

#1 We request a representative panel of charter educators  
Charter CHOIC.

2# How is accountability positioning itself to accurately evaluate performance of charter schools? For example, charter school districts typically serve a specific type of student so the demographics are disproportionate to an ISD. Recent TEA studies show that students in Alternative Ed charter schools make greater gains than their traditional counterparts yet those schools experience various stages of intervention under PBMAS for having higher concentrations of at-risk students from different backgrounds. How will we also adjust PBMAS to more accurately reflect the successes of these schools?

3# Currently the TGI (growth measure) credits schools for a student's growth on TAKS even though the student did not pass. However the student must be moving consecutive from one grade to the next and taking consecutive tests. This disallows most at-risk students enrolled in accelerated instruction programs in drop out recovery. Few dropouts are "consecutive". Also, exit level re-testers are not included as they are not taking consecutive grades and tests. Why not eliminate these criteria and allow growth for each student?

4# I understand the current proposal allows for gold performance acknowledgements for alternative accountability. This still does not address the issue that holds especially true for charters as most are AEA's. They will still only be known to the public as merely Academically Acceptable which is deceptive and misleads the public to believe that most charters are not Recommended. Why can't Alternative Accountability schools receive a rating such as Commended, Ideal, Excellent, Model or Achieved?

5# A current PBMAS indicator penalizes a charter school for not graduating enough students under the Recommended Graduation Plan while the terms of their charter calls for a drop out recovery program primarily delivering a minimum plan. The dilemma is whether or not to fulfill the terms of their charter contract or cater to PBMAS indicators. How will this committee address this and many other related issues?

6# When addressing growth measures for progress from year to year, how will we account for schools with high mobility rates, as students are only there for one year to recover lost credits and graduate? It seems that the system penalizes schools that are helping to solve the state's dropout crisis. Why also don't schools get credit for graduating students outside their 4 year cohort window?

7# Will the committee be willing to consider a specialized accountability for schools serving high at risk students with multiple at risk indicators – such as alternative routes to accreditation from outside sources such as Southern Association of Colleges and Schools?

8# It seems that both public and charter school operators are concerned about accepting transfer students from the other that are underperforming. Why not provide a waiver for one year for the receiving school of the student who is more than one year behind or having previously failed the TAKS to permit the school time to catch the student up

Mindy Chalkley, Pres.