

## 2018 Local Accountability System Meeting

### Summary of Meeting on March 6, 2018

The objectives for the third local accountability system (LAS) pilot participant meeting was to establish common language among pilot participants, share the work each subcommittee had done, help pilot districts develop ideas for feasible components and metrics for their proposals, and decide the date of the optional pilot working session in April 2018. Responses to questions and concerns provided by TEA during the meeting are in red, and responses from American Institutes for Research (AIR) are in blue. The following is a summary of the meeting.

- TEA staff welcomed pilot participants and introduced AIR representatives.
- TEA staff discussed the tentative timeline for implementation of LAS.
- AIR representatives facilitated collaborative activities that led to tentative definitions of domains and the discussion of viable, valid, and reliable components and metrics.

#### Questions

- Is a pilot district required to use LAS for all its campuses or only campuses it selects? [Districts will need to ensure that all eligible campuses within similar school types are evaluated.]
- Can pilot districts have different plans for each of the five campus types (elementary, middle, high, K–12, and AEA) or can there be more flexibility? [Yes.]
- Will districts using LAS resubmit their plans each year, or will their plan be a five-year commitment? [Districts will commit to LAS annually.]
- Will AIR be a third party to verify whether instruments used in pilot plans meet reliability and validity requirements? [No, the purpose of AIR's involvement is to guide the development, implementation, and sustainability of the LAS pilot program and engage in best practices for data collection, analyses and reporting.]
- What needs to be sent to TEA? [The agency needs the district's methodology; the percent LAS domain will count and supporting data with scaled scores for each domain.]
- When will districts receive the methodology for 2018 state academic accountability? [The agency has received final ESSA state plan approval from the USDE. The commissioner's final decisions will be released shortly.]
- Can LAS use safe harbor or required improvement? [No.]
- How can pilot districts make sure their rubrics are reliable and valid? [There aren't universal rules to determine reliability and validity. If the district created the rubric, they need documentation of several years for record of performance. It may vary depending on the rubric. You may need to consult a researcher to determine whether it is valid. You may need to pilot the rubric to determine reliability.]
- Must districts notify the survey provider about its use in an accountability system? [You may need to request use of the survey. Refer to the copyright information in the survey's documentation.]
- Since some of the pilot participants may not attend the April work session, their next meeting will be in June. What do we all need to do between now and then to make sure that we are in the same stage of the developmental process?

## 2018 Local Accountability System Meeting

### Summary of Meeting on March 6, 2018

[TEA requests that each district refine the following:

- Domains
- Components
- Metric
- Cut points of metrics
- Goals of each component
- Weights of Domains
- Scaled scores for each Domain
- Grades for each Domain

#### Concerns

- If it's decided that districts can have different local accountability plans for each of the five campus types, there could be unintended consequences. For example, an early college high school would have to have the same local accountability plan as a comprehensive high school. [The commissioner responded at the February meeting that it seems rational to expect that there will be a common plan submitted based on same school types, except for other groupings. An early college high school would fall under other groupings.]
- One participant noted that equity should be considered. If a district chooses to use LAS but only selects certain campuses within the district, it may be perceived as inequity.
- Outcomes of any accountability system, including LAS, will have an impact on public perception; therefore, there's a concern to publish their LAS results publicly. The development of LAS is still in the infant stages at this point. [The local accountability ratings will be public. TEA will indicate that LAS results are not official. The LAS ratings will not change the campus A–F ratings in the “What If” report, but the intent is to show how the LAS will be tied to state accountability in a separate column or report.]
- Pilot districts have sought clarification as to which metrics will be considered reliable and valid but have not received a clear answer. [It was discussed that the districts would need to provide a rationale for the use of their metrics in the plan.]
- Members have concerns about whether survey results will be available in time and whether surveys will meet the requirements for reliability and validity. [Participation, response rates, and reliability and validity of the surveys will be considered on the case by case basis.] [Simpler metrics, such as counts, percentages, averages, or rates may be more viable options for the pilot. Surveys and rubrics can be costly and require more time for vetting etc. Districts can always choose to use those in future local accountability plans.]
- Many proposed components are hard to quantify, so it is difficult to find appropriate metrics that are also valued by local communities. [If you can't quantify it, it shouldn't be used as a metric. An area in which the district would like to improve is a good component. For validity, you should assign a target and a weight before you collect the data.]
- The results of LAS can potentially have a negative impact on a campus's rating. If we want districts to implement LAS, we need the pilot to be successful.

## **2018 Local Accountability System Meeting**

### **Summary of Meeting on March 6, 2018**

- Many pilot districts already have their own ideas for LAS but worry that their plan will be rejected by TEA, so they need clear guidance to meet the requirements.

#### Suggestions

- Pilot participants strongly suggested that the commissioner allow districts to choose which campuses within their districts use the LAS.
- Pilot districts suggested that districts should have the freedom to make campus groupings, to choose which campuses use LAS, and to choose which domains are used in LAS.
- One pilot district noted that some districts may choose to include financial or resource efficacy in LAS. As a group, they need to consider which domain it may fall under. Another member noted that financial ratings are already issued to districts by the state, and typically, finances are overseen at the district level, not the campus level.
- One pilot district noted that some districts may choose to include campus initiatives as a component. As a group, they need to consider which domain it may fall under.
- An AIR representative suggested that in consideration of time constraints, pilot districts may want to think about using instruments that are already established as viable, reliable, and valid.
- A pilot participant suggested that the group consider the work in other states that has already been done concerning local accountability.

#### Recommendation

- The majority of pilot participants recommended to allow districts to choose which campuses within the district use LAS.
- The Programs subcommittee will have one additional meeting together. All other subcommittees decided that they will no longer meet.