2018 Local Accountability System Meeting
Summary of Meeting on January 11, 2018

The objective for the first meeting of the local accountability system pilot participant meeting was to begin to develop a framework or a standard for a local accountability plan. TEA responses to questions and concerns 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 pilot participants and discussed expectations for the meeting.

- Pilot members began to develop certain areas or categories for districts to use in their local accountability plans and reviewed questions and concerns about the local accountability system.

- Pilot members had the following questions about the development of the local accountability systems.

Targets, Weights and Standardization

1. Within a category, if districts collect data on several possible approved measures, can they choose to report the most favorable as part of the LAS or does the district have to identify the specific measure up front?
   [They must identify up front.]
2. Who assigns standards? TEA, LEA or this group?
   [LEA]
3. If several districts choose to adopt a similar measure (such as the Measure of Academic Progress [MAP]), do their cuts for A, B, C…have to be the same?
   [Each LEA will determine their own cut scores, but it would be prudent if the Pilot campuses worked together to have same or similar cut scores for consistency. TEA cannot dictate this.]
4. Can more subjective measures (parent perceptions, student ratings, surveys) serve as data to assess components, within the LAS?
   [Yes, if the measures are reliable, valid, and auditable.]
5. Will we leave targets open for each campus/district to set? How much flexibility will each district have in developing their cut points for each component?
   [There will be flexibility within the framework at the campus level.]
6. How will assigning different weights within a school district impact schools?
   [It depends on the measures selected and the weights put into the plan. Until we have hard data, this is impossible to predict.]
7. Will a district be able to decide what indicators will be used for all schools if they choose to participate? How will districts be provided flexibility to "customize" for the needs of their specific community?
   [This system is for reporting accountability purposes. Districts can add whatever they want to their local plan, but for state accountability, campuses must use measures that are within the framework.]

8. Must all locally-developed domains be scored in such a way that is compatible with the three state domains? (ex. Weighting)
[There must be a score that can be combined with the state assigned overall score/grade to determine the overall grade with the LAS inclusion.]

9. Can specific campuses not use the local system if it does not work in their favor?
[Once the campus has submitted a plan, this plan MUST be applied to the accountability rating per current legislation.]

10. Who determines the assigned standards/cut scores, and would they be standardized or local?
[LEA controlled, but must be approved.]

11. Do the performance standards need to be the same for every campus for a domain?
[Consistency is always best, but that is an LEA decision.]

12. Does each LAS have to be the same for each campus type within a single district?
[TBD]

13. Can the campus plans look different within a district?
[The Panel voted to recommend that plans can look different within a district. This is not specified in legislation. Final decision TBD.]

14. Will we be allowed to utilize the best grade earned from using and not use the local system?
[Once submitted in 18-19, campuses are committed to their plan.]

15. Can we use student achievement other than STAAR? (ie. TSI, CLI Engage)
[Student achievement other than STAAR must be used that are not a part of the current accountability system.]

16. Is there any correlation between LAS and CaSE?
[There can be.]

17. Can a percentage of growth be translated to an A, B, C, D, or F?
[Only growth on a measure that is not currently measured in Domain system.]

Reliability, Validity and Auditable

1. How can we guarantee reliability/validity on some indicators?
[We will utilize research experts to assist with this from AIR and TEA as well as "best practices" that currently exist.]

2. Who at the local level determines what success looks like? Can districts have a way to prove reliability/validity if one of the measurement tools is not listed within the "menu" of options?
[TBD]

3. How do we define auditable?
[We will utilize our expert resources and "best practices" to define.]

4. How do we define valid? If this means over time, how do we estimate this up front?
[We will utilize our expert resources and "best practices" to define.]

5. How will qualitative data be incorporated into LAS?
[TBD]

Rubrics, Template and Menu

1. Will this group create the rubrics including the indicators and performance levels that the agency will use to evaluate LAS plans?
   [The committee will work to create a framework for reporting.]
2. Will there be a rubric to determine things like "participation" to ensure there are consistent Ratings across the state?
   [TBD]
3. Do all campuses need to use the same template for the agency's website?
   [Panel voted to utilize this, but there were districts strongly opposed. Recommendation is to use standard templates for submitting plans.]
4. How does a "menu" of options meet the statute of "locally-developed" domains/indicators?
   [It merely provides a framework for reporting.]
5. How specific is the "menu" in terms of criteria? Can district/campuses add to the menu?
   [TBD]

Review Panel and Audit

6. What is the purpose of the review panel? Feedback or approval?
   [Both]
7. Do all campuses, who qualify, need to be included? If not, how are they selected?
   [That is an LEA decision if they are an A, B, or C campus.]
8. What would be the repercussions of an audit? (TAIS process for IR Campuses)?
   [TBD]
9. If only 9 plans are approved, does that mean there is no audit or no LAS?
   [That is what current legislation dictates.]
10. Who is the 3rd party? Peer review?
    [TEA. May need to utilize other external resources in the future.]
11. What feedback loops will be available as campuses/districts define their individual LAS plans?
    [Districts and campuses with work with the TEA LAS team.]

Student Population and Growth Mindset

1. How will differences in student populations of campuses be taken into consideration?
   [TBD]
2. Can a system be developed w/some aspect of a sliding scale to reflect diversity across state?
   [TBD]
3. How will sub-pops be reflected in a local system to present student groups from being neglected?
   [TBD]

4. How can growth mindset be included within the indicators and performance levels within the LAS plan?
   [TBD]

Meeting Logistics

1. Can we move the last meeting date (May 11) since it is during state testing?
   [Yes, we are working with AIR to find a date in June, 2018.]

- Pilot members expressed the following concerns about the development of the local accountability systems.
  - The local accountability system should be rigorous, but there needs to be a limit on its impact on state accountability. It should not be the reason that a campus receives a lower letter grade.
  - The local accountability system should not be another form of standardized accountability. This should be an opportunity for innovation and differentiation among districts.

- Members made the following recommendations.
  - Members unanimously voted against requiring all campuses within a district to have the same local accountability plan.
  - The majority of members voted to have a common template, or form, for local accountability plan submission and posting.

- Members developed ideas for areas or categories for districts to include in local accountability plans and established a subcommittee for each area.
  - Academics
  - 21st Century
  - Programs
  - Extra-curricular/Co-curricular
  - Culture/Climate