MSDE Assessment and Accountability Task Force
Meeting 2 Executive Summary (May 30, 2024)

This document presents a high-level summary of the key discussion points from the Maryland State Department of Education Assessment and Accountability Task Force. This meeting was held on May 30, 2024 from 9:00 am-3:00 pm at the MSDE offices in Baltimore, Maryland. **1.1.**

1.1. Welcome and Introductions

Chris Domaleski opened the meeting, welcomed participants, and invited all participants to introduce themselves. He provided an overview of logistics for this meeting, plans for future meetings, and information on how all documents could be accessed.

1.2. Draft Design Considerations

Chris Domaleski led a discussion about design priorities. He summarized the feedback on design priorities from meeting one. Based on those priorities, he reviewed some design illustrations representing various approaches to represent the committee's priorities. Following the presentation of the design illustration members were invited to share questions and feedback.

Following full group discussion Task Force members met in small groups to discuss the design illustrations. Feedback from these discussions include:

- Many participants found the design illustration helpful for categorizing different indicators. It's important to distinguish among indicators that are required and influence ratings versus those that are collected and reported.
- Ensure the blueprint is elevated in the principles and the accountability model design.
- Comparing performance among schools remains important for many participants. However, context should be considered in these comparisons.
- The influence of growth should be amplified in the model.
- It's important to address the importance of access to highly-qualified educators.

1.3. Academic Growth

Scott Marion provided an overview of academic growth distinguishing it from other views of school quality. He also reviewed some principles and criteria that help inform decisions about what features of a growth model should be prioritized. These criteria included:

- Relationship between growth and achievement
- Fair and valid for all students and schools (types)
- Use of background and demographic factors in growth models
- Simplicity, complexity, & technical quality
- Open-source compared to proprietary
- Scale (test) independence or dependence
- Technical quality

- Capacity and resources

After Scott reviewed the criteria he invited task force members to place an initial rating with respect to a series of model preferences. After the initial ratings Scott discussed some of the group results and identified some of the considerations that might influence different priorities.

Then Scott invited participants to make another round of ratings. Since there was a range of perspectives about including background factors, Scott suggested the group discuss this in greater detail.

Some of the prominent themes from the discussion include:

- Growth is important and its influence in the model should be increased
- Growth should reflect expectations that progress to meaningful outcomes.
- Growth should be used to inform where supports are deployed.
- The model should include adequate conditioning to account for prior performance.
- A full range of growth results should be attainable for schools of different types.

In the next meeting, the Center will use the feedback on growth criteria to do a more detailed review of models that best fit the priorities of the Task Force.

1.4. Broader Measures that Matter

Chris Domaleski reviewed considerations for including a broad range of indicators in the model that go beyond federally required indicators.. Chris reviewed different models and practices for including broader indicators, focusing on the [framework produced by the National Academy (2020)](). That framework presents 16 potential indicators associated with student outcomes and access to resources and opportunities.

Groups were invited to discuss and record notes about these indicators focusing on which ones are highest priority and whether/how they should be included in the accountability system (e.g., 'formal' accountability; reporting only). Afterwards, participants recorded their feedback in a survey which will be summarized and discussed at the next meeting.

1.5 Wrap-up, Evaluation, and Adjourn

Chris wrapped up the meeting by summarizing key insights and reviewing action items. The meeting concluded with participants completing a meeting evaluation

The next meeting will be held remotely on June 12, 2024.