

MSDE Assessment and Accountability Task Force
Meeting 4 Summary
July 25, 2024

This document summarizes the key discussion points from the Maryland State Department of Education Assessment and Accountability Task Force. This meeting was the fourth meeting of the Task Force and was held on July 25, 2024. The meeting was held from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm at the MSDE offices in Baltimore, Maryland.

This meeting summary does not directly attribute to any one person, and some comments recognize initial ideas raised by one person and broader articulation or refinement by other members of the task force.

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. During his summary of the agenda, he emphasized that the goal of this meeting was to make some decisions on finalizing recommendations of the Task Force on graduation rate, academic achievement, and academic growth.

1.2. Review ESSA Required Indicators: Academic Achievement and Graduation Rate

Academic Achievement

Chris provided an overview of ESSA Requirements for Academic Achievement. These included requirements for content, accessibility, and psychometric properties. For this discussion, he asked Task Force members to orient toward state tests in English language arts and Mathematics. Chris then discussed two models for reporting: proficiency level summaries (benchmark approach) and proficiency index, which award credit for improvement within a proficiency level. He also shared that ESSA does not permit the use of average scale scores because the approach must be closely coupled with proficiency. Finally, he shared that Maryland has taken an unusual approach of using a composite of these two approaches, essentially averaging both. An anonymous preliminary poll was then taken using Google Forms. Responses indicated that of the 16 participants, none recommended keeping the current approach. In a second question, slightly more than half of the participants recommended reporting proficiency only. About a quarter recommended a performance index only, 1 participant selected a combination approach, and the remainder were 'unsure.' A final vote was taken and shared with the group. The results indicate that a majority of the Task Force still recommended using the percentage of students proficient or above (58.8%). However, some Task Force members still preferred using a performance index (35.8%), and the remainder a combination of the two.

Graduation Rate

Next, Chris provided an overview of ESSA Requirements for Graduation Rates. These included requirements for reporting four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates and alternatives that some states have used. For example, additional information on 5-year and 6-year graduation rates was included. He then shared Maryland's current approach, which includes 10 points for the 4-year graduation rate and 5 points for the 5-year graduation rate. There was one question of clarification on whether Maryland

included summer graduations in the 4-year or 5-year graduation rates. MSDE responded that these students are included in 4-year graduation indicators. An anonymous preliminary poll was then taken using Google Forms. Responses indicated that three-quarters of participants recommended keeping the current approach to report both 4-year and 5-year graduation rates.

1.3. Academic Growth Follow-Up

Next, Scott Marion reviewed two possible indicators of academic growth with a focus on Value Tables and Student Growth Percentiles (SGP). At a prior meeting, the Task Force had prioritized these two approaches to measuring Academic Growth Indicators. Scott shared that the purpose of this discussion was to finalize the Task Force's recommendation on which approach Maryland should use. Scott Marion then reviewed the criteria for a growth indicator discussed previously and invited a discussion on whether the Task Force members still agreed with these criteria and invited proposals of other criteria. No other criteria were raised, and no objections were voiced for the following criteria:

Task Force members were divided into four groups based on the tables they were seated at. Each group was asked to assume MSDE is using Value Table as an indicator of academic growth and then answer questions about the rules for implementation. Next, the same groups were asked to assume MSDE is using SGPs as an indicator of academic growth, and then answer similar questions about implementation. Finally, an anonymous poll asked members, "Based on our discussions to date, which of the academic growth indicators models is more likely to promote our priorities for school accountability?" Results revealed a fairly even split between value tables and SGPs, with a slight preference for SGPs.

1.4. College and Career Readiness

Chris Domaleskin opened the discussion of college and career readiness by discussing the prominence of these criteria in the Blueprint for Maryland's Future. There was an initial discussion on the importance of grade 10 readiness in the Blueprint in contrast to the ESSA requirement for college and career readiness by the end of 12th grade. The group reviewed other state models of CCR in New Hampshire, Georgia, Delaware, Wyoming, and Mississippi. Next, each person was regrouped to develop an indicator proposal. Those proposals were then presented to the wider group. Each CCR model included proposed indicators, the method for combining indicators, and performance expectations.

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 September 5, 2024.