**Mississippi Accountability Task Force Meeting**

**February 23, 2024**

**DRAFT Meeting Summary**

**Meeting Participants**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First Name | Last Name | Organization | Role |
| Lisa Renee | LaMastus | Cleveland School District | Principal |
| Ryan | Kuykendall | DeSoto County | Chief Accountability Officer |
| Christy | Hovanetz | Foundation for Excellence in Education | External Expert |
| Tarrinasha | Jones | Greenville Public School District | Principal |
| Jermaine | Brown | Hattiesburg | Director of College & Career Readiness |
| Robert | Sanders | Hinds County School District | Superintendent |
| Raina | Holmes | Jackson County School District | High School Principal |
| LaToya | Blackshear | Jackson Public Schools | Director of Planning and Evaluations |
| Steven | Hampton | Lamar County | Superintendent |
| Alicia | Conerly | Lawrence County | District Instructional Specialist |
| Lindsay | Brett | Lee County Schools | Principal |
| Greg | Paczak | Madison County Schools | Director of Research & Development |
| Alan | Burrow | Mississippi Department of Education | Director of District and School Performance |
| Deborah | Donovan | Mississippi Department of Education | Data Analytics and Reporting |
| Paula | Vanderford | Mississippi Department of Education | Chief Accountability Officer |
| Tim | Scott | Mississippi Department of Education | Director of Accountability Services |
| William | Roberson | Oxford School District | Superintendent |
| Angela | Burch | Pascagoula-Gautier School District | Principal |
| LaVonda | White | Rankin County School District | Director of Accreditation, Accountability, and Assessment |
| Glen | East | State Board of Education | Board Member |
| Chris | Domaleski | The Center for Assessment | External Facilitator |
| Crystal | Bates | Wayne County High School | Assistant Principal |
| Lawrence | Hudson | Western Line School District | Superintendent |

**Welcome and Introductions**

Following welcome and introductions, Dr. Chris Domaleski reviewed the purpose of the Accountability Task Force (ATF), indicating their role is to help the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) make good decisions about the design and implementation of the state, school accountability system. He emphasized that the ATF focuses on policy priorities and decisions to support those priorities that are technically defensible and operationally feasible. Feedback from the ATF is received as a recommendation to the MDE.

Next, Dr. Domaleski reviewed the ground rules and group norms for the meeting, highlighting the importance of making sure everyone has an opportunity to share their perspectives in an environment characterized by courteous, respectful discourse. The intent is to work toward shared understanding and consensus. However, from time to time, it may be necessary to take a vote to identify the group’s recommendations. When that occurs, dissenting views will be noted in the meeting summary.

Finally, Dr. Domaleski reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

**Business Rule Updates**

Mr. Burrow reviewed several updates to the business rules. The detailed revisions are available in the presentation (slides 9-13) which can be accessed via [this link](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1F1oDe3zV8DaG7UIobuyjo1nSM2XQ_-IBJvMIxcIQQoQ/edit?usp=sharing). A summary of the revisions follows.

* Section 4 adds ACT as an assessment and clarifies how students in grades 3-8 are included in calculations.
* Section 6 accommodates changes from the audit clarifying that scores may not exceed the maximum allocation. Task force members suggested adding 'maximum' before allocated.
* Section 9 clarifies a there is a maximum of 50 points for acceleration. Deleting 9.9 conforms with the senate bill that requires single weighting.
* Section 10 edits clarify that FAY requirements must be met in the year the score is banked and the year the score is applied in the same district.
* Section 22 edits clarify that the same backmapping logic used for traditional schools is applied for charter schools. The task force suggested changing “school district” to “LEA” to cover a range of operators and capture it is a traditional feeder path.

**Reconceptualizing College and Career Readiness**

Next, Dr. Domaleski reviewed some design options to address college and career readiness. Several state examples were discussed and a design illustration for Mississippi was presented.

Feedback from the task force included:

* Prioritize models that include a broad range of measures
* Do not give more influence or weight to test based measures
* Consider approaches that offer some flexibility or choice among options
* Approaches that differentiate degrees of performance are preferred to ‘binary’ (all or nothing) approaches.
* Several committee members supported adding diploma endorsement in the model
* Other elements that could be included are:
  + Social emotional learning
  + Durable/ soft skills
  + Employment
  + Military readiness
  + Teacher retention

The committee agreed that more discussion is needed to refine the indicators that are included and determine how the measures should be combined and weighted.

**Establishing Accountability Weights**

Next, the ATF discussed recommended weights for the components of the accountability system. To provide an indication of whether or how much weights should be adjusted, each member of the ATF provided an individual recommendation of the desired weight for each component, which were compared with the current weights. The median group rating for Elementary/ Middle Schools and High Schools are shown below.

**Elementary and Middle Schools**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Current Weights** | Proficiency Reading: 13.5 | Proficiency Math: 13.5 | Proficiency Science: 13.5 | Growth Reading: 13.5 | Growth Math: 13.5 | Growth Lowest 25% Reading: 13.5 | Growth Lowest 25% Math: 13.5 | English Language Progress: 5 |
| **Median Recommended Weight** | **14.02** | **14.02** | **13.83** | **15.54** | **15.54** | **11.38** | **11.38** | **5.00** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Current Weights** | Proficiency Reading: 9.5% | Proficiency Math: 9.5% | Proficiency Science: 4.8% | Proficiency US History: 4.8% | Growth Reading: 9.5% | Growth Math: 9.5% | Growth Lowest 25% Reading: 9.5% | Growth Lowest 25% Math:9.5% | Graduation Rate: 19% | Accel-eration: 4.8% | College/ Career Readiness: 4.8% | English Language Progress: 5% |
| **Median Recommended Weights** | **9.64** | **9.64** | **5.56** | **2.76** | **8.80** | **8.80** | **7.45** | **7.45** | **16.75** | **8.97** | **8.97** | **4.64** |

**High Schools**

As shown in these tables, the recommended weights by the ATF are close to the current weights. Many committee members placed slightly more weight on overall growth for elementary and middle schools, while slightly down-weighting growth for the lowest 25%. In high school, growth for the lowest 25% was also slightly down weighted and acceleration and CCR was up-weighted.

**Accountability Performance Standards**

Next, the ATF engaged in an activity to provide an initial indication of the pattern of indicator performance that should be associated with each letter grade. Committee members submitted two rounds of ratings and discussed their findings, focusing on the characteristics of schools associated with each letter grade band.

These results will be used to create sample school performance profiles for review at the next accountability task force meeting.

**Future Topics**

In the last session, Dr. Domaleski invited members to provide an closing comments, especially to identify their priorities for topics the ATF should address at future meetings. Suggestions included the following:

* It’s important to ensure that any measure included in the accountability system is technically defensible. If the measure is not reliable and valid, then it should not be used for high stakes accountability. However, even if a measure is not included in the system for high-stakes it may be appropriate for reporting.
* Continue to place a strong emphasis on academic growth in the model.
* It’s important to make sure that any changes to the model are made before new standards are set. These activities should be complete before schools and districts are held accountable for these new expectations. Establish a timeline soon.
* Explore strategies to make college and workforce outcomes broader and more prominent in the model.
* We should discuss the progress in English language proficiency indicator at a future meeting
* Some participants asked if A-F letter grade labels should remain.
* Many participants expressed gratitude for engaging the group with challenging but important topics.