2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of M eeting on September 18–19, 2017

The objective for the first meeting of the 201&ccountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) wasto review the preliminary2017accountability results, discuss topics related to 2018accountability, and consider options for the implementation of the systemestablished by House Bill (HB22.TEA responses to questions and concerns are given during the meeting are provided in redSome questions will require staff research and are yet to be answelled following is a summary of the discussion meeting

- x TEA presented new departmental and organizational structures.
- x TEA presented the 2017 accountability ratings and results.
 - Concerns
 - f The priority and focus schoolists were released unexpectedly.
 - f There is dissonance between that list and accountability results as acasein which a focus school earns distinctions.
- x TEA updated the committee on the 2017 accountability ratings appeals process.
 - Questions
 - f Do the Harveyaffected campuses need to be within the disaster counties or just the districts within those counties qualify for an extended appeals deadlinery district with a campus in the affected counties campusin the affected counties will haveuntil the October 2nd deadline to submit its appelal.
 - f Will campuses and districts be able to appeal ratings other thamder the new system? [No decision has been made.



2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of M eeting on September 18–19, 2017

- x Mike Morath, Commissioner of Education, addressed the committee a focus on local accountailty systems
 - Questions
 - f How will campuses with local accountability plans coordinate with TEA to produce ratings in a timely manner to be determined
 - f Will campuses be tied to their locateountability system No decision has been made yet. This is still under discussion
 - f Will it be possible for the local accountability system to lower a grates? conceivableWhether it could actually happen, though, depends on when in an accountability year a district must commit to it's local accountability plan.]
 - f Will elementary schools be eligible for rating under AEMOt at this time
 - Concern
 - f TEA needs to set timelines for implementation of local accountability plans for the first and second years of AF.
- x Local Accountability Plans subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
 - Concerns
 - f The claity and rigor of these plans are continuingnoens.

Х

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of M eeting on September 18– 19, 2017

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of M eeting on September 18–19, 2017

Concerns f

aO ...

[This 45N 1[-3.59C MC163] ANC1160 PENC1160 PENC1160 TB 63 -3.621_-14 TE4 -00

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of M eeting on October 11–12, 2017

$x \ \ \mathsf{TEA} \ \textbf{\textit{def}} \ \mathsf{dS} \ \mathsf{dA} \ \mathsf{b} \ \mathsf{ded} \ \mathsf{ded$

```
Оib
f Addition
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          BAF@
f Whatepsates the setting of the 
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          PSAT istiHB 22
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         .]
f W
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              thathTEA state
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          BOBLES AT/ACT PORT
                                Edificitiya Edilich
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           ij
f IsOR photUT A is A charge the
                                [TexTelJijden
                                OR podbulg
 Св
f Thacebelle the
                                 D
```

TreEbiAge Aigh | PeRip 2 6 4

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of M eeting on October 11–12, 2017

x Tecenonial Median PAC Health Median

d#d0Hia

TreEbiAge Aigh | PoBrig 3 fo 4

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee Summary of M eeting on October 11–12, 2017

```
x TEA plate Stop grades, in the day
   t∮n
   f Isterputkitutian
                                                                               Citto
          handstyfeB, state
          td ette
   ( Ca
       f Thinpuble
       f Thysubhitystething to b
          epidas b Pegol
                                                            ion n
x TEA (ddidCbCbcpitchb)
       Оþ
       f IstaapeIMS and Water
                   ? NoDataSTAAR statePEIMS ted
          delif deliberation EIMS del
                                                                                            t
```

TreEbiAge Aigh | PeRip 4 6 4

2018AccountabilityTechnicalAdvisory Committee Summary of Meting orNovember 16 17, 2017

The objective for the second meeting of the 2018 Accountabilitychnical Advisory Committee (ATAC) wasto review accountability models prepared by TEA and continue crafting recommendations for the new—Raccountability system established by House Bill (HB) 22. TEA responses to questions and concerns given during the meeting are provided in red. Some questions will require staff research and are yet to be answelted following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting.

- x TEA welcomed the committee.
- x Committee membes reviewedconcerns and recommendation previous ATAC and APAC meeting
 - Š Questions
 - f Where is the mention of school to work transition for special education students [We are looking into the possibility of including graduation type codes 04, 05, 54, and 55 into the CCMR special educationstudents.]
 - Š Concerns
 - f There is push back at the district level regard in y -4.03 -1 Tw -4.03 /ts.(.)-1(o)2(n)]

2018AccountabilityTechnicalAdvisory Committee Summary of Meting onNovember 16 17, 2017

2018AccountabilityTechnical

2018AccountabilityTechnicalAdvisory Committee Summary of Meting orNovember 16 17, 2017

- f Remove outliers at every increment from the line equattorreduce the effect of magnet schools with selective enrollment
- f Evaluate campuses' economically disadvantaged data from previous years to assess the impact of Hurricane Harvey.
- x TEA presented the 2018 accountility Closing the Gaps domain odeling data.

Š Questions

- f Will safe harbor be recalculated every year or calculated once for a given 5 or 15-year timespan Safe Harbor will be recalculated each year denominator will remain either 5 or 15 depending which goal is adopted in the ESSA plan.
- f If the goal is to highlight contrast due to mobility, why not count all students versus all students in the accountability substantial students to be measured.]
- f Is it possibe to weight the indicators differently in the final Closing the Gapscalculation? This is one of many options.]

Š Concerns

- f If the minimum size to include an indicator drops from 25 to 10, there will be an explosion in the number of measurable indicators.
- f If there are not data for at least 10 students, the overall rating could be based on one domain.
- x TEA opened a discussion on calculating overall ratings

Š Questions

- f Will TEA increment the IR year for IR campuses in 2018 even though the accountability systems drastically changing to.]
- f Will the rules about PEG remain the sam [e/18 22 updated the PEG methodology. Effective for the 2019–20 school year, a campus will be placed on the PEG List if it is assigned Fam both the Student Achievement and in the School Progress domains.]

Š Concerns

f The School Progressegression model is based on results with different passing standards held constant for five years, we could expect the results to decrease relative to the line as more students are held to higher passing standards.

f

2018AccountabilityTechnicalAdvisory Committee Summary of Meting onNovember 16 17, 2017

f Small, struggling that mpuses are dealing with thip le divisions in the agency and are greatly taxed by their responsibilities to each. The agency should work to reduce the burden.

TEA opened a discussion about distinctions and badges

Š Questions

- f Are badges required in the new accountability system?
- f Canthe top third of campuses bewarded a distinction rather than top quartile? [Adjustments can be made if they are deemed appropriate.]
- f Can we weight elements of the campus comparison group distance formula differently? Adjustments can be madetified are deemed appropriate.]

Š Concerns

- f We don't have a "school of choice" indicator that would make comparison groups more equitable
- f Who qualifies aspostsecondary readyis not consistent between the a c c o u n t a b i e (I) - 1 (i) - 1 (t)

2018AccountabilityPolicyAdvisory Committee Summary of Meting on December 4, 2017

2018AccountabilityPolicyAdvisory Committee Summary of Meting on December 4, 2017

- f The state of Texas should negotiate from a position of strength to acquire Texas student SAT/ACT results at minimal cost.
- f The decision to exclude AP foreign languages from CCMR calculations should be based on supporting research.
- f Level of student interest is important and should play some role in selecting industry certifications.
- f While not every CTE sequence leads to a certification, we should give CCMR credit for CTEcoherent sequence.
- f Graduation is an important goal of education and therefore graduation rates should take a prominent place in the accountability system
- x TEA presented the 2018 accountability Student Achievement domain modeling data. Š Questions
 - f What is the rationale for awarding half credit for C7E/lany of the cur-1(o)3(s)6(<1n0W(2-22.48 -1.1fo)2(r633.1(s)]TJ*e)-1()]TJ -32.68)1(t)4(h0 Tc</p>

Quesons

fTEA 93(I)-1r92 OudeeiEA]iC(e1m.t7TJ 0 Tc 0 Tw 4.18 0 Td ()Tj EMCC LBody <</MCID 33 >>15.67 /C2_0 1

2018AccountabilityPolicy .001 Tc 0.

2018AccountabilityPolicyAdvisory Committee Summary of Meting on December 4, 2017

- f Perhapsocal accountability system could award adges.
- f Badges could be awarded for limiting class sizes, highly experienced teachers funding levels, etc.
- x TEA opened a discussion about calculating overall ratings.
 - Š Questions
 - f Has there been discussion about grades with pluses or minutes? current plan is to only provide domain and letter grades of A, B, C, D, or F with no differentiation such as an A+ or. Excep in mind that all grades will have a numeric equivalent.]
 - Š Concerns
 - f With the 70/30 breakdown between the best of Student Ackniementor School Progress plus Closing the Gather relative performance regression chart could become a target tampering by manipulating economically disadvantaged numbers. We should keep this in mind.