Local Accountability System Guide

The *Local Accountability System Guide* is designed to explain the requirements of creating a local accountability system.

These materials may be revised during the plan development and submission process.

For more information visit https://tea.texas.gov/las.aspx or contact the Local Accountability System at las@tea.texas.gov.

Due to COVID-19-related uncertainty about school schedules, the local accountability team is temporarily adopting a flexible approach to district development of a local accountability plan. Please reach out to set up a virtual meeting to discuss your district's unique circumstances and to ask questions.

Updated on August 10, 2020

Contents

Section 1—Local Accountability System Overview

The *Local Accountability System Guide* is designed to explain the requirements of creating a local accountability plan.

Local accountability system details and supporting materials are available online at https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/accountability/academic-accountability/local-accountability-system.

Overview of the Local Accountability System

House Bill (HB) 22 (85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017) established the Local Accountability System (LAS) to allow districts and open-enrollment charter schools to develop local accountability plans for their campuses.

Similar to the state accountability system ratings, a district's local accountability plan provides stakeholders with detailed information about school performance and progress over time. Local accountability plans may vary by school type (elementary school, middle school, high school, and K–12) and by school group but must apply equally to all campuses as applicable by school type and group. Once approved by the Texas Education Agency (TEA), it is expected that a plan be operational and relatively unchanged for three to five years.

Through the creation and publication of a local accountability plan based on campus needs and goals, a district communicates priorities and demonstrates a commitment to achieving the components in the plan. The dissemination of local accountability plan ratings by TEA and the district signifies the importance of the local goals and documents progress at the campus level.

At the end of each school year, districts and open-enrollment charter schools assign overall and domain-specific letter grade ratings of *A*–*F* for each campus, according to performance outcomes, as outlined in the approved local accountability plan. Campuses with an overall rating of *A*, *B*, or *C* (based on student performance at that campus) under the state accountability system for the applicable year of the plan may combine state and local accountability ratings with the state rating contributing at least 50 percent of the combined rating. The local accountability plan campus ratings do not affect the state accountability system rating at the district level.

Who Is Rated?

All campuses with an approved district plan are eligible to receive local accountability ratings. Campuses with an overall state accountability rating of *C* or higher (based on ratings derived from student performance at that campus) are eligible to combine an overall local accountability rating with the overall state accountability rating to determine the combined rating. Beginning the first year they report fall enrollment, campuses and open-enrollment charter schools, including alternative education campuses (AECs), are rated under the state accountability system based on the performance of their students.

For the purposes of assigning state accountability ratings, campuses that do not serve any grade level for which the STAAR assessments are administered are paired with campuses in their district that serve students who take STAAR. Campuses not rated under the state accountability system are not eligible to combine state and local ratings. Local accountability data for campuses without state ratings may be displayed on TEA, district, and campus websites but will not be combined with state accountability data. Please see the state accountability manual for the applicable year for more information about campus ratings and eligibility.

School Types

Districts and open-enrollment charter schools create local accountability plans based on school type (elementary school, middle school, high school, or K–12) which include all campuses within a school type. The district or open-enrollment charter school may also request to identify an additional school group within a school type for which to customize the local accountability plan.

For example, a district may request to identify a school group consisting of elementary-level magnet schools and customize a local accountability plan with components specific to that group. Otherwise, all campuses within a school type must be evaluated on a common set of district-determined components. Districts and open-enrollment charter schools may also request to identify schools rated under alternative education accountability (AEA) provisions as a unique school type.

Local Accountability Plan Process

1. Plan Development

    - Interested districts should attend a required TEA-sponsored training or individual sessions with the local accountability system team.
    - District staff, in collaboration with stakeholder groups, evaluate data and local initiatives to set goals for student outcomes.
    - District staff determine appropriate measures and examine baseline data for the outcomes outlined in the plan.
    - District staff develop a comprehensive plan using valid and reliable measures that include at least one year of baseline data.
    - In general, baseline data is used to set achievement levels, where the baseline average represents a *C*, or mid-level range. Campus rating levels are created from baseline data and district goals to contain levels of performance that allow for differentiated levels. Districts are encouraged to include one-, two-, and three-year goals in their plan to track progress over time. See related sections for detailed information about plan and component requirements.

2. Plan Submission, Revision, and Approval

    - Districts and open-enrollment charter schools submit a local accountability plan for review by agency staff. TEA staff provide feedback and work collaboratively with districts to refine plans for approval. All local accountability system plans must be approved by TEA.
    - As outlined in statute, a review panel that includes a majority of members who are superintendents or members of the board or governing body of school districts or open-enrollment charter schools with approved local accountability plans is convened when TEA determines there are ten or more approved plans. The third-party review panel approves or denies the submitted plan.

3. Plan Implementation

    - The first year after plan approval is considered the initial implementation year. During the initial implementation year, districts have the option of submitting local accountability ratings for official combination with state ratings. If districts do not submit ratings for official combination, they may choose to revise the plan and resubmit for approval based on experiences during the initial implementation year.
    - When a district submits data for official combination, an approved plan is considered established for the subsequent three years. During the established plan period, districts are expected to submit local accountability ratings for each campus. Ratings will be officially combined for eligible campuses (rated C or higher under the state accountability system). If a district chooses not to

participate for a minimum of two additional years, the plan will be considered void and a district will need to resubmit a plan(s) and receive approval from TEA to participate in the local accountability system at a later date.

4. Ratings Submission and Approval

- Districts and open-enrollment charter schools submit component, domain, and overall scaled scores and ratings for each campus under an approved district plan according to the annual timeline.
- TEA posts the combined overall and domain scaled scores and ratings at https://txschools.gov/. Other TEA public websites display the separate overall state and local accountability scores and ratings along with the weight assigned to each accountability system.
- Districts and open-enrollment charter schools must post local accountability system component, domain, and overall scores and ratings along with rationales for goals, and methodologies for calculations on the district website(s).

TEA will work with districts to set timelines for participating and interested districts.

Section 2—Local Accountability Plan Design, Submission, and Approval

Plan Development Process

Prior to submitting a local accountability plan, districts and open-enrollment charter schools should engage in a process of data review and goal-setting related to student outcomes that includes school board and community involvement. Prior to submitting a plan for the first time, districts and open-enrollment charter schools are required to attend TEA-sponsored training.

TEC §39.0544 (b)(1) states the following:

The plan may be approved only if after review

- the agency determines the plan meets the minimum requirements under this section and agency rule;
- at the commissioner's discretion, an audit conducted by the agency verifies the calculations included in the plan; and
- if at least 10 school districts or open-enrollment charter schools have obtained approval of locally developed accountability, the plan is subject to a review panel appointed by the commissioner.

According to the annual timeline of the school year for which the plan is applicable, districts and open-enrollment charter schools are required to submit local accountability plan component, domain, and overall scaled scores and ratings to TEA by the first week of July immediately following the plan year. TEA calculates combined ratings for eligible campuses by weighting the local accountability overall scaled score at the proportion determined by the district in combination with the state accountability overall scaled score. Campuses with an overall rating of *C* or better based on the performance of their students under the state accountability system have both the state and local accountability overall ratings posted on the campus report cards along with a combined overall rating. Campuses with a *D* or *F* under the state rating system, or campuses without a campus-specific state rating based on the performance of their students, have the local accountability rating displayed on the campus report card but do not receive a combined overall rating.

Typically, TEA approves district or open-enrollment charter school local accountability system plans for an initial implementation year followed by a three-year implementation period. At the end of each three-year period, the district or open-enrollment charter school has the option to modify and resubmit a local accountability plan. If a significant local change occurs during the three-year period such that a part of the plan is no longer viable, the district or open-enrollment charter school may request a modification to the approved local accountability plan. A school district or open-enrollment charter school approved to assign local accountability ratings must comply with TEC §39.0544(e)(1). Failure to do so subjects the district or open-enrollment charter school to agency actions and interventions under TEC Chapters 39.

Required District Postings

TEC §39.0544 (a)(5)(6) and §39.0544 (e)(2) require districts and open-enrollment charter schools produce a campus score card for display on the district's website. The campus score card should include at a minimum the scaled score and rating for each component and domain along with the overall rating. Districts and open-enrollment charter schools are required to include an explanation of the methodology used to assign performance ratings under the local accountability system. A link to the local accountability ratings posted by the district must be provided to the agency and is included on the school report card located on https://txschools.gov/.

Section 3—Ratings, Audits, and Appeals

Ratings Submission Process

Component, domain, and overall outcomes must be scaled to a common metric and submitted to the agency for each campus rated under an approved local accountability plan. In order to combine local accountability scores with state accountability scores, each component and domain score is required to be scaled to a 30–100 range, with the following cut points:

Cut Points	Rating
90–100	A
80–89	B
70–79	C
60–69	D
<30–59	F

Ratings Review Process

All scaled scores and letter grades submitted by districts are subject to audit. Any data discrepancies or any indication that data have been compromised may result in verification and audit of district and campus data used to assign local accountability ratings. The audit process may include requests for data used for campus-level calculation of component and domain scaled scores.

On an annual basis, TEA randomly selects districts or open-enrollment charter schools for a local accountability audit, and, for each such audit, TEA randomly selects components for review. Selected districts and open-enrollment charter schools must submit the requested data for review within the timeframe specified. Districts and open-enrollment charter schools must maintain documentation of the local accountability plan along with all associated data used to assign campus ratings for two years after the end of the plan implementation period.

Ratings Appeal Process and Timeline

A successful local accountability appeal is usually limited to situations such as a calculation error attributable to TEA or testing contractor. Accurate data is fundamental to local accountability ratings. The local accountability system depends upon the responsible collection and submission of data by school districts and open-enrollment charter schools. Responsibility for the accuracy and quality of data used to determine local accountability ratings, therefore, rests with each district and open-enrollment charter school. Superintendent certification of data accuracy during the ratings submission process includes an assurance that calculations have been verified to ensure that all data were included as appropriate for all components.

Appeals may be submitted by the superintendent or chief operating officer once ratings are released. The local accountability appeals timeline follows the appeal deadline dates and

processes as described in the state accountability manual for the applicable year. Please refer to the state accountability manual for exact deadlines and details about the appeal submission process.

Due to the diversity and number of districts, open-enrollment charter schools, and campuses in Texas, as well as the range of data sources eligible for inclusion in local accountability, there may be situations that are not specifically addressed in this guide. If an approved data source is unintentionally affected by unforeseen circumstances, such as natural disasters and test administration issues, the commissioner of education will consider those circumstances and the impact in determining whether or how that data source will be used to calculate ratings for the LAS.

Section 4—Local Accountability System Timeline

Should unforeseen circumstances occur, some dates may be modified. To receive weekly updates on the local accountability system, please subscribe to the Performance Reporting list serve on TEA's website at https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/TXTEA/subscriber/new.

Interested districts should commit to participating in the local accountability system for a period of at least five years. Below is a brief description of the timeline and activities from plan development to full implementation.

Year One—Plan Development

Interested districts participate in required training opportunities sponsored by TEA to begin plan development. During this year, districts examine data, identify needs, develop a strategic plan, and determine data sources for measuring outcomes.

At least one year of baseline data for each data source is needed for inclusion in the plan. If at least one year of baseline data is not available and the data source includes standards based on a nationally normed sample, that information may be used to set district goals as a substitution for baseline data.

A district may choose to wait to submit a plan, or to include a specific component, when baseline data is available. After the development of a plan that includes baseline data for each outcome, a district submits the plan to TEA for review, which may include review by an external panel. Upon approval of the plan, the district enters the applicable cohort of participating districts.

Year Two—Initial Implementation

Districts with approved plans move into an initial year of implementation. During the initial implementation year, officially combining local and state ratings for public dissemination is optional. In addition, districts may work with TEA to refine aspects of the plan for re-submission and finalization for the remaining three years of participation in the local accountability system.

Years Three through Five—Combined Local and State Ratings

After the initial year of implementation, the district plan is established, and local accountability ratings are required to be posted for each campus. For campuses eligible for combined ratings, and receiving a "C" or higher on the state accountability system, the state and local accountability ratings are combined as outlined in the approved district plan.

After one year of plan establishment, defined by TEA posting the combined state and local accountability system ratings for eligible campuses, the district is expected to participate for a minimum of an additional two years. If a district chooses not to participate for a minimum of two additional years, the plan will be considered void and a district will need to resubmit a plan(s) and receive approval from TEA to participate in the local accountability system at a later date.

Timeline for Local Accountability Plans Applied to 2020–21

Interested districts are invited to contact TEA to discuss the process for developing and submitting a local accountability plan. Timelines will be customized based on discussion between the district and TEA.

Section 5—Plan and Component Specifications

Plan Rubric

	Exceptional	Acceptable	Needs Revision
Rationale	Rationale is clearly explained and based on district goals, thorough data analysis, and community input. Plan represents district priorities with the potential to positively impact all students with clear differentiation for student groups/school types.	Rationale is adequately explained and based on district goals, data analysis, and community input. Component represents a district priority with the potential to positively impact students.	Rationale is not clearly explained with no clear links to district goals, data analysis and community input. It is not clear how the component represents a district priority with the potential to impact students.
Components	Components address student outcomes, or areas clearly related to student outcomes, with clear definitions of student growth. Components are valid, reliable, and representative of strategic district goals with opportunity to show long-term growth patterns.	Components address student outcomes or areas clearly related to student outcomes, with potential for growth. Components are valid, reliable and representative of district goals.	Components do not address a student outcome, or areas clearly related to student outcomes, or show the potential for growth. Components are limited to current district achievements and do not differentiate across campuses.
School type	Components are clearly aligned to needs and goals of school type or group. When one or more related components across school types or groups are included, the plan incorporates longitudinal goal-setting and monitoring.	Components reflect needs and goals of school type or group.	Components do not reflect the needs and goals of the school type or group.
Student group	Components fully capture the student population and focus on improving performance of all student groups (i.e., equity). Components are selected to address specific needs of different student groups to improve outcomes.	Components adequately capture the student population and focus on improving performance of all student groups (i.e. components foster equity).	Components do not capture the student group population. Components do not address educational equity across student groups.
Baseline Data	Baseline data provides a clear basis for including component (i.e., need) and is used to create a scaling system that places current averages, or mid-points, at a scale concurrent with clearly defined growth goals.	Baseline data provides a basis for including component and is used to create a scaling system that places current averages, or mid-points, at a scale concurrent with adequately defined growth goals.	Baseline data is not included in the plan used in scaling process.

	Exceptional	Acceptable	Needs Revision
Rating Cut-points and Goal-setting	A–F rating scale for each component provides for differentiation and growth across campuses with clear links to district goals and student needs. Ratings are defined and goal-oriented rather than year-to-year improvement of any rate. Ratings are based on data and clearly-defined with the average associated with "C," or mid-range levels.	A–F rating scale for each component provides for differentiation and growth across campuses. Ratings are goal-oriented rather than simply year-to-year improvement of any rate. Ratings are based on data and clearly defined with the average associated with "C," or mid-range levels.	A–F rating scale for each component does not provide for differentiation or growth across campuses. Ratings are not based on data and the average is not associated with "C," or mid-range levels.
Weighting	Weighting is consistent with guidelines and district goals. Components are weighted based on targeted student outcomes and prioritized by student need.	Weighting is consistent with guidelines. Components are weighted based on targeted student outcomes rather than inputs.	Weighting is inconsistent with guidelines and district goals.
Data source	Data sources are clearly defined and based on reliable and valid measures encompassing multiple data points. Data source measures allow for growth and do not include sources where a ceiling effect is evident. For example, a campus rating scale where a majority of campuses are rated at the top level (i.e., exemplary) would not be allowable as a data source for a local accountability system component.	Data sources are clearly defined and based on reliable and valid measures encompassing multiple data points as appropriate (i.e., overall ratings rather than a single item from a test or survey). Data source measures allow for growth and do not include sources where a ceiling effect is evident. For example, a campus rating scale where a majority of campuses are rated at the top level (i.e., exemplary) would not be allowable as a data source for a local accountability system component.	Data sources are not clearly defined. Data sources are based on limited or a single data point (i.e., limited test items, single survey question). Data source measures show a clear ceiling effect where the majority of campuses are already rated at the top level (i.e., exemplary). These data sources are not allowable as a local accountability system component. Data sources are not based on valid and reliable measures.
Data collection	Data collection process is clearly defined with target populations, including groups used in the numerator and denominator (when applicable), sampling frames, collection windows, calibration of raters, and allowable accommodations.	Data collection process is adequately defined with target populations, including groups used in the numerator and denominator (when applicable), collection windows, calibration of raters, and allowable accommodations.	Data collection process is not defined.
Conversion to 30–100 Scale	Plan includes a chart, or formula, showing how each raw campus rating will be converted to a 30–100 scale (A=90–100; B=80–89; C=70–79; D=60–69; F= below 59). Conversions are a one-to-one correspondence for each range.	Plan includes a chart, or formula, showing how each raw campus rating will be converted to a 30–100 scale (A=90–100; B=80–89; C=70–79; D=60–69; F= below 59). Conversions are a one-to-one correspondence for each range.	Plan does not include chart, or formula, showing how each raw campus rating will be converted to a 30–100 scale (A=90–100; B=80–89; C=70–79; D=60–69; F= below 59). Conversions are not a one-to-one correspondence for each range.

Plan Domains and Components

Local accountability plans may include measures in up to five domains:

- Academics
- Culture and climate
- Extra-and co-curricular
- Future-ready learning
- Locally-determined

Local accountability plan components, or measures, represent the goals of the plan. Districts select components by reviewing data related to the district vision and priorities, identifying needs, developing a strategic plan, and determining reliable and valid data sources for measuring outcomes.

Districts should strive to create a coherent plan, reflective of district priorities, that includes a variety of components with different types of measures to adequately capture the intent of the local accountability plan.

Districts may choose which domain each component will represent (see Scaling and Weighting for more information) with a minimum of two components and a maximum of ten per plan (by school type/group).

Districts should carefully consider availability of data across campuses when selecting components. Local accountability plans apply to all campuses within a school type, or applicable group; data used to measure components should be available for all applicable campuses. Additional information about components is provided in the Exemplars section.

Measures and Data Source

At least one year of baseline data for each data source is needed for inclusion in the plan. If at least one year of baseline data is not available, and the data source includes standards based on a nationally normed sample, that information may be used to set district goals as a substitution for baseline data. Interested districts should contact TEA to discuss individual district circumstances. In some cases, beginning-of-year data may be compared to end-of-year outcomes in lieu of baseline data.

A district may choose to wait to submit a plan, or to include a component, when baseline data is available. After the development of a plan that includes baseline data for each outcome, a district submits the plan to TEA for review. Upon approval of the plan, the district enters the applicable cohort of participating districts. (See the District Timeline for more information.)

If a district chooses to use the face value of the average performance level, rather than use the average performance level, or baseline used to set the C, or mid-range value, the plan may have no more than one component with the face value of the average performance used to set the campus rating scale and the component may carry no more than 10% of the overall plan weight.

For example, if the district average is 80% of elementary students reading at or above grade level, and the district chooses to set the campus rating scale to the face value of the district average (in this case a B on a A-F scale comparable to the state system where an A= 90–100; B= 80–89; C= 70–79; D= 60–69; F= 30-59, then the plan may have no more than one component with a campus rating scale that uses the district average to set above the C, or mid-range, and the component weight may be no more than 10%.

A second example is when a small district has a single campus for which the district baseline data is calculated. In this instance, a district may choose to use several years of baseline data, or if the district chooses to use the current levels at face-value, rather than to set the rating scale, there is a limit of one such component per plan weighted at no more than 10%.

In the case of components where current levels are not used to set the campus rating scale to a C, or mid-level range, the agency may require the district to re-evaluate the inclusion of the component on an annual basis.

Experience vs. Opportunity

As is the case for all components, measures used must be valid and reliable with at least one year of baseline data used to calibrate the average, or mid-range, of the campus rating scale. In addition, participation-based components should include evidence based on established research findings, or documentation collected at the local level, that show a relationship between participation and other student growth measures.

Acceptable Components

Participation-related components that measure *ongoing and meaningful experiences* are generally acceptable. Examples include *sustained* participation in choice-based activities related to academics, athletics, fine arts, music, or other areas. The expectation is for *participation over time* measured by attendance, hours, or other counts of experience. The district must define participation at an acceptable level and clearly articulate the data collection procedure.

Not Acceptable Components

Components that measure the *opportunity to participate*, or number of clubs, meetings, or events *offered* are generally not acceptable.

Components that report *participation in single events* (career fair night, parent night, single performance or competition) are generally not acceptable.

All Students vs. Student Groups

Districts are encouraged to thoughtfully consider the populations included in participation-related components when creating a local accountability system plan. Use of historical data and district priorities can help determine the district focus and populations included in participation-related components.

Questions to consider include:

- Is the district focusing on ensuring *all* students are participating?
- Is the district focusing on *under-represented groups* to ensure equity?
- Is the district including a significant number of students, or focusing on improving equity to necessitate inclusion of component in district local accountability system plan?

Statute Requirements

Statute requires that measures adhere to the following criteria:

(A) contains levels of performance that allow for differentiation, with assigned standards for achieving the differentiated levels;
(B) provides for the assignment of a letter grade of A, B, C, D, or F; and
(C) meets standards for reliability and validity.

Specifically, in order to create measures that contain levels of performance that allow for differentiation, with assigned standards for achieving differentiated levels, districts should examine baseline data for each measure, calculating the range and average performance across campuses. Using this information, along with the performance goals set by the district, the performance levels can be set to reflect placing the average at a C, or mid-level, range and creating the remaining levels to reflect levels of differentiation that correspond with current district rates and goals.

In order to provide for the assignment of a letter grade of A, B, C, D, or F, districts should use the levels of differentiation created from the current baseline average and goals to set standards for each level based on setting the average at a C, or mid-level, with the higher A and B levels designating levels considered exceptional and good, respectively, with the lower D and F levels designating levels considered needs improvement and unacceptable, respectively.

Example: Setting a Campus Rating Scale

Based on results from standardized early reading indicators, the district analyzes three years of baseline data to show that, district-wide, approximately 80% of students are exiting kindergarten with a mastery of kindergarten skills.

The district uses the baseline data to set a scaling system for assigning campuses grades of A–F. The baseline average, 80%, is used to set the "C," or mid-level range, at 75–84%. The cut points for the higher ranges are based on the component outcome and district goals.

In this example, the district set the "A" range to reflect 95–100% of students exiting with a mastery of kindergarten skills to align with district priorities of having all students enter first-grade with the necessary skills.

For kindergarten, the A–F rating system uses the percentage of students exiting kindergarten with a mastery of kindergarten skills.

A= 95–100%

B= 85–94%

C= 75–84%

D= 65–74%

F= 64% and below

This campus rating system results in 2 campuses at the *A* rating, 3 campuses at the *B* rating, 10 campuses at the *C* rating, 4 campuses at the *D* rating, and 2 campuses at the *F* rating.

Reliability and Validity

As required by statute, measures must meet standards for reliability and validity.

In terms of **specific measures, tests, or ratings**:

*A measure is considered **reliable** if it delivers consistent results across administrations.*

> Examples include forms of assessments that have been created and tested to be equivalent to each other and observational ratings conducted by trained and assessed raters who have reached a level of consistency with each other.

*A measure is considered **valid** if the resulting outcome represents what the test is designed to measure.*

> Examples include content-specific tests focused on the related content topic, surveys designed to capture beliefs and attitudes about certain topics, and rating protocols with clearly defined observational evidence.

***Reliability** and **validity** are closely related, and both must be evident for a measure, test, or rating to be included as component outcomes in a local accountability system plan.*

In terms of the **overall local accountability system plan,** in addition to including reliable and valid measures:

*A plan is considered **reliable** if it is applicable over time across campuses.*

*A plan is considered **valid** to the degree that the results show progress toward meaningful local student outcome goals.*

Examples of measures, or use of results, that are not reliable nor valid include:	Potential solutions to increase reliability and validity:
• Use of a single, or a few, items from a longer test or survey designed to be administered and scored as a whole. An equivalent example would be the use of two to three questions from a STAAR test that are used as the sole determination of student achievement and progress.	• Use of a measure designed to capture the intended outcome.
• Use of scales, such as Lexile ratings, that are used in ways that were not intended by the design of the scale. For example, the conversion charts of STAAR raw scores and Lexile levels were designed to suggest accessible reading levels for students scoring at different levels on the STAAR, not as ways to measure growth across administrations.	• Using scales and measures in the way they were intended by the design.

Examples of measures, or use of results, that are not reliable nor valid include:	Potential solutions to increase reliability and validity:
• Use of components that are based on availability of resources or participation counts rather than on measurable outcomes.	• Select components that focus on student outcomes or areas directly related to student outcomes.

Weighting

Domains are weighted as the sum of component weights. Example: A domain with 3 components of 10%, 50%, and 20% would have a weight of 80% of overall plan. A plan could have from one to four additional components across different domain(s) for the remaining 20%.

Components may carry a weight ranging from 5% to a maximum of 60% for a total of two to ten components per school type plan. The assignment of individual component weighting is determined by districts in accordance with the data sources and measures of the individual components as well as the overall plan. For example, if a plan has five components, the relative weight of each component would be determined by the measure, source, and outcome of the component.

The overall local accountability rating and the combined rating for each campus are presented on the TEA/report card website. Districts are required to include domain component descriptions and ratings on district/campus websites.

Scaled Score Guidelines

Districts must use a one-to-one correspondence for ratings to a scaled score when converting campus grades for each component to a 30 to 100 scale for local accountability ratings. The floor of 30 was selected to align with the state accountability system that uses this same scale for the F rating.

The formula for calculating the scaled score from each raw score is as follows:

Scaled score= (upper limit of scale score interval range)—((scale score interval difference)*(upper limit of RAW interval -RAW))/RAW interval for range

An example of calculating a conversion between the campus rating system and the scaled scores is below.

Example: Calculating Scaled Scores from a Campus Rating Range

A district administers an early reading indicator to students exiting first grade. Baseline data shows that, district-wide, about 62% of students are currently meeting expectations as defined

by national norms provided by the assessment. The district uses the baseline information to set the mid-level range of 55-69% of students meeting expectations as a C. The A–F grade ranges are listed below. These ranges are used to communicate goals and annual results to campuses and community stakeholders.

The percentages represent the first year of district goal-setting with the percentages representing the A and B levels becoming higher over the next few years as the district implements a scientifically-based early reading program district-wide.

Percentage of First Grade Students Meeting End-of-Year Reading Expectations	
Range	**Rating**
85%–100%	A
70%–84%	B
55%–69%	C
40%–54%	D
≤ 39%	F

To calculate scaled score ratings to submit to TEA, campus grade ranges must be converted to a 30–100 scale using the ranges set in the campus grading system. The grade ranges must have a one-to-one correspondence between each grade level range and the corresponding range representing each segment of the scaled score (A=90–100; B=80–89; C=70–79; D=60-69; F=59–30).

Component scaled scores should be rounded to the tenths place and domain scaled scores should be rounded to the nearest whole number using the convention of .5 or above as the cut-point for rounding.

Step 1: Calculate the increments in each grade range. For the example above, the increments are the same for A–D at 15 points each.

Step 2: Next, divide the grade range increments by the number of corresponding points. In this case, the grade range increments are all 15 points and the scaled score range is ten interval points (90–100). 15/10=1.5.

Step 3: The bottom range for an A on the grading scale is an 85 which corresponds to a 90 on the 30–100 scale. Adding 1.5 to 85 results in 86.5 and creates a range of percentages (85 to 86.4) from the grading scale that correspond to a 90 on the scaled score. A range is created from the grading scale for each scaled score by repeating the addition of 1.5 to each consecutive number.

Step 4: If the grade ranges are not the same across categories, calculate the range for each by dividing the number of grade range points by the number of point in the corresponding scaled score interval to obtain the interval increments. For the F range example, the grade range is any score below 39% corresponds to an F. In order to create

the range for corresponding 30–100 scale, divide 39 by 30 which represents the campus grade range of F (0% to 39%) divided by the scaled score range of 30 to 59 (30 interval points) to obtain 1.3. The 0 of the campus grading scale corresponds to a 30 on the scaled score and increases by 1.3 on the campus grading scale for each 30–59 scaled score point on the F range.

The chart below shows the campus rating scale and the scaled score equivalent for each campus rating based on the example described in this section.

Example: Campus Rating Range and Corresponding Scaled Scores

Component Letter Grade	Min %	Max %
A	85	100
B	70	84
C	55	69
D	40	54
F	0	39

% range from grading scale minimum	% range from grading scale maximum	Scale Score	Scale Score Letter Grade
100	100	**100**	A
98.5	99.9	**99**	A
97	98.4	**98**	A
95.5	96.9	**97**	A
94	95.4	**96**	A
92.5	93.9	**95**	A
91	92.4	**94**	A
89.5	90.9	**93**	A
88	89.4	**92**	A
86.5	87.9	**91**	A
85	86.4	**90**	A

83.5	84.9	**89**	B
82	83.4	**88**	B
80.5	81.9	**87**	B
79	80.4	**86**	B
77.5	78.9	**85**	B
76	77.4	**84**	B
74.5	75.9	**83**	B
73	74.4	**82**	B
71.5	72.9	**81**	B
70	71.4	**80**	B
68.5	69.9	**79**	C
67	68.4	**78**	C
65.5	66.9	**77**	C
64	65.4	**76**	C
62.5	63.9	**75**	C
61	62.4	**74**	C
59.5	60.9	**73**	C
58	59.4	**72**	C
56.5	57.9	**71**	C
55	56.4	**70**	C
53.5	54.9	**69**	D
52	53.4	**68**	D
50.5	51.9	**67**	D
49	50.4	**66**	D
47.5	48.9	**65**	D
46	47.4	**64**	D
44.5	45.9	**63**	D
43	44.4	**62**	D
41.5	42.9	**61**	D

40	41.4	**60**	D
37.7	38.9	**59**	F
36.4	37.6	**58**	F
35.1	36.3	**57**	F
33.8	35	**56**	F
32.5	33.7	**55**	F
31.2	32.4	**54**	F
29.9	31.1	**53**	F
28.6	29.8	**52**	F
27.3	28.5	**51**	F
26	27.2	**50**	F
24.7	25.9	**49**	F
23.4	24.6	**48**	F
22.1	23.3	**47**	F
20.8	22	**46**	F
19.5	20.7	**45**	F
18.2	19.4	**44**	F
16.9	18.1	**43**	F
15.6	16.8	**42**	F
14.3	15.5	**41**	F
13	14.2	**40**	F
11.7	12.9	**39**	F
10.4	11.6	**38**	F
9.1	10.3	**37**	F
7.8	9	**36**	F
6.5	7.7	**35**	F
5.2	6.4	**34**	F
3.9	5.1	**33**	F
2.6	3.8	**32**	F

1.3	2.5	**31**	F
0	1.2	**30**	F

Example: Scaling Categorical Data

Categorical data, or data not on a continuous scale, can be converted to the standard scale (A=90-100; B=80=89; C=70=79; D=60-69; F= 30-59) by assigning the maximum value for each scaled score interval with the corresponding category used in the campus rating scale.

Example: The campus rating scale uses a categorical 5-point rating of Exceptional; Very Good; Acceptable; Needs Improvement; and Not Acceptable. In order to submit scaled scores for each rating, the district uses the maximum value for each scaled score interval by assigning the following values.

Categorical Rating	Standard Scale Rating	Standard Scale Score
Exceptional	A	100
Very Good	B	89
Acceptable	C	79
Needs Improvement	D	69
Not Acceptable	F	59

Example: District Priorities, Components, and Measures

District staff, in collaboration with school board members, community leaders, and school stakeholders, have developed a series of campus priorities.

Priority One: Increase reading proficiency for all students in grades K–5.

Priority Two: Expand access and success in *Algebra I* to all students in Grade 8.

Priority Three: Provide support for all teachers to successfully implement and integrate social and emotional learning practices throughout the school day.

Priority Four: Improve parent relationships and perceptions of school staff at all grade levels.

In order to move from district priorities to measurable outcomes for a local accountability system plan, district leaders discussed possible data collection sources and examined existing data. Details by priority area are listed below.

Priority One: Increase reading proficiency for all students in grades K–5.

The district decided to look at reading proficiency across two levels: Grade K–2 and Grade 3–5.

Grade K–2: The district examined early reading indicator scores collected from existing assessments (Istation, DIBELS, and TPRI) and found that on average, 65% of all students

were reading at or above grade level in Grade K–2. When disaggregated, 43% of students classified as economically disadvantaged were reading at or above grade level. Using this baseline data, and district-established five-year goals for improving reading achievement, the district created campus rating scales (A–F) to create two separate components (all students and economically disadvantaged) for campuses with students in Grade K–2.

Campus Rating Scale	All Students Reading at or Above Grade Level	Economically Disadvantaged Students Reading at or Above Grade Level
A	**90–100%**	**85–100%**
B	**76–89%**	**60–84%**
C	**60–75%**	**40–59%**
D	**50–59%**	**30–39%**
F	**49 ≤**	**29 ≤**

Grade 3–5: The district examined STAAR scores and through conversations with instructional staff decided to focus on the amount of time spent reading individually and increase the number of books students are reading in Grade 3–5. This is in addition to providing targeted instruction for students reading below grade level. An examination of Accelerated Reader® records showed students in Grade 3–5 logged fewer than 15 minutes independent reading time per day and on average, completed independent reading of four books (at individual reading levels) per year. The district created campus rating scales based on five-year goals for all students to measure both time spent reading independently daily and the total number of books read per year. Data is collected from daily logs and the Accelerated Reader® system.

Campus Rating Scale	Average Independent Reading Time (minutes per school day)	Average Total Number of Books Read Independently (per school year)
A	**30+ minutes**	**10+ books**
B	**21–29 minutes**	**7–9 books**
C	**15–20 minutes**	**4–6 books**
D	**10–14 minutes**	**2–3 books**
F	**10 ≤ minutes**	**1 ≤ books**

Priority Two: Expand access to and success in *Algebra I* to all students in Grade 8.

The district examined data related to math course enrollment and outcomes for students in Grade 8 across the district. The data showed differences across student groups and campuses in terms of enrollment. Districtwide, about 57% of Grade 8 students were enrolled in Algebra I with some campuses having nearly all students enrolled and some campuses barely enrolling enough students to fill one course period (15% of Grade 8 students). Overall, of students enrolled in Algebra I, about 60% received a passing grade of *C* or higher on the course and 30% successfully completed the end-of-course exam by the end of ninth grade (which is captured by the state accountability system).

Based on the data and districtwide five-year goals, the district decided to include % of Grade 8 students enrolled in Algebra I and successful completion of the course as indicated by a passing course grade as local accountability system plan components.

Campus Rating Scale	Percentage of Grade 8 Students Enrolled in Algebra I	Percentage of Grade 8 Students Receiving a Passing Grade in Algebra I
A	**85%–100%**	**85–100%**
B	**75–84%**	**61–84%**
C	**45–74%**	**50–60%**
D	**30–44%**	**30–49%**
F	**29% ≤**	**29% ≤**

Priority Three: Provide support for all teachers to successfully implement and integrate social and emotional learning practices throughout the school day.

The district has engaged in extensive professional development opportunities for campus and district level staff related to social and emotional learning practices. As part of this investment, the district contracts with an accredited organization to conduct annual site visits that include campus-wide appraisals of systems and routines that support social and emotional learning in students and individual teacher observations. The organization provides each campus with a detailed report that includes an overall campus rating score and a narrative describing both positive findings and areas in need of improvement. The report rates campuses on a five-point scale (1=needs improvement; 2=minimally acceptable; 3=adequate; 4=good; 5=exceptional).

Districtwide, the average campus rating is a 2.3. The district opts to align the campus rating scale with the rating provided by the contractor and sets the following using baseline data and five-year goals.

Campus Rating Scale	Campus Rating Provided by External Contractor
A	**5**
B	**4**
C	**3**
D	**2**
F	**1**

Priority Four: Improve family/parent relationships and perceptions of school staff at all grade levels.

The district values family engagement and relationships with school staff and has set a goal of increasing parent and family perceptions of school staff as it related to academics, climate, and respect. An annual survey (30 items; designed by a researcher) is distributed in multiple languages for completion by a parent or family member with a 60% response rate goal (measured as number of completed surveys/number of students at campus). In order for a campus to include the survey as part of the local accountability system rating, the response rate must be at least 30%.

Based on previous survey administrations, the districtwide average is 70% positive perceptions of school staff. The district does a further examination of survey data and finds differences by school type. The district sets the campus rating scales by school type and uses the baseline average, and five-year goals, for each school type to set the C, or mid-level range.

Campus Rating Scale	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
A	**96+%**	**86+%**	**80+%**
B	**90–95%**	**76–85%**	**70–79%**
C	**80–89%**	**65–75%**	**60–69%**
D	**70–79%**	**55–64%**	**50–59%**
F	**60% ≤**	**54% ≤**	**49% ≤**

Local Accountability System Glossary

Community Stakeholders: Anyone who is invested in the welfare and success of a school and its students, including administrators, teachers, staff members, students, parents, families, community members, local business leaders, and elected officials such as school board members, city councilors, and state representatives.

Campus: A school that is operated by a charter school or school district.

Charter School: An entity that controls and is responsible for a campus or campuses that has/have been granted a charter under TEC, Subchapter D, Chapter 12.

Combined Rating: Campuses eligible for a combined rating that have a submitted plan and associated final data will have their local accountability system rating combined with the state accountability rating in the proportion specified in the approved local accountability system plan.

Component: An indicator chosen that leads to increased student outcomes.

Domain: Local accountability system domains can be categorized by academics, culture and climate, extra and co-curricular, future ready and a locally defined and named domain.

District: A campus or group of campuses that is operated by a board of trustees or other similar governing body. It includes both charter schools and traditional independent school districts.

Methodology: The system and process used to choose, define, and calculate local components.

Minimum-Size Criteria: A benchmark that sets the fewest number of performance results that must be available for those results to be used to assign local accountability ratings. The minimum-size criteria vary by component.

Overall Score and Rating: Each eligible campus will receive both a state accountability overall score and rating and a local accountability overall score and rating. Overall scores and ratings are assigned based on applicable domain scores and ratings in the proportions determined by each of the accountability systems.

Panel Review: When 10 or more districts submit a local accountability system, a third-party panel will be convened to review all plans for final approval.

Rating: The A–F letter grade assigned to each applicable domain and overall score based on the A= 90–100; B=80–89; C=70–79; D=60–69; and F=≤59).

Scaled Score: A scaled score is the result of a transformation applied to the raw score. The purpose of scaled scores is to report scores for all campuses on a consistent scale.

School Type: A specific label given to a campus for the purposes of determining its domain targets. The label a campus receives—elementary, middle school, elementary/secondary, or high school—is determined by the grades served by the campus as reported in the October TSDS PEIMS enrollment snapshot.

Single Campus Districts: A school district or charter school comprised of only one campus that shares the same year performance data with its only campus. For these single-campus school

districts and charter schools, the combined state and local accountability ratings applied to the campus are applied to the district, ensuring that both the district and campus receive identical ratings.

Small Numbers Analysis: A process to determine if a rating is appropriate for small districts and campuses that do not meet minimum-size criteria using current year data.