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 A–F 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. The following is a summary of the discussion at the meeting.

- TEA welcomed the committee.

- Committee members reviewed concerns and recommendations from previous ATAC and APAC meetings.
    Questions
        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 for special education students.]
    Concerns
        There is push back at the district level regarding Tw -4.03 -1Tw -4.03 /ts.(.)-1(o)2(n)]T(r

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

2018 Accountability Technical

Remove outliers at every increment from the line equation to reduce the effect of magnet schools and schools with selective enrollment.

Evaluate campuses' economically disadvantaged data from previous years to assess the impact of Hurricane Harvey.

- TEA presented the 2018 accountability Closing the Gaps domain modeling data.

  Questions

  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. The denominator will remain either 5 or 15 depending on which goal is adopted in the ESSA plan.]

  If the goal is to highlight contrast due to mobility, why not count all students versus all students in the accountability subset? [Statute requires both continuous and mobile students to be measured.]

  Is it possible to weight the indicators differently in the final Closing the Gaps calculation? [This is one of many options.]

  Concerns

  If the minimum size to include an indicator drops from 25 to 10, there will be an explosion in the number of measurable indicators.

  If there are not data for at least 10 students, the overall rating could be based on one domain.

- TEA opened a discussion on calculating overall ratings.

  Questions

  Will TEA increment the IR year for IR campuses in 2018 even though the accountability system is drastically changing? [No.]

  Will the rules about PEG remain the same? [HB 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 an *F* in both the Student Achievement and in the School Progress domains.]

  Concerns

  The School Progress regression model is based on results with different passing standards. If 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.

Small, struggling *IR* 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

Are badges required in the new accountability system? [No.]

Can the top third of campuses be awarded a distinction rather than top quartile? [Adjustments can be made if they are deemed appropriate.]

Can we weight elements of the campus comparison group distance formula differently? [Adjustments can be made if they are deemed appropriate.]

Concerns

We don't have a "school of choice" indicator that would make comparison groups more equitable.

Who qualifies as "postsecondary ready" is not consistent between the a c c o u n t a b i e (l) - 1 (i) - 1 (t) 3