

## **TAAG Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** May 27, 2025

**Time:** 9:00 AM - 11:30 AM

### **Texas Accountability Advisory Group (TAAG) Minutes**

#### **Meeting Minutes for May 27, 2025**

TAAG met in May 2025 to continue discussions on proposed enhancements to the *A–F* accountability system in preparation for the 2028 *A–F* Refresh. During the session, members also received an update on the status of public comments submitted regarding the *Accountability Rating System Manual* for 2026 ratings.

The meeting addressed the 2028 *A–F* Refresh, with a focus on College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR). Members reviewed relevant CCMR data to inform feedback on a proposal for differential weighting of CCMR performance indicators. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) presented an analysis of the Domain 3 scoring methodology changes implemented in the 2023 *A–F* system refresh. Additionally, TEA solicited feedback on preliminary proposals related to distinction designations.

The meeting concluded with a review of upcoming discussion topics and confirmation of future 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 for *Accountability Rating System Manual* for 2026 ratings on the [2026 Accountability Manual](#) webpage. TEA shared that 15 comments were received with no substantive changes to methodology to or scoring resulting from those comments. Additionally, as it does every year, TEA utilized stakeholder feedback to make clarity edits to the manual.

Not addressed in the meeting, but previously announced in a [To The Administrator Addressed Correspondence](#) on May 8, 2025, TEA is deferring the proposed change to give credit to only those courses on the approved college preparatory course for CCMR list until the 2028 accountability year, with the 2026-2027.

---

#### **Topic 2 – Proposal Analysis: Consideration #3: Differential Weighting of CCMR Indicators**

##### **Summary:**

TEA provided initial analysis of differential weighting of CCMR indicators aligned to the weighted categories as presented at the April 2025 TAAG meeting. TEA reiterated the goal of the proposal is not to change CCMR rates, but rather incentive readiness indicators that are aligned to increased post-secondary success and outcomes for students. It was observed that the indicators students

tend to meet are TSI only, TSI combined with Dual Credit, or TSI combined with AP/IB in categories 1,2, and 3 respectively. Analysis was shared to review various areas of potential disproportionality in earning the highest weighted category. This included economic disadvantage, graduating class size, and community type, and region. Overall, TEA shared that this information is important to monitor and understand as the weighted categories are developed, and the results indicate the development of this differential weighting proposal can continue. Lastly, TEA presented members with an updated proposal based on feedback TAAG and EAG (Education Service Center Accountability Group) provided in the April meetings noting that further analysis would be conducted assess indicators alignment with student postsecondary outcomes.

### **Discussion:**

Stakeholders sought clarification on the dual credit requirement for category 3, confirming that the 15-hour total includes 3 hours each in ELAR and Math. Questions were raised about how students with mixed indicators (e.g., AP, OnRamps, Dual Credit) are categorized. TEA confirmed that there is not a total sum of points, but rather, the highest earned CCMR indicator receives the credit. TEA confirmed that Military Ready data is included in the analysis and clarified that the projected CCMR rate drop from 76.3% to 63.4% is not a direct comparison, as these are raw scores that will be scaled for final use in the accountability system.

Concerns emerged about the equity of weighting CCMR indicators, with some expressing that the system may overemphasize college readiness at the expense of career and military pathways. Stakeholders noted that CCMR outcomes vary across campuses with different demographics and postsecondary focuses. There was also confusion around the Texas Success Initiative (TSI), prompting requests for clearer breakdowns of its components. The agency will share this information in the next TAAG meeting. Some suggested removing College Prep from TSI due to uncertainty, though it remains included.

Additional feedback focused on the impact of these changes on specialized campuses like P-TECH and ECHS, where high dual credit accumulation could skew results and lead to automatic “Beyond CCMR” (category 3) status. Participants also questioned the relevance of TSIA, believing some colleges no longer require it for non-degree-seeking students. Suggestions were made to include ROTC scholarship recipients and military academy acceptances in CCMR credit, with questions about how such data would be reported and whether districts remain incentivized to ensure TSI readiness.

There was interest in reviewing slides that disaggregate categories 2 and 3 by TSI via assessment versus College Prep, to better understand the composition of student performance. This raised concerns about equity and whether the model unintentionally encourages campuses to focus on specific student groups. Suggestions were made to consider partial credit (e.g., quarter or half points) for students in categories 2 and 3 to avoid incentivizing strategic behavior that could distort outcomes.

Some members voiced support for the shift away from a pass/fail model, recognizing that it gives credit for more rigorous indicators.

### **Member Feedback:**

Members emphasized the importance of clear communication regarding the intent and structure of the proposed CCMR category system. Many noted that without a well-defined explanation, the changes could be perceived as shifting expectations. There was general support for moving beyond a pass/fail model to one that differentiates levels of postsecondary readiness, but questions were raised about how rigor is defined and whether the system appropriately balances college, career, and military pathways.

Members noted the potential for the model to disproportionately benefit students with access to advanced programs, such as Early College High Schools and P-TECH, which may not be available in all regions. Some stakeholders cautioned that the system might unintentionally encourage schools to focus on students who can meet multiple indicators, rather than ensuring broader student success. Clarification was also requested on the equivalency of TSI by assessment versus College Prep.

Members acknowledged the value of recognizing more rigorous outcomes, they encouraged further alignment with long-term postsecondary goals. Suggestions included incorporating military officer programs, tracking college enrollment and persistence, and aligning CCMR metrics with outcome-based funding. Stakeholders also requested more detailed data reporting and analysis to ensure the new metrics provide distinct insights. Overall, there was support for continued refinement of the model and a strong recommendation for a comprehensive communication strategy to support understanding and implementation.

**TEA Response:**

TEA agrees with the need for clear communication about the purpose of the goal of creating a weighted CCMR accountability measure; and confirms that the system design is to create more rigorous expectations. The agency agrees with the importance of encouraging all the valuable pathways for college, career, and military; while it seeks to ensure the highest weighted CCMR indicators are well aligned to future success. The agency will utilize stakeholder feedback to continue to investigate and refine the proposal.

---

### **Topic 3 – A-F System Data Checks: Domain 3 Scoring Methodology and Evaluating All Student Groups vs 2-Lowest Performing Racial/Ethnic Groups in Domain 3**

#### **Summary:**

TEA presented an analysis of the distribution of scores of 1 and 2 points within Domain 3 from 2024 accountability. In alignment with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), TEA is required to measure interim progress toward long-term goals in academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency. These metrics must be disaggregated by student subgroup and must reflect the level of improvement necessary to close statewide gaps in proficiency and graduation outcomes.

The analysis highlighted performance trends among the state's two lowest-performing ethnic groups—Hispanic and African American students. Findings showed that 29% of campuses received zero points in this area.

Notably, 32% of the campuses that earned zero points in 2024 had met their short-term targets in the previous year. However, due to the current methodology, campuses must show consistent year-over-year growth to earn points. As a result, schools that are on a long-term upward trend but do not demonstrate growth in a given year earn zero points.

Additionally, a second analysis reviewed new campuses and the current methodology that does not allow them to earn 1 or 2 points. New campuses had a higher proportion—approximately 14% more—earning zero points for Hispanic and African American student groups compared to returning campuses.

Last, a third analysis looked at the change during the 2023 refresh to focus on only the two lowest-performing racial ethnic groups. The data showed that continuing to rate all 7 racial and ethnic groups would result in 9 additional campuses being rated. 37% of campuses had no change in Domain 3 score, 34% showed decreases in Domain 3 score and 29% showed increases. TEA recommends no change as current methodology is designed to support more intensive focus on lowest performing groups and is better aligned with goal of closing achievement gaps.

#### **Discussion:**

Members supported using the district's two lowest-performing student groups from the prior year, rather than the current year, as a more stable comparison point. There was general agreement that comparing campuses to district performance is a reasonable proxy, and some noted that having options for multiple comparison methods (e.g., Options 1 and 2) is preferable to having none.

**Member Feedback:**

TAAG members generally view the 2023 0-4 scoring design in the Closing the Gaps Domain as an improvement, noting that 0–4 scoring system is more growth-centered, fair, and less punitive. Several members appreciated its balanced approach and found it easier to explain. However, concerns remain about its overall complexity, particularly in practical application and communication with administrators. Members agreed with the agency continuing to explore options regarding how to handle slight declines, and the scoring of new campuses, which may lack adequate proxies for demonstrating progress. Further data analysis and targeted adjustments are recommended to enhance clarity and equity.

Members were supportive potential changes to scoring methodology for both returning and new campuses.

**TEA Response:**

TEA will utilize available data and stakeholder feedback to develop a proposal.

---

**Topic 4 – Distinction Designations Initial Proposal Feedback****Summary:**

Two proposals from the Distinction Designation Committee meeting were presented to taskforce members for feedback. Specifically, adding eligibility for Post Secondary Readiness Distinction Designation for Dropout Recovery Schools (DRS) evaluated under Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) provisions and adding 4 additional indicators to the Post Secondary Readiness Distinction Designation. Those indicators being College Enrollment, Continued College Enrollments, Graduation with 2-year Degree, and Graduation with 4-year Degree all of which are currently reported in the Texas Performance Reporting System.

**Member Feedback:**

TAAG and other stakeholder groups indicate support for DRS eligibility for distinction designation but noted the potential challenges with developing meaningful comparison groups with such a small group of campuses. TAAG and other stakeholder groups indicated support for including the 4 additional proposed indicators, with some members noting that continued college enrollment and graduation with 2 and 4-year degrees are also dependent on the efforts of institutions of higher education (IHEs) that students choose to attend.

**TEA Response:**

TEA will move forward with modeling proposed changes to share at a future meeting.