

**2017 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on September 26–27, 2016**

2017 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting on September 26–27, 2016

Several members expressed concerns regarding the equity of including campuses of choice (early college high schools and charters, for example) in campus

2017 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting on September 26–27, 2016

Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to explain that zero or negative scores are good • Students may be counted twice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not conform to statute • Unsure of what exactly is being measured • Target would change from year to year • Lack of variability in the residuals • Domain scores would not be independent • Not a stand-alone domain • Complex and difficult to explain • Required Improvement would not be an option • Students would be counted twice
----------------------	---	---

After discussing the advantages and disadvantages of each model, the committee unanimously preferred the gap model (with a target of 60) for Domain III over the regression model, noting that the regression analysis model would count some students more than once, whereas the gap model may only count students more than once under certain circumstances. In addition, under the regression analysis model, the domain target would vary each year, depending on the performance of the subgroups used in that domain.

Domain IV Development

Agency staff presented options for Domain IV indicators. The committee discussed the definition and scope of attendance and

