**Mississippi Accountability Task Force Meeting**

**June 3, 2020**

 **Meeting Summary**

Meeting Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agency** | **Position** | **Last Name** | **First Name** |
| Aberdeen School District | Principal | Fondren | Kristen |
| Bay Waveland School District | Director of Federal Programs | Menotti | Nicole |
| Center for Assessment | External Facilitator | Domaleski  | Chris |
| Clinton Public Schools | Superintendent | Martin | Tim |
| Corinth School District | Math Specialist | Jones | Marion |
| DeSoto County | Director of Accountability & Research | Kuykendall | Ryan |
| Foundation for Excellence in Education | External Expert | Hovanetz  | Christy |
| Madison County Schools | Superintendent | Seals | Charlotte |
| MDE | Data Analytics and Reporting | Donovan | Deborah |
| MDE | Chief Accountability Officer | Vanderford | Paula |
| MDE | Director of District and School Performance | Burrow  | Alan |
| MDE | Chief Academic Officer | Oakley  | Nathan  |
| MDE | Director of Accreditation | Malone | Jo Ann |
| New Albany School District  | Superintendent | Evans | Lance |
| Noxubee County | Assistant Superintendent | Baliko | Richard |
| Petal School District | Director of Student Assessment | Brown | Kelli |
| Rankin County School District  | Principal | Pambianchi | Lee |
| Senatobia School District | Special Education Teacher | Brewer | Elaine |
| Simpson County School District | Teacher | Williams | Aaron |
| Starkville-Oktibbeha School District | Superintendent | Peasant | Eddie |
| Sunflower County School District | Superintendent | Davis | Miskia |
| Tunica County | Superintendent | Pulley | Margie |
| Union County School District | Assistant Superintendent | Faulkner | Windy |
| Vicksburg Warren | Principal | Minor | LaToya |

**Welcome and Introductions**

Following welcome and introductions, Dr. Chris Domaleski briefly reviewed the meeting summary from the April meeting. No revisions to the notes were suggested; however, Dr. Domaleski indicated that committee members may email edits following the meeting. Thereafter, he reviewed the proposed agenda for the current meeting.

**Representing Career Readiness in Accountability**

The first topic was to continue discussions from the April 2020 meeting about how career readiness can be more fully incorporated in the school accountability model. In previous meetings the ATF narrowed their focus to two general options:

* Option 1: ACT or WorkKeys serve as the components of the college and career readiness indicator
* Option 2: Include diploma endorsements as a new component of acceleration

ATF members expressed support for option 1. This approach would be implemented as follows:

* distribute the 50 points associated with the College and Career Readiness (CCR) component of the high school accountability model based on the percent of students who meet ACT benchmarks or WorkKeys benchmarks
* determine a benchmark on WorkKeys that is comparable in terms of rigor to ACT
* the final CCR score will reflect ACT or WorkKeys, whichever is more favorable

The ATF further affirmed that their support for option 1 is based ensuring that full participation in ACT continues. That is, the inclusion of WorkKeys in the accountability model should not remove or diminish the ACT participation requirement.

Next the ATF discussed the timing of including WorkKeys in the model. Three ideas were discussed:

* Option A: Include WorkKeys in the model as soon as possible, presumably spring 2021
* Option B: Pilot WorkKeys inclusion in the model in 2021 in order to review impact data and finalize recommendations
* Option C: Wait to include WorkKeys in the model until statewide administration of WorkKeys is supported

 The ATF agreed that a pilot process is important before making a final recommendation for the manner in which WorkKeys should be included. However, the ATF did not come to an agreement on whether statewide administration was an important prerequisite. In short, Option A was tabled, options B and C should be further discussed at a future meeting.

**MAAP-A Low 25 Growth**

MAAP-A is the state alternate assessment typically administered to 1% or fewer students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. In February, the ATF provided initial guidance for incorporating the MAAP-A results in accountability. That guidance is as follows:

* Apply a school level threshold for the lowest 25% that replicates as closely as possible the approach used for the general assessment.
* The minimum n-size rule would be removed for MAAP-A
* Calculate the lowest 25% group for each subject, but combine for all grades tested at each school
* Every school should have at least 1 examinee in the lowest 25%. Examples:
	+ 1 student tested: this student is in the low 25 group (hereafter: L25)
	+ 2 students tested: the lower performing 1 student is designated L25
	+ 3 students tested: the lowest performing 1 student is designated L25
	+ 4 students tested: the lowest performing 1 student is designated L25
	+ 5 students tested: the lowest performing 2 students would be designated L25
* If multiple students have the same score as the score serving as the threshold for the L25 group, all students with this score and lower are designated L25

Following a review of impact data and discussion, the ATF affirmed the approach described above as their recommendation for L25 growth for students taking MAAP-A.

**Prioritized Topics for Future Meetings**

* The ATF did not have time to discuss the low 25 growth approach for HS, this should be included on the next agenda.
* Otherwise, the topics previously identified in the April meeting summary should continue to remain on the list of potential meeting topics.