**Mississippi Accountability Task Force Meeting**

**April 22, 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 |
| Lowndes County School District | Deputy Superintendent  | Ballard | Robin |
| 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 |
| New Albany School District  | Superintendent | Evans | Lance |
| Noxubee County | Assistant Superintendent | Baliko | Richard |
| Ocean Springs School District | Principal  | Tiblier | Vickie |
| 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 March 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.

**Reporting in 2020**

The first topic addressed was reporting in 2020. Dr. Domaleski and Mr. Burrow reviewed the list of accountability indicators that would otherwise be reported with a status report for each (e.g. available, not available, uncertain). The ATF was asked to advise on which indicators should be reported and whether any changes and/or supplemental information should accompany those reports.

In general, the ATF advised that only information which is not impacted by the pandemic disruptions should be reported. In particular, no indicators should be reported as an accountability metric or aggregated to produce an accountability score in whole or in part. If an indicator is impacted (e.g. partial data) then both accountability and public reporting should be avoided. The latter should only occur if clear information is provided to aid in interpretation and use. Internal reporting (i.e. sharing information with district leaders) is encouraged, however.

There was a separate discussion about ACT. Currently, not all students have tested and it is uncertain when/if the remaining students will test. Many committee members suggested it would not be prudent to publicly report partial ACT scores, even if it is not part of an accountability metric (i.e. college readiness score).

With respect to progress in English language proficiency (ELP), some students were able to complete the ELP test and decisions have been made based on those results. However, public reporting of ELP results is not recommended. Moreover, a separate discussion should take place regarding the progress criterion when accountability comes back online, presumably in 2021. This was ‘bookmarked’ for a future ATF agenda.

**Computing Academic Growth**

Without a prior score in 2020, growth cannot be computed for 2021 in the typical manner. Therefore, the MDE is exploring using 2019 scores as a prior for 2021 growth calculations: aka “skip year” approach. This raises questions about the extent to which 2021 growth scores using this method are comparable and appropriate to support accountability determinations.

To begin the review of the “skip year” approach, the MDE presented data showing the extent to which district growth scores in 2019 using 2017 priors were comparable to those based on 2018 – the traditional approach.

While the analyses revealed that the data were general comparable – even slightly favorable, the ATF raised two important issues:

* School level impact should be explored
* The extent to which the pandemic influences results moving forward cannot be modeled well with legacy data

The ATF discussed a range of approaches for 2021 and beyond, including the plausibility of using the disruption to explore major changes to the system, given that comparability is likely threatened. Others suggested the state should explore flexibility with the U.S. Department of Education to see if continuing a “hold harmless” approach in 2021 is an option.

The MDE will continue to update the ATF about the range of options and flexibility that may be available next year. In the meantime, we will continue to explore options to restoring accountability calculations. As a next step, the MDE will pursue modeling school level growth impact. This will be addressed further at a subsequent meeting.

**Representing Career Readiness in Accountability**

Next, the task force discussed some strategies for bolstering career readiness in the accountability model. In particular, two options were presented:

* Option 1: Include WorkKeys performance as a new component of college readiness
* Option 2: Include diploma endorsements as a new component of college readiness

Many ATF members felt that option 1 was promising but suggested WorkKeys should not be combined with ACT to produce a combined score influenced by both tests. Rather, it should be included as a disjunctive element such that students would get credit for meeting the ACT standard or the WorkKeys standard.

Option 2 might be more appropriate as an acceleration component. However, more information is needed including modeling the impact. This would delay implementation, however, as impact data is not available until next year.

Ultimately, the ATF was not prepared to make a decision on a recommendation at the April meeting. Dr. Domaleski, explained that the task force will continue the discussion at a future meeting, informed by modifications to the options based on the ATF’s feedback.

**Prioritized Topics for Future Meetings**

Each member of the ATF was asked to identify topics that should considered at future meetings. Topics identified included the following:

* Explore how students with disabilities perform on WorkKeys.
* Revise career readiness models and revisit at a future meeting
* The ATF should examine growth in grade 4 for K-5 school.
* Adjustments to banking of HS data in future years given the disruption will need to be explored.
* Can the ATF get a status report on U.S. History when available? Will standard setting occur this summer?
* EL performance targets for next year need to be discussed at a future meeting. Do the targets advance or will they be held to the 2020 threshold?