

# 2017 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee

## Summary of Meeting on November 14, 2016

### Meeting Objective

The objective for the first meeting of the 2017 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) was to discuss topics related to 2017 accountability and review options for the implementation of the A-System prescribed by House Bill (HB) 2804.

### Overview of 2017 Student Assessment Changes

Justin Porter, Deputy Director of Assessment and Programj -0.005 T3bn0ntete2(a)-326 TfpD

2017 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee  
 Summary of Meeting on November 14, 2016

to either adjust the weight for the levels of achievement or put less emphasis on the advanced level or completely exclude the advanced level from Domain I. Commissioner Mospartke about the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's goal of 60 percent of Texans ages 25–34 holding a postsecondary credential or degree by the year 2030. Encouraged committee members to recognize this goal while considering the 60 percent target for Domain I.

Domain II Development

TEA staff briefly discussed Domain II, noting that it will likely be very similar to Index 2 in the current system.

Domain III Development

Agency staff presented two models for Domain III: a performance gap model and a regression analysis model. The performance gap model would identify a racial/ethnic group or the economically disadvantaged group with the greatest gap from the goal of 60 percent of assessments at postsecondary readiness standards. Alternatively, the regression analysis model regresses the Domain I results for economically disadvantaged on the percentage of students identified as economically disadvantaged. The Domain III letter grades is determined by residuals using multiples of standard deviations. The committee discussed advantages and disadvantages of each model, which are listed in the table below.

|  | Performance Gap Model | Regression Analysis Model |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|

2017 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting on November 14, 2016

Weighting of Domains 1–III

Committee members discussed options for weighting Domain I, Domain II, and Domain III, recognizing that altogether they will account for 55 percent of the overall letter grade. Five options were identified, discussed, and voted upon:

- Weight each domain equally (10 votes)
- Use the outcome for each domain but with differential weighting (5 votes)
- Average the best two letter grades (1 vote)
- Average the better letter grade of Domain I or Domain II with Domain III (2 votes)
- Take the best of all three letter grades for an overall Domain I–III grade