

[https://tea.texas.gov/About\\_TEA/Laws\\_and\\_Rules/Commissioner\\_Rules\\_\(TAC\)/Proposed/17\\_04\\_Proposed\\_Amendment\\_to\\_19\\_TAC\\_%C2%A7101\\_400/](https://tea.texas.gov/About_TEA/Laws_and_Rules/Commissioner_Rules_(TAC)/Proposed/17_04_Proposed_Amendment_to_19_TAC_%C2%A7101_400/)

- f Will the original substitute has been edited in any way qualified EOC to graduate? **[Yes.]**
- f The School Progress Part A domain chart shows that if a student achieves the Masters Grade Level standard in the current year regardless of prior year performance, a full point is awarded for growth. If substitute assessments are included at the Masters Grade Level standard, why not award a full point for growth? **[The answer to this question is that the State Board of Education has not taken the picture of outcomes for the School Progress Part A domain. For the sake of transparency, this method is unfavorable.]**
- f SAT tests are administered to students in some districts. Will the assessments be fair?
- f Will the SAT scores included be the best or most recent? **[We are working with the State Board of Education. This will likely have a multiple effect next year.]**

#### § Concerns

- f The inclusion of substitute assessments for the School Progress, Part A and the Top 25% Student Progress distinction designation if these students are not given a progress measure. These are often high performing students. In some districts, 75 percent of students would be able to use a substitute assessment for English

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting on February 1 –2, 2018

- I. Consequently, using substitute assessments could have an unintended negative impact on growth the following year.
- f* Districts may discourage students from participating in college pathway assessments because of possible negative accountability implications.
- f* Using substitute assessments in



2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting on February 1 –2, 2018

targets but realizes that there may need to be minor adjustments made to the system.]

- f Perhaps awarding A to the top 10 percent of campuses is too few. Some other reports produced outside of the agency award A to the top 25 percent
- f Current modeling shows 20 percent of elementary campuses will receive a D or F in Student Achievement. Elementary campuses are most challenged with improving outcomes of English learners.

Š Suggestions

- f Consider weighting STAAR, CCMR, and graduation rates at 40-40-20 respectively for Student Achievement.
  - f Use equal weights for Student Achievement to better emphasize the value of graduating from high school.
- x Committee members reviewed the Closing the Gaps domain considering the U.S. Department of Education response to the ESSA state plan.

Š Questions

- f To meet the participation rate requirements of ESSA, as the intent to add “artificial failers” up to 95 percent and then apply the accountability subset rules or apply the accountability subset first? [The intent is to add enough results back into the participation denominator to get to 95 percent. This will only apply to the Academic Achievement Indicator in the Closing the Gaps domain.]
- f What will be the overall effect of adding “artificial failers” based on 2017 accountability results?

Š Concerns

- f For small campuses with few mobile students, these “artificial failers” could be a big issue as they are less likely to drop out of the accountability subset.
- f It is distinctly possible that many of the best results will be excluded from

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting on February 1–2, 2018

§ Suggestion

Adjust the targets for the Academic Achievement indicator for 2017–18 through 2021–22 to the baseline targets. Weight the Academic Achievement indicator at 40 percent, the federal graduation rate at 10 percent, the EL proficiency status at 10 percent (once available), and ~~CCR~~ at 40 percent.

- x Committee members expressed frustration at the lack of impact ATACs having on the development of the new accountability system.

§ Concerns

- f Members are feeling like a box to be checked.
- f The voice of ATAC is heard then discarded.
- f This is a wasted opportunity to receive and incorporate ATAC feedback.
- f This system strains credibility with so many failures based on one test on one day.

- x TEA staff recounted major points raised during day one

§ Concerns

- f The agency has been unresponsive to ATAC concerns in general.
- f The inclusion of substitute assessments will affect growth measures throughout the accountability system.
- f The exclusion of CTE coherent sequence will unfairly affect the CCMR component for many campuses and districts. These changes are happening well after the fact and counter to district plans.
- f Closing the Gaps Academic Achievement indicator targets too high. The committee recommends adjusting the targets for 2017–18 through 2021–22 to the baseline targets.
- f Schools of choice will unfairly occupy the higher letter grades in this new system.
- f The ATAC notes are not accurately reflecting the atmosphere of the discussion and conviction of the participants.

- x Committee members reviewed scaling methodology for overall grades.

§ Questions

- f Will the raw scores change every year? **[The goal is to hold the scaled scores constant for five years.]**
- f How is an outlier defined for the School Progress ~~at~~ B domain?
- f Could an overall Campus be designated for comprehensive support based on the Closing the Gaps domain?

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting on February 1 –2, 2018

§ Concerns

*f* It seems surprising that 56 percent of high schools would have a better outcome in the Student Achievement domain rather than the School Progress domain

*f* Many more campuses will be identified as *At Risk* than in the former accountability system.

§ Suggestions

*f* There must be tangible descriptions of these grades. The agency should be able to qualitatively describe each letter grade.

xTj 0.0y8>Tj /5a

003 Tcn.16 Td [(\_0 1 Tf -3.158 0 Td0.27 m)2(eTf -d1(e)2( a 1(e)03 Tcyiv)-1(e)]TJ -0(c)-2(r)-42-0. /LBody . -1(be)]TJ

2018 Accountability Technical Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting on February 1 –2, 2018

§ Recommendations

- f The committee voted to use the scaled score for the Closing the Gaps domain to determine the closing the gaps distinction designation.
- f Members recommended that the following indicators be used for the campus postsecondary readiness distinction designation:
  - x Percentage of STAAR Results at Meets Grade Level or Above
  - x Four-Year Longitudinal Graduation Rate
  - x Four-Year Longitudinal Graduation Plan Rate
  - x College, Career, and Military Ready Graduates
  - x SAT/ACT/TSIA Participation (4 years)
  - x AP/IB Examination Participation: Any Subject (4 years)
  - x CTE-Coherent Sequence Graduates
  - x Percentage of Grade 3–8 Results at Meets Grade Level or Above in Both Reading and Mathematics
- x Committee members discussed the first meeting of the Local Accountability System pilot group.

§ Questions

Will LAS be implemented one year at a time or for longer periods once approved? **[Districts are held to using their local accountability plan for the campus for one school year.]**