

## General Description:

House Bill (HB) 22 (85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017) established Local Accountability Systems (LAS) which allow districts and charter schools to develop plans to locally evaluate their campuses. The use of a local accountability plan is not required, and only campuses with an overall letter grade of an A, B, or C can formally tie local accountability ratings to state accountability ratings. Once plans receive approval from the agency, districts and charter schools may use locally developed domains and components with the three state-mandated domains to assign overall A–F ratings for each campus.

## Authority:

Texas Education Code (TEC), §39.0544  
House Bill 22, 85<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature, 2017

## Intent of Legislation:

The intent of the LAS is to develop a process through which districts may submit additional data that, when combined with annual state accountability data, would provide a more complete picture of district impact and performance beyond “test scores.”

The Local Accountability System (LAS) is designed to encourage districts to focus on student outcome-based components identified from community and stakeholder feedback that are important for student success. The idea is for districts to spotlight these key areas, which are also often leading indicators for desired future outcomes, rather than showcasing a broad array of indicators. The combination of local and state data will provide a more complete picture of district impact and performance beyond “test scores.” It is important that the indicators are meaningful, rigorous, and relevant to the primary goals of the district.

## Statute Program Provisions and Commissioner’s Preliminary Decisions:

As defined by statute, LAS plans

- contain levels of performance that allow for differentiation with assigned standards for achieving the differentiated levels;
- combine up to 50 percent of a campus’s overall state accountability rating for each eligible campus;
- provide for the assignment of a letter grade of A, B, C, D or F;
- meet the standards for reliability and validity;
- provide calculations for overall performance ratings that are capable of being audited by a third party;
- require districts to produce a campus scorecard to display on the agency’s website; and
- make available to the public an explanation of the methodology used to assign performance ratings.

Local Accountability System Plan Design:

- LAS plans may consist of different sets of components for each of the four school types used in the accountability system (elementary school, middle school, high school, and K–12).
- Districts may also elect to focus their LAS plan on one or more of the four school types (elementary, middle, etc.).
- All campuses within each school type must be rated on a common set of components and domains.
- Districts may customize plan components within school types by creating a school group, such as magnet HS, to ensure the applicability of all components.
- Districts must obtain TEA approval for the creation of a school group within a school type.
- Districts may not use the “better of” rating at either the component or domain level.
- LAS plans focus on key areas identified by internal and external stakeholders. It is anticipated that changes to the plan would not occur annually unless there are significant changes, such as goal attainment, campus closure, etc.
- Changes to the district LAS plan will only be permitted during designated windows within the cycle with a few exceptions that will be outlined in more detail in the rules.
- Districts may determine the assigned standards/cut scores and weighting for each domain and component as long as the plan is consistent with TEA guidelines and LAS team input and it has rigorous standards based on local baseline data (one year minimum) and any state or national standards set for the measure.

Local Accountability System Component Design:

- LAS plan components may not include exact duplicates of measures included in the state accountability system.
- LAS plans should focus on key areas identified by internal and external stakeholders. The district will be asked to provide a brief rationale for each component that describes the relevance and utility of the component as it relates to district goals.
- For each component, districts must provide information about their methodology to ensure the data is valid, reliable, and auditable, such as practices to assess representative participation in the measure.
- For each component, districts must also provide an overview of the process for data collection and analysis, including timelines for any related activities, such as staff training and/or calibration, assessment and survey windows including make-up testing and follow-up surveys (if needed).

- To ensure the rigor of the LAS process, measures such as surveys must include an auditable process for verifying interrater reliability and calibration across campuses.
- Components focused primarily on campus/district inputs will be limited both in number and in weight in order to emphasize most components focus on outputs and outcomes.
- LAS plans may include components that credit campus growth in addition to attainment/ongoing demonstration of rigorous standards to more fully capture campus impact and performance.
- As part of the plan approval process, an analysis will be conducted to ensure inclusion of components that provide disaggregated perspectives of growth and achievement of applicable student groups in addition to components that look at overall data for the campus/grade level.
- For each component, districts must submit a frequency distribution for each campus type based on the proposed standards/cut scores using district baseline data from the previous school year.
- LAS plans must include the specific weighting and scaling plan to be used for calculating campus ratings on each component before the plan can be approved. Once approved, the weighting and scaling plan may only be changed during designated windows for plan updates.

#### Local Accountability System Process Logistics:

- Campuses and/or districts will be required to store the collected data for five years or as required for audit purposes.
- Once LAS is in full implementation, TEA in coordination with a review panel will approve the plans.
- Once LAS is in full implementation, audits of campus rating data will occur both as needed to resolve discrepancies and on a random basis to help ensure the fidelity of the system. Audits will be conducted by TEA, in coordination with an audit panel.

DRAFT