

OFFICE OF CHIEF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE OFFICER
Summary of State Board of Education Agenda Items
April 16-17, 2015

OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY

09. Report from the Accountability Task Force and Technical Review Team meetings held on April 8, 2015

The purpose of the Accountability Task Force is to 1) review standards for school and district accountability and make the processes more accurate (not lower or easier to attain), 2) make adjustments required by changes to state or federal expectations (including the recommendations of 2013-14 Accountability Results Audit), 3) add clarifications noted during the 2013-14 implementation of the model, and 4) review recommendations of stakeholders for adjustments and consider revisions, as needed.

The original Accountability Task Force and the Technical Review Team met on April 8, 2015, to review the recommendations made by the 2014-2015 Accountability Task Force prior to submission to the Commission on School Accreditation on April 14, 2015, for approval.

No Action: Discussion Only

Back-up material attached

Targets for the 2015 Accountability Task Force

Purpose:

- To review standards for school and district accountability and make the processes more accurate (not lower or easier to attain)
- To make adjustments required by changes to state or federal expectations (including the recommendations of 2013-14 Accountability Results Audit)
- To add clarifications noted during the 2013-14 implementation of the model
- To review recommendations of stakeholders for adjustments and consider revisions, as needed

Recommended Change	Statute and Policy Implications	Implementation Year	Action
1. ED Requirement: Include SCD students in the calculation of growth of the lowest 25%	BR 7.4 must be removed. Scores from the alternate assessment for SCD students will not be included in the identification of the Lowest 25%.	2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: Strike all of Rules 7.1.2 and 7.4 ; Adjust Rule 7.1.1 to incorporate standardization of scores by grade level, subject, and year of administration; Remove all language regarding SCD exclusion
2. ED Requirement: Do not count high school banked scores at two schools.	Federal: 34 CFR 200 BR 10.1 must be corrected to only one school. BR 6.6 should be clarified.	2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: Bank the scores of students taking high school assessments before enrolling in the 10 th grade until the student is enrolled in the 10 th grade; Remove language regarding school of origin from Rule 10.1

Recommended Change	Statute and Policy Implications	Implementation Year	Action
<p>3. Audit Observation: The MDE applies ungraded students' date-of-birth grade assignment, as the local school district may inaccurately assign a particular grade to a student.</p>	<p>BR 16.5 Students with disabilities who are coded as "ungraded" (56 or 58) in MSIS will be assigned a peer-grade calculation based on his/her age on September 1 of the current school year. Policy follows practices outlined in Assessment and Special Education documents and/or technical manuals.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Recommendation: Do not make any changes to the business rule</p>
<p>4. Audit Observation: Students not identified as those with a severe cognitive disability participated in the alternate assessment (DLM); however, the incident rate was extremely low (114 cases statewide).</p>	<p>BR 16.3 Non-SCD students are not allowed to participate in alternate assessments. If any such students have alternate assessment data, the test data will be considered not valid.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Recommendation: Do not make any changes to the business rule</p>
<p>5. Audit Observation: A separate process validated assessment results for SY2012-13 and SY2013-14; however, school administrators could not locate and verify the procedural guidelines.</p>		<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: MDE should strengthen communication and supports provided to districts on the validation of assessment and graduation (cohort) data</p>

Recommended Change	Statute and Policy Implications	Implementation Year	Action
<p>6. Audit Observation: Students with “banked” scores in Algebra I do not participate in another statewide mathematics assessment at the high school level, which appears inconsistent with 34 CFR 200.</p>	<p>Federal: 34 CFR 200 BR Section 10 (and others) will be impacted by any changes to address this observation.</p>	<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: Bank the scores of students taking high school assessments before enrolling in the 10th grade until the student is enrolled in the 10th grade; In Rules 10.1 and 10.2, remove the language regarding school of origin; Student who moves out of district before the banked date does not get included in the model</p>
<p>7. Audit Observation: Graduation rates were validated in a separate process; however, the procedural guidelines could not be located and verified.</p>		<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: MDE should strengthen communication and supports provided to districts on the validation of assessment and graduation (cohort) data</p>
<p>8. Audit Observation: The identification method for the Lowest 25% indicator’s business rules is not technically correct when more than a single scale score value represents the “cut point” for the 25%, thus can result in values greater than 25% when combined across all applicable grades within a given school.</p>	<p>State: 37-17-6(5)(c)(ii) Individual student growth: the percent of students making one (1) year’s progress in one (1) year’s time ... emphasis on the progress of the lowest twenty-five percent (25%) of students in the school or district; BR Section 7 will be impacted by any changes to address this observation.</p>	<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: Strike all of Rules 7.1.2 and 7.4; Adjust Rule 7.1.1 to incorporate standardization of scores by grade level, subject, and year of administration; Remove all language regarding SCD exclusion; Change the name of the Lowest 25% subgroup to the Lowest Performing Students subgroup</p>

Recommended Change	Statute and Policy Implications	Implementation Year	Action
<p>9. Audit Recommendation: The equipercentile equating procedures used to “map” schools from the 600 point scale (e.g., K-4) should be replaced with a fixed 600 point scale based on the same proportion of points used to delineate each of the five performance levels on the 700 point scale.</p>	<p>BR 22.1.2 should be clarified or removed. (If removed, the new fixed scale should be added to Section 1.)</p>	<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: Establish static cut points for schools without science; Cut points will be reevaluated with new assessment data (New Rule 22.1.3)</p>
<p>10. Clarification Point: Correct language regarding exclusions.</p>	<p>BR 15.1 needs to be strengthened to ensure that ONLY first year EL students are excluded. BR 27.2.2 needs to be removed, as the flag is not available. All references to “pending” need to be removed. BR 14.1.1 must be removed, as the USDE did not approve this rule. BR related to ACT Numerator are needed. CCR Timeline needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation (15.1.1): Remove the following language from the business rule: “A student whose HLS (Home Language Survey)... the length of time the student has lived in the United States.”</p> <p>(27.2.2): Remove the rule</p> <p>(14.1.1): Remove the rule</p> <p>New Rules: 25.13 and 25.14</p>

Recommended Change	Statute and Policy Implications	Implementation Year	Action
<p>13. Focus Group Topic: AMOs (incorporate safe harbor and/or confidence intervals; reset with new assessments)</p>	<p>Federal: Expected by USDE per ESEA Flex FAQs BR 14.1 does not provide specifics, so limited impact on BR; however, AMOs are explicit in ESEA Flex docs.</p>	<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: Strike all of Rule 14.1.1, as outside the scope of Accountability; Reestablish AMO targets following the administration of new assessments; Incorporate a safe harbor measure in the determination of whether a subgroup met its AMO target; Establish AMO targets to schools without tested grades using the backmapping logic</p>
<p>14. Focus Group Topic: Schools without Tested Grades/Subjects (use school-based assessment for K-3, set scale, backmap science)</p>	<p>BR Section 22 will be impacted by any changes to address auditor's recommendation in #9 regarding a set scale.</p>	<p>Recommended: 2014-15 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: MDE will identify alternative measures for assigning performance classifications to schools without tested grades (e.g., administration of statewide assessments in the early grades)</p>
<p>15. Focus Group Topic: Get another waiver of accountability for transition</p>	<p>State: 37-17-6(4)(e): Requires annual accountability Federal: Allowed by USDE per ESEA Flex FAQs; however, Priority and Focus lists must still be generated based upon 14-15 results</p>	<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: MDE should apply for an Accountability Pause as part of ESEA Flexibility Renewal submission in March 2015</p>

Recommended Change	Statute and Policy Implications	Implementation Year	Action
<p>16. Focus Group Topic: Assignment of Grades (Split Model, reconsider weights for science/history, assessments)</p>	<p>State: 37-17-6(5) BR Section 1</p>	<p>Recommended: 2014-15 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: Re-evaluate grading scales with new assessment data (including fall of 2015) (New Rule 1.6); Review the impact of student performance on grade level assessments when combined with high school level assessments in schools with a grade 12 also serving students below grade 9 to determine if a need exists to change the weighting</p>
<p>17. Clarification Point: The number of possible points schools (and districts) with a grade 12 may earn during the 2014-2015 school year.</p>	<p>BR Page 1 BR Section 25.11 A student's score will be applied to the school in which the student is enrolled in MSIS at the time of the Senior Snapshot.</p>	<p>2014-2015 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: Modify the overview section (Components included in the model beginning the 2014-15 SY) to reflect the scores of the ACT being included during the 2015-2016 SY</p>
<p>18. Clarification Point: Identification of students included in the participation calculations for the CCR component</p>	<p>BR 25.10 The ACT scores of all students identified in the Senior Snapshot will be included in the calculation except students identified in MSIS as SCD. However, if a student identified in MSIS as SCD takes the ACT, his/her score will be included in the calculations.</p>	<p>2015-2016 SY</p>	<p>Recommendation: The results of students from the state administered and non-state administered ACT exams will be used for counting students as participating (New Rule 25.13); Students included in the senior snapshot will have until February of the academic year to participate in the ACT administration before the highest subscores are identified for accountability (New Rule 25.7.1)</p>

Recommended Change	Statute and Policy Implications	Implementation Year	Action
19. Clarification Point: Identification of students included in the proficiency calculations for the CCR component	BR 25.10 The ACT scores of all students identified in the Senior Snapshot will be included in the calculation except students identified in MSIS as SCD. However, if a student identified in MSIS as SCD takes the ACT, his/her score will be included in the calculations.	2015-2016 SY	Recommendation: Only students who are counted as participating in the CCR component are included in the denominator of the CCR proficiency calculation (New Rule 25.14)
20. Clarification Point: Treatment of students enrolling and withdrawing from the same or different schools on the same day	BR 2.7 If a student enrolls and withdraws on the same day, the student will be considered as having been enrolled for one (1) day.	2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: Add clarifying language to the rule that states for students that withdraw and enroll between different schools or the same school on the same day, the receiving school will receive credit for enrollment (Rule 2.7)
21. Clarification Point: Treatment of re-entry dates of students who dropped out of school in the FAY calculations		2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: Include a rule that states the re-entry dates of students who dropped out of school are included as enrollment dates in the FAY calculations (New Rule 2.10)
22. Clarification Point: Details of the graduation (cohort) data calculation are included in the statewide accountability system technical manual		2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: Add a rule to clarify the methodology for calculating graduation rates are included within a separate document (New Rule 8.4)

Recommended Change	Statute and Policy Implications	Implementation Year	Action
23. Clarification Point: Graduation (cohort) data included in the accountability results are lagged one (1) year		2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: Add a rule indicating Graduation (cohort) data is lagged one year (New Rule 8.5)
24. Clarification Point: College and Career Readiness (ACT) scores included in the accountability results are lagged one (1) year		2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: Do not include a specific rule; clarify with Sr. Snapshot
25. Clarification Point: Identification of priority and focus schools based on the analysis of three (3) years of accountability data due to changing assessments		2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: MDE will explore and review data options for identifying schools when data for SY 2014-15 are available (no change to rule at this time)
26. Clarification Point: Identifying the school/district of origin for students taking high school assessments for the first time while at MSA or MSMS	BR 23.1.2 If a student takes a high-school-end-of-course assessment for the first time while at MSA or MSMS, his/her scores will be sent back to their school/district of origin and rolled into the state totals.	2014-2015 SY	Recommendation: The school/district of origin will be based on where the student met the requirements for FAY the year immediately prior to enrolling in MSA or MSMS (New rule: 23.1.4)

2015 Accountability Task Force**Overarching Recommendations for the Implementation
of the Mississippi Statewide Accountability System**

The recommendations included below address the current practices and/or procedures followed in the implementation of the Mississippi Statewide Accountability System (MSAS). Since these areas are not directly tied to the performance of the system, the recommendations are not considered business rules for the MSAS.

1. The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) should strengthen its communication and supports provided to school districts on the validation of assessment and graduation (cohort) data.
2. The MDE should strengthen its communication and supports provided to school districts on the grade level testing requirements.
3. The MDE should analyze the impact of student performance on grade level assessments in the accountability results of schools with a grade 12 who also serve students in grades below 9 (e.g., K-12) to determine if the results for grade level and high school level assessments should be weighted differently.
4. The MDE should explore alternative methods (e.g., administering statewide assessments to students enrolled in Grades 1 and 2) for assigning performance classifications to schools without tested grades.
5. The MDE should review the methodology used to identify the Lowest Performing Students subgroup (Lowest 25%) to include standardization of assessment scores and the identification of students at the school level versus identification at the grade level. A second data point should be applied to further distinguish the performance of students to be placed in the subgroup.