

# 2018 Accountability Development

## Student Achievement Domain

ATAC and APAC	
Concerns	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation for military enlistment</li> <li>• Use best SAT/ACT result instead of most recent</li> <li>• Lack of graduation plan indicator</li> <li>• Removal of CTE-coherent sequence indicator</li> <li>• Rural areas do not have local jobs tied to the list of industry certifications</li> <li>• Cost of AP/IB programs</li> <li>• Lack of CCMR indicator for students served by special education and in transition programs</li> <li>• Use acceptance to a four-year college or university as a CCMR indicator</li> <li>• Diminished value of graduation rates may push emphasis away from all students and toward students who can achieve CCMR</li> <li>• Very few campuses will earn an A with the modeled 60 cut point</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Or logic for TSI postsecondary readiness indicator</li> <li>• Add PSAT to the TSI indicator</li> <li>• Phase-out of CTE-coherent sequence indicator</li> <li>• Add internships/work experience as CCMR indicator</li> <li>• Number of dual-credit hours (3 core or 9 any subject recommended)</li> <li>• Equal weighting for the three CCMR components</li> </ul>

# 2018 Accountability Development

## School Progress, Part A Domain

ATAC and APAC	
Concerns	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not appropriately measure success for students who skip a grade</li><li>• Lack of growth measures for high school campuses</li><li>• High schools lack growth opportunity when students take Algebra I in grade 8</li><li>• Lack of progress measure before grade 4</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Model data including EOC retesters to provide additional data for high school campuses</li><li>• Use performance of prior-year non-proficient students</li><li>• Give one point for maintaining Approaches Grade Level standard</li></ul>

## School Progress, Part B Domain

ATAC and APAC	
Concerns	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not measuring progress</li><li>• Schools of choice could be outliers</li><li>• Complicated to explain to the public</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Plot growth over several years for progress</li><li>• Regression line should have a floor and ceiling</li><li>• Can campus comparison groups be used in this domain?</li><li>• Is there a way to consider continuous enrollment?</li></ul>

# 2018 Accountability Development

## Closing the Gaps Domain

ATAC and APAC	
Concerns	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Challenging to meet minimum size with former special education student group</li><li>• Concern that this could incentivize removing students from special education services. This student group should be report only.</li><li>• Recalculating targeted and comprehensive lists annually impacts sustainability of funding</li><li>• Difficult to track mobile students and their codes from year to year</li><li>• Missing safe harbor by a percent has big consequences based on non-significant differences</li></ul>	

DRAFT

# 2018 Accountability Development

## Local Accountability System (LAS)

ATAC and APAC	
Concerns	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Coordinating reporting with TEA to produce ratings in a timely manner</li><li>• Clarity and rigor of these plans is a concern</li><li>• Can a LAS bring down a campus rating?</li><li>• How is the public to know if the grade is based on the state or local system?</li><li>• Complicated for the public to understand</li><li>• Informing the public about LAS</li><li>• Concerns about grade inflation</li><li>• Lack of uniformity in defining a C</li><li>• Concerns districts will all start to mimic established LAS and not create original ones</li><li>• Will districts have to commit to multiple years of a LAS?</li></ul>	