

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on February 4, 2019

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on February 4, 2019

don't include out of school testers or results for students outside of
grades 3-12.]

§ Concerns

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

Summary of Meeting on February 4, 2019

- x TEA will make an adjustment to the graduation rate scaling A 100 percent graduation rate will scale to 100. A 99 percent will still scale to 95.
- x Committee members reviewed the Step 103 out of 4 F=F) rule.
 - § TEA proposesthree options:
 - f Leave the rule as it is.
 - f Look specifically at the Student Achievement domain—if a C or better then let the ratings remain.
 - f Look specifically at the Student Achievement domain—if a D or better, then let the ratings remain.
 - § Questions:
 - f What was the purpose behind the 3 out of 4 F rule? [One of the issues with having the better of Student Achievement or School Progress is that the public may not get the full picture. The desire is to not allow a masking of data. If the school gets a 70 in Student Achievement, they could essentially fail everything else and not fail overall. This aligns with the Agency's mission to improve low-performing schools]
 - § Concerns:
 - f D schools still have sanctions, why do we need to pull them down to an F?
 - f The strength of proficiency or growth of the A-F system is being eliminated by this rule.
 - f There is not consistency throughout the system. Three out of four is B doesn't make you a B We need to be consistent.
 - f There is the potential for extended consequences, as the district could be limited due to this artificial calculation.
 - f We have campuses with excellent growth, but the achievement just is not there yet. This rule denies us that credit.
 - f This is very deceiving when comparing low performing schools. A school may be performing better overall, but it is masked due to this rule.
 - f We lost transparency when we combined all the grades to give one overall grade.
 - f I disagree that this is to help low performing schools. If that is the case, why didn't we stay with the Met Standard/Improvement Required system?
 - f If we had a good calculation to start with, we wouldn't need an arbitrary rule applied at the end to sort this out.
 - f There are a lot of unintended consequences within this system. It is not a perfect system. This rule is inconsistently impacting districts.
 - f If you truly want to "close the gap" you have to have accelerated growth.

2019 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee