Local Accountability System

PILOT PARTICIPANT MEETING
FEBRUARY 12, 2018

I.   Guiding Principles of LAS Development – Commissioner M. Morath   10:00–12:30

II.   Lunch   12:30–2:00

IV.   Subcommittee Work – L. Diserens   2:00–4:00
- Defining Categories (Domains)
- Definition Gallery Walk
- Subcommittees Report
- Indicator Gallery Walk

VI.   Follow Up and Next Steps – L. Diserens/J. Crowe   4:00–5:00

Guiding Principals of LAS Development

Challenging Questions

Campus Plans
- Can each campus submit a different plan?
- Can each district require that the same campus type use the same plan?

Data Collection
- How does the campus data get shared with TEA – participants want to understand how much (if any) TEA is supposed actually collect.
- Will TEA collect and run data through programs to check the campuses data, or will that just part of the audit?
- If not, can the districts house all data and the superintendent just signs off on submission?
- Can the annual cycle for reporting LAS outcomes be changed? This is a concern since the results must be combined with the state's calculations for Domains I-III, there will be a delay in the reporting of final outcomes.

Standardization
- Do districts have to have the same methodology when using the same indicator?
- What type of validation does TEA expect to support using indicators?
- Would TEA consider adding administrative points to those districts who use the a standardized plan created by a group of pilot districts?

Panel:
- Will a panel approve these plans before implementation? Will the panel complete a Post-Check which may lead to audits?

Subcommittee Work

Programs Subcommittee

This subcommittee had the following suggestions:

- Districts should be able decide their own grades and maintain the data in house.
- TEA should not have to verify every piece of data, but the subcommittee suggests that TEA use audit sampling as needed.
- All districts should not have the same cut points/weights when using the same indicators.

The subcommittee had the following questions:

- Where is it in statute that districts must submit all their data to TEA and that TEA should have to verify every piece of the data?
- Is it reasonable to expect that all data will be sent to TEA?
- If a district wants to use certain afterschool programs as one of their indicators, will the validity requirement be satisfied by research that claims any afterschool program leads to a certain graduation rate, or will the research need to be specific to their afterschool program?
- With five different groups that are creating measures and indicators, some may crossover into other categories. How do we avoid crossover? Should we avoid crossover?

The subcommittee suggested using Google Docs to share with each other their districts plan to use indicators.

21ˢᵗ Century Subcommittee

The subcommittee had the following suggestions:

- Use rubrics that measure 21st century skills just as Arizona, New Jersey, and West Virginia have done.
- Allow more personalization in education and in the student engagement indicators included in LAS. Many of these can't be quantified, but outcomes can be evidenced in the classroom from educators.

The committee had the following questions:

- How does TEA suggest measuring leadership or even speaking skills? Everyone has a different idea of what qualities and attributes demonstrate good leadership and speaking skills.
- Can TEA tell districts and campuses how to measure surveys, portfolios, and rubrics?
- If TEA decides that districts/campuses must have a consistent framework among all campuses, is that really a Local Accountability System?
- Which 21st century skills do TEA consider to be reliable?
- Can indicators be used that are either qualitative or quantifiable?

Culture and Climate Subcommittee

One member emailed research documents regarding National School Climate standards to the subcommittee and discussed portions of the purpose, definitions. and categories.

The subcommittee had the following suggestions:

- Include the use of instruments like surveys and rubrics.
- Do not narrowly define culture and climate, which could limit the number of programs.
- Include the following indicators:
  o Teacher retention
  o Student/employee attendance rates
- Review the following programs:
  o Panorama
  o YouthTruth
  o Gallop Student Poll

Academics Subcommittee

The subcommittee had the following suggestions:

- CTE should be a part of LAS since many districts have put a lot of effort into it, and their students have been working toward earning credit for those courses.
- Include other national certifications from the Perkins list that are not on the current industry-based certification list (i.e., Advanced CNE certification).
- The language needs to be consistent among groups (e.g., categories and indicators).
- The timeline of submissions and deadlines needs to be more detailed.
- Districts and campuses are only able to use current data, not lagging data.
- There should be more discussion around K–2 academic indicators.

The subcommittee had the following questions:

- How is CTE going to be used in LAS? A lot of students have been working on CTE, so we want it to be continued in the LAS plans.
- Can the STAAR retest recovery rate be used as an academic indicator?
- Can credit attainment be used as an indicator by tracking the number of credits attained in a year to track for graduation?
- Can the number of certain graduation plans be used?
- Could attendance be used as an indicator? Since it would be self-reporting, the district wouldn't have to wait on data from the state.
- What does the STAAR value added component mean? Does this mean we can use STAAR if it is not used the same way in accountability?
- Can we use continuers as a rate, which is not the same as the 5-year rate?
- Is the LAS grade considered to be from a domain, or are the categories each a domain?
- Can we use results from Algebra II and English III EOC?
- Can the annual cycle for reporting LAS outcomes be changed because the results must be combined with the state's calculations for Domains I-III and there will be a delay in the reporting of final outcomes.

Extra/Co-Curricular Subcommittee

The subcommittee had the following suggestions:

- Regarding the LAS percentage of the overall accountability rating, if districts have the decision in picking their own categories and the weightings of the categories, which will likely vary, it may bring into question the reliability requirement in statute.
- The definition of the Extra/Co-Curricular category should include organizations with activities and programs that can be measured to be considered reliable and valid.
- The indicators should include state and nationally recognized programs that are backed by research.

The subcommittee has the following suggestions for specific indicators (It will need to be determined if a district can use either participation, performance or both for each indicator.):

- 4H (Young Farmers of America)
- UIL (athletics, music, academics)
- FFA
- Ag
- Community service (Sometimes the motivation is to add to resumes for students. This may count for participation. Example: Work hours and information from Northside.)
- Scholarship applications
- FAFSA and ApplyTx (tracked in the 60x30 initiative)
- Internships
- Job shadowing (assessed by rubric rating students)
- Working while maintaining a GPA of a certain level
- Portfolio assessment paperwork (assessed by rubric)

Follow Up and Next Steps