**Mississippi Accountability Task Force Meeting**

**November 29, 2018**

**Meeting Notes**

Meeting Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Organization** | **Position:** |
| Richard | Baliko | Noxubee County School District | Principal |
| Stacy | Baudoin | Pearl River County School District | Principal |
| Kimberly | Blunt | Columbus Municipal School District | Principal |
| Lisa | Bramuchi | Cleveland School District | Asst. Supt. |
| Ken | Byars | Amory School District | Superintendent |
| Tiffany | Fisher | Meridian School District | Teacher |
| Steven | Hampton | Lamar County School District | Director of Research and Accountability |
| Tracy | Jackson | Greenville Public School District | Academic Director |
| Ryan | Kuykendall | DeSoto County School District | Director of Accountability & Research |
| Delesicia | Martin | Hinds County School District | Superintendent |
| Aldo | Moran | Ocean Springs School District | Assistant Principal |
| Howard | Savage | Quitman School District | Administrator of the Year |
| Heather | Todd | Marshall County School District | Teacher |
| Benjamin | Torrey | Holmes County Consolidated School District | Coordinator of Testing & Accountability |
| Shannon | Vincent | Moss Point School District | Superintendent |
| Tim | Martin | Clinton School District | Superintendent |
| Michael | Lindsay | Gulfport School District | Commission on School Accreditation |
| Whitney | Drewrey | Lafayette School District | Teacher of the Year |
| Matt | Thompson | Union County School District | K-12 Subcommittee Member |
| Rosemary | Aultman | State Board of Education | Board Member |
| Chris | Domaleski | Center for Assessment | External Facilitator |
| Christy | Hovanetz | Foundation for Excellence in Education | External Expert |
| Deborah | Donovan | MDE | Data Analytics and Reporting |
| Paula | Vanderford | MDE | Chief Accountability Officer |
| Alan | Burrow | MDE | Director of District and School Performance |

**Introduction/ Background**

Following introductions, Dr. Chris Domaleski described the purpose of the Accountability Task Force (ATF) and reviewed some ground rules for how the ATF would operate. Subsequently, Dr. Paula Vanderford reviewed some updates from the MDE and changes to how the ATF would be structured and coordinated.

Next, Mr. Alan Burrow reviewed all of the elements of the accountability system. Mr. Burrow described the changes to the system in recent years and explained how the current system is designed and implemented. The presentation included a longitudinal review of performance data on key indicators.

**Progress in English Language Proficiency**

Dr. Domaleski described how the current ELP indicator is calculated. The method involves 1) determine the target score needed to achieve proficiency at year 5 or graduation 2) divide the distance between each EL student’s current score and the target score by the number of years remaining to reach proficiency, 3) determine the ratio of annual progress achieved to progress required (from step two) to produce a value between 0 and 1, which is aggregated for all students in schools meeting minimum n-size. Any student who does not demonstrate progress will have a rate of 0. Moreover, any student not recaching proficiency within 5 years will have a reduction in the progress calculation of .75 (year 6) or .5 (years 7+).

Following a review of the calculation procedures, some descriptive and performance data was examined, including an overview of accountability score distributions for schools with and without the ELP indictor.

Dr. Domaleski introduced four potential changes to the system, informed by department review, feedback received, and recommendations from the TAC. These were:

1. Adjust the method of aggregation to better reflect the intended weight of ELP.
2. Remove the point adjustment after the target exit year.
3. Explore different goals for time to proficiency based on starting level and/or grade band.
4. Award maximum points to achieving 70% progress toward attainment of ELP.

Regarding the first potential change, the ATF agreed an adjustment to the aggregation method should be explored. The ATF asked for the proposed method to be modeled. This method involves the following:

1. For any school with an ELP indicator (i.e. the school is at or above the n-size threshold), the ELP indicator should have a 5% influence on the total score. The weight of the other indicators in the model are reduced in equal proportion such that the maximum score is the same (700 or 1000) and the influence of each indicator is maintained.
2. There will be no change for schools that do not have an ELP indicator.

Regarding the second potential change, removing the adjustment for proficiency earned after the target year, the majority of the ATF felt it was a promising idea, but suggested it should be tabled in the near term until the impact of other changes was better understood.

The third potential change, exploring different time to proficiency targets, was broadly endorsed. The ATF suggested this should be prioritized for review at the next meeting. Specifically, the ATF suggested that the MDE model data based on 1) starting level 2) grade band and 3) starting level by grade band. ATF members advocated for modeling ELP for students with cognitive disabilities as well.

Lastly, the ATF considered the fourth proposal, awarding maximum points for schools where 70% or more of the students meet ELP targets. Many, but not all, ATF members agreed this was a promising idea. Ultimately, the ATF agreed to explore the impact of this idea in combination with the other potential changes discussed.

**Non-Conventional Grade Configurations**

The ATF discussed policy alternatives for schools with atypical grade configurations that cover both 1) elementary and middle school (ES/MS) grades and 2) high school (HS) grades. For example, data analyses indicate that some K-12 schools might be rated as a ‘B’ school under the current policy but would be rated as an ‘A’ school for both ES/MS and HS if calculated separately.

After considerable discussion about alternatives, a proposal emerged that generated broad support. The proposal involves the following for schools with combined ES/MS and HS grades:

1. Compute accountability score separately for each of ES/MS and HS grades
2. Transform the ES/MS score to the HS scale using equipercentile equating
3. Create a weighted composite of the two scores based on percent enrollment for each component (e.g. if ES/MS represents 60% enrollment it is weighted 60%).

The ATF also considered whether these schools should be included in the distribution if a new baseline is established. That decision was tabled for the present meeting and will be explored when more information is available about the impact of the current proposal.

The next step will be to document the procedure and model the results to review with the ATF at a future meeting.

**Prioritized Topics for Future Meetings**

Each member of the ATF was asked to identify topics that should considered at future meetings. Topics suggested include the following (topics are only listed once although some were voiced by multiple members):

* What is the impact of biology scores and standard setting, including the shift from 4 to 5 performance levels?
* Will new baseline cuts be established in 18-19?
* Should there be a FAY component to acceleration?
* TSI and ATSI designations seem to disproportionally impact larger schools with sufficient enrollment to make n-sizes.
* Are the performance expectations associated with ACT set appropriately?
* With respect to 3rd grade MAAP, will policy set passing at level two or three?
* The current growth model rewards schools that maintain students at level 5. Should a similar policy be considered for students who advanced a level or more in the prior year and maintain the new (higher) level in the current year?
* Continued emphasis on the ELP component is appreciated.
* Discuss differences in the availability of dual credit statewide.
* Explore differences in characteristics of the lower quartiles of each school.
* Revisit k-1, k-2 and how they are measured
* What about transient schools and small transient schools with respect to the 3rd grade reading component?
* How should the accountability system handle schools without tested subjects and grades?
* What is the appropriate policy for students who fail to meet the 3rd grade MAAP passing score?
* Should credit be given in the growth model for students that improve 2 or more levels?
* How will performance on the writing portion of ELA MAAP impact accountability?
* The definition of ‘incident of violence’ used for the state report card needs to be clarified. Current variation in practice may be communicating differences that are unfair or inaccurate.
* Differences among schools that do or do not serve higher proportions of students with disabilities (SWD) students, including and especially students with significant cognitive disabilities (SCD), are influencing accountability performance.
* Growth performance at levels 3a and 3b are markedly different and should be explored.

**Future Meetings**

The following dates were selected for upcoming meetings of the ATF:

* January 31, 2019
* February 28, 2019