

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

The objective for the first meeting of the 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) was to review the preliminary 2017 accountability results, discuss topics related to 2018 accountability, and consider options for the implementation of the system established by House Bill (HB) 22. TEA responses to questions and concerns are given during the meeting and are provided in red. Some questions will require staff research and are yet to be answered. The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting.

x TEA presented new department leadership and organizational structures.

x TEA presented the 2017 accountability ratings and results.

- Concerns

- f The priority and focus schools lists were released unexpectedly.

- f There is dissonance between that list and accountability results, as a case in which a focus school earns distinctions.

x TEA updated the committee on the 2017 accountability ratings appeals process.

- Questions

- f Do the Harvey-affected campuses need to be within the disaster counties or just the districts within those counties to qualify for an extended appeals deadline? **Any district with a campus in the affected counties campus in the affected counties will have until the October 2nd deadline to submit its appeal.**

- f Will campuses and districts be able to appeal ratings other than under the new system? **[No decision has been made.]**

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

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

- x Mike Morath, Commissioner of Education, addressed the committee with a focus on local accountability systems
 - Questions
 - f How will campuses with local accountability plans coordinate with TEA to produce ratings in a timely manner? [This has yet to be determined]
 - f Will campuses be tied to their local accountability 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 grade? [It's conceivable. Whether it could actually happen, though, depends on when in an accountability year a district must commit to its local accountability plan.]
 - f Will elementary schools be eligible for rating under AEP? [Not at this time]
 - Concern
 - f TEA needs to set timelines for implementation of local accountability plans for the first and second years of AEP.
- x Local Accountability Plans subcommittee presented highlights of their discussions.
 - Concerns
 - f The clarity and rigor of these plans are continuing concerns.

x

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

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

- Concerns
 - f*

Ca

1161(-3.0 DC MCI63)NICHDC r(0)T363 -3.021 -4 T4 -0 0

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

x TEA Presentation

< Qs

f Adm

[S&F@teagov]

f Why PSAT score

[PSAT score HB 22 .]

f Why TEA

[TEA]

TEA

PSAT/ACT

TEA

]

f Is Report A+ or B

W

[TEA]

OR

< Cs

f TEA

TEA

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

x TCEMMAAPAC
Held by

16

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

x TEA ~~Public~~ ~~Input~~

< Q ~~1~~

f ~~Issues~~

~~with~~ ~~PEIMS~~, ~~and~~
~~et~~

~~Q~~

< C ~~1~~

f ~~Topic~~

f ~~Topic~~ ~~to~~
~~PEIMS~~

an n

x TEA ~~Public~~ ~~Input~~

< Q ~~1~~

f ~~Issues~~ ~~with~~ ~~PEIMS~~ ~~and~~ ~~WEL~~

~~?~~ ~~No~~ ~~PEIMS~~ ~~at~~
~~PEIMS~~

t

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on November 16/17, 2017

The objective for the second meeting of the 2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) was to review accountability models prepared by TEA and continue crafting recommendations for the new accountability 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 answered. Following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting.

- x TEA welcomed the committee.

- x Committee members reviewed concerns and recommendations from previous ATAC and APAC meetings
 - 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 CCM for special education students.]
 - Š Concerns
 - f There is push back at the district level regarding [redacted]

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on November 16-17, 2017

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on November 16/17, 2017

- f* Small, struggling campuses are dealing with multiple 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

§ Questions

- f* Are badges required in the new accountability system? **[No.]**
- f* Can the top third of campuses be awarded 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 made if they are deemed appropriate.]**

§ Concerns

- f* We don't have a "school of choice" indicator that would make comparison groups more equitable
- f* Who qualifies as postsecondary ready? is not consistent between the

a c c o u n t a b i l i t y (1) - 1 (i) - 1 (t)

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on December 4, 2017

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting 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.

§ Questions

- f* What is the rationale for awarding half credit for CTE? Many of the

§ Questions

f TEA 93(l)-1r92 0udeeiEA]iC(e1m.t7TJ 0 Tc 0 Tw 4.18 0 Td ()Tj EMCC LBody <</MCID 33 >>15.67 /C2_0 1

2018Accountability Policy .001 Tc 0.

2018 Accountability Policy Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on December 4, 2017

- f* Perhaps local accountability systems could award badges.
 - 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 minuses? [The 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 B. Keep in mind that all grades will have a numeric equivalent.]
 - Š Concerns
 - f* With the 70/30 breakdown between the best of Student Achievement or School Progress plus Closing the Gap, the relative performance regression chart could become a target tampering by manipulating economically disadvantaged numbers. We should keep this in mind.