

**Mississippi Accountability Task Force Meeting
November 21, 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 and the agenda.

Reconceptualizing College and Career Readiness

Dr. Domaleski shared the latest version of the proposed college and career readiness component of the accountability model. Task Force members were asked to provide feedback on the components in the model, the performance thresholds for each indicator, and the overall weights in the system.

The Task Force members agreed with the components in the model but some members proposed adding work based learning to the numerator of acceleration.

With respect to the performance thresholds, a majority (9 of 12) of the Task Force recommended changing the performance threshold as reflected below:

.25/1	.5/1	.75/1	1/1
ACT ≥ 15 Superscore OR 830 SAT	ACT 17 Superscore OR 920 SAT	ACT 20 Superscore OR 1050 SAT	ACT ≥ 25 Superscore OR 1200 SAT

The rationale for this recommendation was that it simplified the model and created consistent expectations between ACT and SAT.

A minority (3 of 12) supported an alternative approach as reflected in the following table.

.25/1	.5/1	.75/1	1/1
ACT ≥ 15 Superscore OR 830 SAT	ACT 17 English OR Reading 19 AND 17 Math OR 920 SAT	ACT 18 English OR 22 Reading AND ACT 22 Math OR 1050 SAT	ACT ≥ 25 Superscore OR 1200 SAT

With respect to overall weighting, the Task Force supports the proposed weights assuming the U.S. History test will be sunset. These weights are reflected in the following table.

Indicators	Current Points	Revised Points
Proficiency Reading	95	95
Proficiency Math	95	95
Proficiency Science	47.5	47.5
Proficiency U.S. History	47.5	0
Growth Reading	95	95
Growth Math	95	95
Growth L25 Reading	95	95
Growth L25 Math	95	95
Graduation Rate	190	190
Readiness	95	142.5
English Language Progress	50	50
	1000	1000

Federal Designations

Next the Task Force reviewed the requirements for federal designations which include:

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI):

- Not less than the lowest 5% of Title I schools
- Any high school failing to graduate one third or more of its students

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI):

- Schools with a subgroup that is consistently underperforming

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI):

- Any school in which a subgroup of students on its own would lead to CSI identification
- ATSI schools that have not satisfied exit criteria in a ‘state determined number of years’ are classified as CSI

Task Force members reviewed the MDE’s current methodology designations, focusing on the requirement that exit criteria is based on improvement by “increasing one letter grade or an increase that crosses over the midpoint of the letter grade range.” Many Task Force members agreed this criterion should be decoupled from letter grades and expressed as overall composite score improvement. Some members suggested that the threshold for “F” and CSI should be linked but there was not widespread agreement on this recommendation.

There was also discussion of adding a rule that requires a minimum degree of improvement (e.g., score improvement of 10% or more) or an additional improvement criterion (e.g., composite score and growth should increase). The Task Force agreed more discussion would be needed informed by feedback from school improvement to refine their guidance.

Growth

The MDE has received feedback that growth points should be examined to ensure it adequately rewards progress, particularly for students at level 3.

The Task Force reviewed results from an analysis showing the impact of adding an additional growth category '3C.' The analysis revealed the percentage of students receiving growth points modestly improves (51% to 57%) in mathematics and more substantially improves in ELA (37% to 51%) when a third growth category is added in level 3.

The Task Force was informed that the state Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has reviewed this issue and advised that the scale should not be divided such that the scale ranges exceed the conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM). Accordingly, creating 3 levels in 'pass' is the limit of what the scale can support.

Overall, Task Force members support adding a 3C level. Some Task Force members felt strongly that students should be assigned a growth point for staying in level 3, since attaining 'pass' is an accomplishment that should be rewarded. Other Task Force members did not agree with this proposal as it may diminish the incentive to strive for proficient.

Progress in English Language Proficiency

The MDE has transitioned to a new English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT). LAS Links will be replaced by ELPA 21. Since the tests are not comparable, this necessitates changes to the progress in English language proficiency indicator. This also presents an opportunity to refine and improve this indicator.

After reviewing the ESSA requirements and the MDE's current methodology the Task Force discussed some options for revising the indicator informed by research by Dr. Goldschmidt.

Dr. Domaleski reviewed a potential model for ELPA 21 based on a similar approach from Nebraska that is based on value tables. This approach will account for up to 6 years for students to reach proficiency, depending on the student's starting level. Moreover, the model can be adapted to award points based on the percent of progress demonstrated between the current category and the target category, which is consistent with MDE's current methodology.

The Task Force discussed whether it would be possible to suspend EL progress for one year if the MDE can get approval from the U.S. Department of Education. This would allow the first year of progress calculations to be based on a consistent assessment in each year.

The MDE will look into this alternative and further develop the methodology and discuss further at a future Task Force meeting.

Future Topics

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

- Continue work to refine and finalize readiness, growth, and ELP in the model
- Continue to explore alternatives for entry and exit requirements for federal designations
- Many participants expressed gratitude for engaging the group with challenging but important topics.