**Mississippi Accountability Task Force Meeting**

**January 31, 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 meeting, 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 November 2018 task force meeting. No revisions were suggested. Dr. Domaleski indicated that any edits submitted by Monday, February 4th, 2019 would be considered before the notes were considered final.

**Progress in English Language Proficiency**

The ATF provided four recommendations related to progress in English language proficiency at the November 2018 meeting, 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.

The first of those recommendations served as the focus for the current meeting and the others will be addressed at subsequent meetings.

Following a review of the calculation procedures, data showing the impact of the ‘reallocation’ method compared to the ‘subtraction’ method was presented based on previous year’s data. In most cases, scores and were either unchanged or increased by a small amount. Of course, this is influenced by the large number of schools that do not have an ELP component. In a small number of cases, grades would have improved by one level with reallocation.

Ultimately, the ATF agreed to unanimously to endorse option one - the reallocation method – in lieu of the subtraction method. In addition, the ATF requested:

* provide a breakdown of district impact in future analyses
* provide a comparison of reallocation vs subtraction when the other options are modeled

**Non-Conventional Grade Configurations**

At the November 2018 meeting the ATF discussed policy alternatives for schools with atypical grade configurations that cover both 1) elementary and middle school (ES/MS) grades and 2) high school (HS) grades. Of particular note, some of these schools receive a lower overall rating than would otherwise be produced if the components were considered separately.

At the November meeting an approach for resolving the issue by providing a single high school score that more fairly includes ES/MS performance was developed. This involves:

1. Compute accountability score separately for each of ES/MS and HS grades
2. Transform the ES/MS score to the HS scale
3. Create a weighted composite of the two scores based on percent enrollment for each component

This approach was modeled using prior year accountability data. Dr. Domaleski noted there were multiple approaches to complete step two (transforming the scale), many of which were modeled. These include: 1) establish the 1000 scale with an equivalent percentage of earned points 2) equipercentile equating 3) linear regression and 4) quadratic regression. Each of these approaches has some merit, but the quadratic regression approach most closely matches the letter grade cut points on each scale. As such, this approach minimizes the number of ‘mis-fitting patterns’ in school classification.

It is possible to eliminate these mis-fitting patterns if multiple scale transformations were produced within each corresponding grade level band. For example, one transformation would create an equal interval correspondence between the cuts between D and C on each scale, the next between C and B and so forth. The drawback is that this approach is more complicated to explain and implement, but it could be replicated easily with a single ‘look-up table’ that showed the 1000 point scale equivalents for each value on the 700 point scale.

The ATF agreed this ‘look-up table’ approach was preferred, due to the importance of eliminating mis-fitting patterns. With this change, the ATF agreed without dissent to recommend this approach for calculating scores and grades for schools with non-traditional grade configurations.

The ATF also considered whether the new or old method of computing scores for these schools should be included in the distribution if a new baseline is established. It was agreed without dissent that any future baselining should be carried out using the old or prior method for producing scores for these non-traditional schools. This will minimize an adverse impact on schools not otherwise affected by this change.

**Incorporating New Science Tests in Accountability**

The next topic addressed was how to include new science test scores in accountability rating for 2018-2019 and beyond. The MDE has resolved that the first year of the new test would be a ‘hold harmless’ year for science. Given that the science standards are expected to be more rigorous, the intent is to withhold any adverse accountability for the first year.

The ATF discussed some options for how to implement this approach. It was noted that simply removing science from the calculations and reallocating the weights to ELA and math would have a nearly universal adverse impact, given that science performance is generally more favorable. Another class of approaches discussed was creating a transitional score for the new science test that estimates performance on the legacy test. The ATF did not support that alternative.

Ultimately, the ATF agreed unanimously that the preferred option is to give schools and districts the choice between the results based on 1) the old 2017-2018 science performance in 2018-2019 or 2) the new 2018-2019 score (the ATF went on to discuss a 2A and 2B which is detailed later in this section). Accountability scores would be calculated both ways and schools and districts would receive the more favorable of the two as their official score of record in 2019.

This led to a discussion of what to do in 2019-2020 in beyond, which is complicated by the current method of banking science performance when a student takes the test prior to grade 10. The ATF was unanimous in recommending that banking should be discontinued as soon as possible. This would be particularly beneficial in 2019-2020. In this year and beyond, the ATF urged that all science tests taken, regardless of the examinee’s grade, would be used in accountability. This would sunset the current practice of banking.

Moreover, the ATF recommended that the elimination of banking should be offered as an option in 2018-2019. Essentially, this would create a 2A and 2B choice for districts and schools to consider in lieu of carrying forward legacy performance (option 1). Option 2A would include new science tests with banking implemented consistent with current practice. Option 2B would be new science tests in 2018-2019 with no banking. This plan is summarized in the table below.

**Summary of proposal to compute accountability scores in 2018-2019**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***How is science performance determined?***  | ***How are overall accountability points calculated?***  |
| 1.Use last year’s score (2017-2018) | Science performance is based on whichever option is most favorable.  |
| 2A. Use the current year score (2018-2019) with current banking method applied. This means the new test will be used for 10th graders and the old test will be used for 8th and 9th graders. |
| 2B. Use the current year score (2018-2019) without banking. This means that 8th, 9th, and 10th grade scores will all be based on the new test.  |

**Acceleration**

The next issue addressed by the ATF was how to calculate participation and performance for acceleration in the instance where a student is taking a multi-year course that culminates in an assessment at the end of the second year only. Currently, students in year one are included in the performance calculation. Since there is not a test for these students, they are not given performance credit.

The ATF agreed the business rules should be changed such that the denominator for performance credit only includes students who are enrolled in a qualifying course that culminates in a test that year. However, students in the first year of course designed as a two year course, should continue to count for participation.

These rules should be applied consistently for all students in a qualifying course.

Finally, the ATF began a discussion of 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 ATF was not able to complete this conversation and resolved to continue deliberations at a future meeting.

**Prioritized Topics for Future Meetings**

Each member of the ATF was asked to identify topics that should considered at future meetings. Topics suggested include the following (topics are only listed once although some were voiced by multiple members):

* It is important to examine the ‘stagnant’ growth in level 3.
* What strategies will help students progress to the next level?
* What are approaches to support students not successful on the third grade reading test?
* Several ATF members expressed gratitude for the good work on the K-12 school issue.
* Explore strategies to better reflect the impact of EL progress for schools with small n-sizes. Many expressed concerns that the impact of this component is not commiserate with group size.
* Study a broader range of career readiness outcomes.
* Examine FAY rule for acceleration
* Is TSI/CSI disproportionately and/or unfairly applied to larger schools with more subgroups?
* Continue the work to better incentivize AP/IB participation.

**Upcoming Meetings**

The following dates were selected for upcoming meetings of the ATF:

* February 28, 2019
* March 28, 2019