2018 Local Accountability System Meeting
Summary of Meeting on April 25, 2018

The local accountability system (LAS) pilot participants voted in March to add a working meeting in April for districts to revise their plans with guidance from TEA and AIR. During this meeting TEA and AIR clarified districts' questions and provided rationale for answers with feedback during the stations. Pilot participants rotated through three stations, two dedicated to revising districts plans and working with TEA/AIR and each other. During the third station, TEA gathered input from the districts regarding the use of an evaluation tool after districts submit their plans. The following is a summary of the meeting:

- TEA welcomed pilot participants and introduced LAS and AIR representatives
- TEA staff presented three components of LAS evaluation guidelines
- AIR representatives presented various aspects of the Theory of Action and Logic Model
- TEA and AIR hosted three work stations: Plan Review of Metrics/Data, Evaluation Tool Concepts, and Plan Review of Components
- TEA discussed updated timelines and discussed any future potential meetings

Discussions

TEA asked the group to reflect about the top five student outcome driven priorities in their districts and share with table groups. They further discussed how these five priorities fit within the district priorities, high leverage areas and if they are being reflected in their LAS plan.

AIR staff asked participants about their goals and logic behind their LAS plan and the group discussed the following:

- What is the point of LAS? The participants responded that it should capture the full educational picture that the community values.
- What is their motivation in creating a LAS plan? The participants said they wished to communicate what their community values and report on measures that are not included in the state accountability system.
- How will their plans motivate themselves and others? The participants responded that the results will give them guidance on improving student outcomes that the community values.
- What will have to happen in their districts to achieve their LAS goals? The participants responded that they will have to define their goals, measure their results and create action plans to respond to results.

Following lunch, the group was divided into like size districts to rotate through the stations. In two stations, districts worked with their plan on the components and the metrics for each component. In the third, they discussed options and components and offered suggestions necessary for an evaluation tool to be used by TEA when reviewing the plans.

Notes from the Evaluation Tool Rotation:

The AIR representative asked participants to describe their previous feelings regarding evaluation. The participants responded with diverse responses such as frustrating, not productive, collaborative, positive and difficult to do well.

Suggestions for the required components of the evaluation tool include:

- requiring that plans focus on outputs (that include student outcomes) than inputs from the district
- inclusion of smart goals in the rationale
- using guiding concepts to write the overall rationale as well as justification for using certain components
- avoid selectively measuring students that can participate in each component, all students within a group that are eligible should be measured
- plans should include a section to describe how their plan will be auditable
- baseline data requirement should be included, using most recent data available

Districts would like to see a collaborative, somewhat iterative process in which they can maximize submission of a quality plan. Participants suggested that the plans receive a simple dichotomous rating (e.g., meets requirements/does not meet requirements, approved/not approved, or accepted/in progress). The group suggestion is that TEA will review the plan, provide descriptive feedback, and leave it up to the district to implement the required changes. If a district does not choose to make the changes by a certain deadline, they will not be included in that year for Local Accountability.

The participants suggested that TEA should train ESC representatives to work with the districts before the first submission date.

One group rotation discussed the need for a minimum number of domains and components to be included in the system. Their recommendation was that each plan should have at least two domains and three total components. They agreed that districts could pick as many as they want, but there should be a minimum requirement to see balance in plans across districts.

Another group rotation suggested instead of allowing groupings for additional plans per school type, that there be a "N/A" option for those campuses that don't fit a school type. All schools within a school type would have to meet the minimum requirements (e.g., two domains and three total components) and most of schools that have similar possible indicators could include those, while schools such as Early College High Schools, would not.

Notes from Plan Review of Components Rotation:

The AIR representative asked participants guiding questions to begin discussions regarding viable components. The larger districts had many different components due to access, but they have been able to fit these into the currently established draft domains.

The major question that once again emerged from the rotating groups was how many domains and components must be used in the plan.

Other discussion topics included the following:

- Duplication of sources but not duplication of metrics
- Use of same data for CCMR – some may be used in current year for LAS that will be part of state accountability system the next year
- Discussion of range of possible outcomes and having growth goals for each component
- Many expressed a desire to work individually with TEA and AIR teams on the specifics of components for their districts

Notes from Plan Review of Metrics Rotation:

The AIR representative had reviewed the draft plans of participants and provided feedback on common themes that were described among each of the current draft LAS plans. The feedback was kept to general thoughts and suggestions and avoided mentioning a specific district when feedback was given.

Metric feedback included the following:

- Finding a balance of quality vs. quantity - suggestions included considering course completion instead of course offering and participation. An example of measuring female students taking advanced science courses was given as opposed to measuring science course enrollment
- Metrics should be quantifiable and the data should be easy to locate if requested
- Districts should SOMETIMES avoid using percentages and instead use counts. A hypothetical example was given where two high schools of differing sizes reported percentages instead of student counts. The difference in the size of the schools would be lost to the public if percentages were used instead of student counts.
- Performance vs. participation – districts should consider performance on college assessments instead of participation with college entry exams
- Access vs growth/improvement – districts should consider deeper measures when possible instead of yes/no or met/not met results. An example was given where district could use UIL awards as a deeper metric instead of participation in certain classes such as art
- Yes/No components – district should avoid using these types of metrics and instead when possible, use performance measures that allow for growth or a range of performance levels like a rubric

- Graduation and dropout recovery – districts should consider giving credit for dropout recovery or for graduation outside of the cohort

Diploma types – participants discussed reintroducing metrics for graduation based on diploma type, which was a part of the former accountability system. Suggestions included extra points for graduates based on endorsements

- Both TEA and AIR staff reiterated the point that participants should avoid duplicating the state accountability system components in their local accountability plans.

The next two group rotations received similar feedback but also discussed how to evaluate newly created programs, such as fine arts. The eventual goal would be to evaluate based on a rubric of quality and complexity but first year programs may only have participation counts. The suggestion would be to use it as a baseline year and develop metrics to show growth for subsequent school years

Participants also asked for feedback on measuring teacher absenteeism, since it was a common issue among several districts. AIR staff recommended that districts can do this and also focus on student outcomes. A suggestion was made to look at chronic student absenteeism and metrics that would award points for reduction.