

Summary:

An initial proposal for differential weighting of CCMR indicators based on proposed programmatic differences was presented for member feedback. The proposal maintains current CCMR indicators and encourages increasing levels of attainment, by organizing current indicators into three categories, with the first category reflective of an initial level of College, Career, or Military readiness being achieved. Proposed categories reflect Texas Success Initiative attainment, similar to CCMR Outcomes Bonus. Proposed scoring methodology is similar to methodology used in Domain 1 Academic Achievement. This approach helps students earn credentials of value by encouraging the accumulation of achievements across various indicators. The proposal includes the Industry-Based Certifications (IBC) List for Public School Accountability, in Texas Administrative Code 74.1003, that qualifies IBCs into three tiers.

Discussion:

Members inquired about the process and data used to categorize IBCs into tiers. Some members raised concerns that local employers in agricultural or small-town economies might not align with tier one IBCs. Members noted that IBCs are regional, and an in-demand IBC in one region might not be needed in other parts of the state, potentially reducing economic mobility for graduates.

Group Feedback:
Members expressed support for the proposed scoring methodology similar to the methodology used in Domain 1 Academic Achievement. Some members noted that increasing achievement levels could offer students more opportunities for success in their post-secondary lives. However, members raised concerns about the criteria for achieving the "Meets" level as proposed, which would require both TSI and an increase in indicators. Specifically, members observed that the proposed methodology for scoring CCMR achievement represents a change to established expectations regarding minimum standards. Members questioned how this change would be communicated and reflected in the scaling process.

TEA Response:
TEA will continue to research indicators' predictability of college enrollment and persistence aligned with the state's postsecondary goals for 2030.

Topic 5 - *A-F* System Data Checks

Summary:
TEA presented data analysis that examines the relationship between Federal Comprehensive Support Identified (CSI) campuses and F-Rated campuses. Although there is some overlap, CSI-identified and F-Rated campuses are identified differently and receive different supports. The data analysis revealed that 78% of CSI campuses were F-rated, while 38% of F-rated campuses were either CSI-identified or reidentified in 2024. In total, 259 campuses were both F-Rated and CSI-identified or reidentified in 2024.

In response to public comments requesting that only the better of campus Domain 2A or 2B scores be carried forward to district Domain 2 methodology, TEA conducted data analysis comparing the outcomes. The analysis showed that 78% of districts saw no difference in scale scores, and 96% of letter grades remained unchanged. Since this suggested change has a minimal impact on outcomes and does not reflect all four domains, TEA proposes no change to district Domain 2 methodology.

Discussion:
Members stated including all campus Domain 2A and 2B in District calculations provided a more accurate view of district performance. Members noted the added complexity of the alternate methodology reduces transparency of the system.