

2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 26, 2015

earn a *Met Standard* rating: Index 1 or Index 2 and Index 3 and Index 4. Working at their tables, ATAC members reviewed the various accountability ratings reports to the APAC members.

Following the members' discussions at their tables, staff spoke about performance index targets and corresponding percentiles, explained how to calculate distinction designations, and reviewed distinction reports and system safeguards.

Review of HB 2804 Requirements

Staff presented several documents covering HB 2804: one briefly summarizes the five domains; another summarizes the domains, the A–F ratings, and the Texas Commission on Next

2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 26, 2015

Review of New Indicators and Data Collection Requirements

Staff presented a summary of the September 2015 ATAC meeting and a document listing several indicators required by HB 2804 for which new data collection were necessary. Members first reviewed the section of the ATAC meeting summary that covers the new data collection requirements and discussed it in small groups. The first indicator discussed was the percentage of students who enlist in the armed forces. Members wondered how soon after graduation a student would need to enlist in order for the district and campus to get credit and whether enrollment at a military academy would count as enlisting in the military. Members asked TEA if it could explore a data-sharing agreement with the military to get the information. Members also expressed a desire to avoid using lagging indicators to assign accountability ratings. TEA staff explained that lagging indicators are a result of the timing of the data's availability combined with the statutorily required deadlines to release accountability ratings.

The next indicator discussed was the percentage of students who earn an industry certification. Members discussed the challenge of collecting accurate, meaningful data for this indicator because of the number of different types of certificates available, the number of different certifying agencies, and the fact that different agencies have different standards for certification. Staff mentioned that ATAC had agreed to TEA's preliminary recommendation to use the definition for the performance acknowledgment for certification/licensures as described in the 2015–16 TREx data standards and agreed to provide further information at the next APAC meeting.

The next indicator was the percentage of students in grades 7 and 8 who receive instruction in preparing for high school, college, and a career. APAC members commented that, because of HB 18, all campuses should have 100%, which limits the effectiveness of the indicator.

2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 26, 2015

participation indicators (e.g., participation in band or clubs). Members expressed concern about the climate survey because it would not be a consistent survey across all districts and campuses. Others expressed the concern that some of the options could make Domain IV too similar to Domain V. Members also commented that the additional indicators shouldn't result in any additional costs to a district or campus.

To facilitate the committee's decision on which possible indicators to pursue further, staff listed all the indicators being discussed on a board at the front of the room and asked each member to put a check mark by the five that he or she prefers. Those potential indicators with the most check marks will be the ones that staff will research to determine their feasibility. The list is as follows (the italic number in brackets indicates the number of check marks an option received, indicating how many APAC members listed it among their top 5):

Academic enrichment (participation in clubs

2016 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on October 26, 2015

Next Steps

APAC members agreed to a one-day meeting scheduled for Friday, January 22, 2016. At that meeting, APAC will review the ATAC recommendations for 2016 accountability, develop its own recommendations for 2016 accountability, and continue its work on the implementation of HB 2804.