

Summary of January TAAG Meeting on January 23, 2024

The purpose of the meeting held on January 23, 2024, was to greet TAAG members at the outset of the new year and to evaluate proposals intended for the Commissioner of Education, offering recommendations concerning the academic accountability system. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) will respond in *italics* to inquiries or comments necessitating a reply. Some questions may need further investigation by staff. Below is an outline of the meeting's key points, incorporating additional feedback provided by TAAG members after the meeting.

- Welcome
- Framing of the 2024 Accountability System (A-F design commitments)
 - The system remains static. The manual will provide information relevant to multiple accountability cycles and will be proposed for public comment earlier than before.
 - No Questions, Comments, or Concerns
- Previously communicated changes that impact 2024 Accountability ratings—*Two added ways to demonstrate CCMR*
 - Reinstatement of military enlistment for CCMR with district-provided documentation, collected via a TEAL portal.
 - Questions
 - Has there been any discussion on the comfort level of DD form 4 because of the highly confidential information that is required? *Yes, confidential details can be redacted by districts or the officer, but the form must clearly identify the student and bear an official armed forces signature.*
 - Why are we uploading through TEAL and why is this not something that can be done as a PEIMS indicator? The larger districts will have more difficulty when uploading these documents into TEAL. *When the military readiness indicator was initially introduced, the agency permitted districts to define and report it in PEIMS. Districts lacked precise definitions and were left to make internal definitions which the agency flagged as not in alignment with the intent. The process for submitting the DD form 4 is meant to provide clarity and consistency for districts when reporting military enlistment.*
 - Comments/Concerns

- Members suggested that direct reporting by the Department of Defense would simplify the process for districts.
 - Concerns were raised about the potential breach of confidentiality due to personally identifiable information on DD form 4.
- Version 3 of the Industry-Based Certifications (IBCs) list, accepted alongside version 2 for CCMR credit for 2023 graduates in the 2024 accountability period.
 - Questions
 - Essentially, do we have one more year of the phase-in of IBCs with (v3)? *Yes, forthcoming changes will support students in earning CCMR credit through IBC indicators.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - Members recommended updating the IBC list on program study frameworks before Fall 2024 to aid in preparation for the new school year.
 - Concerns were expressed about the complexity of IBCs for a large state like Texas, especially for students changing schools and small Independent School Districts (ISDs).
- Policy or data changes impacting 2024 accountability ratings—*Two areas require changes to the 2024 accountability system and proposed methodology was considered by TAAG.*
 - Policy change: Align the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) criteria for CCMR credit with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's (THECB) TSI exemption criteria benchmarks for ACT. *TAAG considered the methodology for scoring students with test records before and after February 15, 2023.*
 - Questions
 - Can you share with us the underlying data so that we can see the impact based on this changing methodology? What is the impact statewide that this change would be having on the field? *The data is addressed in the TAAG slides.*
 - How would you explain this methodology to practitioners such as counselors and teachers who are navigating students through these changing testing criteria? *There is a need to ensure and emphasize the understanding of the different criteria set forth for meeting the CCMR indicator criteria and the criteria of the THECB's TSI exemption criteria.*

- Comments/Concerns
 - Members agreed that combining scores from multiple tests to select the best outcome is beneficial for students and districts.
- Data change: Target setting for Progress to English Language Proficiency (ELP) in Closing the Gaps due to scoring changes in the Writing domain. *TAAG considered two options for setting targets for the ELP Progress measure.*
 - Questions
 - Do you have the progress data already that would be used to develop the targets? *Data required for developing cut scores and the potential disproportionate impact on campuses were discussed. To set targets now based on composite scores would require using 2022 to 2023 progress, which used different writing domain scoring.*
 - If we go one more year with domain methodology and then set new composite score cut points for 2025 accountability, how quickly will we have to set cut points again? *Once set, the targets using composite scores would remain in place until the next accountability refresh.*
 - Is the idea for you to have data so that the feds approve it at this time next year? *Yes, for 2025 accountability when we go back to composite methodology next year.*
 - Would the methodology stay the same in 2024 as it was for 2023? *We would continue with the same methodology that was approved by the feds which was making progress in 2 out of 4 domains.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - A majority preferred to use domain scoring for another year and transition to composite scoring in 2025 after analyzing two years of data pending the results of the data analysis.
- Changes to improve clarity and increase understanding
 - No Questions, Comments, or Concerns
- Early notification of impending changes not affecting 2024 accountability ratings—Future accountability cycles will be impacted in two areas.
 - Phase-in for IBCs and aligned Programs of Study
 - Questions
 - None
 - Comments/Concerns

- Members acknowledged the agency's response to the challenge of adapting to results based on outdated data and urged for advanced notice of changes.
 - Recommendations included updating the IBC list promptly and adjusting programs of study to benefit smaller schools.
- Development of a review and approval process for college prep courses by the CCMP division for the 2027-28 school year.
 - Questions
 - None
 - Comments/Concerns
 - The necessity for an advisory group with diverse stakeholders for the CCMP college prep course approval was indicated.
- 12th Grade College Prep Requirement
 - Questions
 - Is it in writing somewhere that students in grade 11 can earn CCMR credit via a College Prep course? *The table on page 9 of the 2023 Accountability Manual indicates 2022 graduates (and non-graduating 12th graders in Closing the Gaps) receive CCMR credit when they have completed and earned credit for college prep courses during the 2021-22, 2020-21, 2019-20, and 2018-19 school years.*
 - Comments/Concerns
 - We have always functioned under the criteria outlined in 26.014 which states in part, that this is "...for students at the 12th grade level..."
- Additional Inquiries/comments from TAAG members
 - Has the RDA committee met? *Not yet. Coordination with the Review and Support team is ongoing, and interested individuals will be contacted.*
 - When/ if 2023 ratings are released, can we agree to look at the results and try to determine additional next steps for accountability? *Upon the release of 2023 ratings, a commitment to review the outcomes and consider subsequent steps for accountability was affirmed.*