**Mississippi Accountability Task Force Meeting**

**February 28, 2019**

**DRAFT 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 reviewed the purpose of the Accountability Task Force (ATF), the ground rules for deliberations established at the previous task force meetings, and provided an overview of the agenda for the current meeting.

Dr. Domaleski asked if there were any revisions to the meeting notes from the January 2019 task force meeting. There was a suggestion that a clarification should be added to the table of recommended options for including science testing in accountability. That suggestion was to add an “option 2C” which would read, “Use the current year score with BOTH new tests in 2018-2019 (as specified in 2B) AND banking (as specified in 2A).”It was agreed that this option would be added and the notes would be revised.

**Progress in English Language Proficiency**

At previous meetings the ATF provided four recommendations related to progress in English language proficiency which 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.

In January the ATF agreed to unanimously to endorse option one but acknowledged that it was important to understand the impact of each option in combination with the other options.

Dr. Domaleski informed the task force that data were now available to evaluate options one, two, and four independently and in combination. He reviewed school and district summaries based on descriptive statistics for index scores and grade distributions for both elementary/ middle schools and high schools.

A strong majority of the task force endorsed options one, two, and four; however this recommendation was not unanimous. Notwithstanding, the task force unanimously maintained their commitment to exploring option three in the future, including and especially its impact in combination with options one, two, and four.

**Development Centers**

The task force considered whether to change Business Rule 21 to exclude Development Centers authorized in Mississippi Code 37-23-91 from performance classifications. Scores will be attributed back to school/district of residency.

The new business rule will read, “*No school performance classification will be assigned to alternative schools, career and/or technical schools, or development centers authorized in Miss Code Ann. 37-23-91. Scores of students attending these schools will be included in the school grade of the student’s official MSIS home school of enrollment.”*

The task force endorsed this proposed business rule change without dissent.

**Acceleration**

At the January 2019 meeting the task force discussed whether all courses (e.g. dual credit, AP, IB) should be weighted equally for purposes of accountability or if some additional weight should be given to courses that are more academically rigorous.

The task force reviewed policies and practices for several other states to inform the task force’s deliberation. The task force also reviewed some analyses to model impact under different conditions (e.g. different weights, different proportions of examinees etc.). Finally, the task force heard from Dr. Heather Morrison, who shared research on student performance on AP assessments and the relationship of performance with key outcomes such as graduation and degree attainment.

After substantial discussion a majority of the task force recommended increasing the weight of AP/IB, Cambridge, and Industry Certification in the performance calculation such that it is doubled weighted. Specifically, these courses will receive a weight of 2 instead of 1 in the numerator when the student meets his or her performance target.

With respect to multiple courses, a weight of 2 will be added to the numerator for each additional qualifying AP/IB, Cambridge, or Industry Certification earned by students. For dual enrollment, the current addition of a 1 + (.1,.2 etc.) weight will continue for each subsequent course. For example, a student who takes and passes two AP courses would earn a 4 in the numerator. A student who takes and passes two dual enrollment courses would earn a 2.1 in the numerator.

The task force also agreed that a cap should be placed on acceleration such that the total (participation and performance) does not exceed 50 for any school.

While a majority supported the aforementioned proposal, there were some dissenting perspectives. Some participants preferred a proposal that would assign a weight of 1.5 instead of 2. Still others did not support differentiating weights for dual enrollment courses compared to other courses. Those who did not support differentiating weights spoke to the importance of dual enrollment courses for many students to support their post-secondary preparation and expressed concern that the increased weights would disincentivize participation in these valuable courses. Some members also worried the proposal could create a gap between schools that are able to offer more AP courses compared to those who do not offer as many.

**Prioritized Topics for Future Meetings**

Each member of the ATF was asked to identify topics that should considered at future meetings. Some prominent topics suggested include the following:

* Consider approaches to expand the college and career ready component of the accountability system. It is especially important provide more indicators of accomplishments with respect to career readiness such as ACT WorkKeys or similar measures. Also, consider post-secondary measures in the accountability system.
* Students with disabilities, including students with significant cognitive disabilities, should be appropriately included in the accountability system.
* More investigation is needed with respect to growth; in particular, there is a concern that the measure is not sufficiently sensitive to growth from 3A to 3B.
* Some members expressed concern that larger schools with more subgroups are disproportionately identified for ATSI, TSI, and CSI.