

---

---

OFFICE OF GOVERNOR RONNIE MUSGROVE  
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

---

---

**TO:** GOVERNOR  
**FROM:** RILEY  
**SUBJECT:** PRELIMINARY 2003 STATEWIDE ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTS  
**DATE:** 8/13/03  
**CC:** RENICK, BOYD, KINNEY, MAYO, SEWELL

---

MDE has provided me with preliminary 2003 statewide accountability results. THIS INFORMATION IS EMBARGOED UNTIL SEPTEMBER 12, SO THIS MEMO IS CONFIDENTIAL. MDE will release district and school level test scores tomorrow, August 14, but accreditation levels and adequate yearly progress (AYP) results will not be released until September 12. This memo addresses the September 12<sup>th</sup> data. These results will not be final until approved by the State Board on September 12<sup>th</sup>.

20 schools have been identified for Special Action:

- 10 schools have been designated "Priority Schools" based on their having the lowest achievement and growth in Level 1 Low-Performing School Classifications
- 5 schools will be in School Improvement for the 1<sup>st</sup> year under NCLB. This means that these schools missed AYP for 2 consecutive years. These schools will receive technical assistance from MDE and parents have the option to send their children to any other school in the same district. 1 of these schools was in our 11 schools identified in need of improvement last year.
- 2 schools will be in School Improvement for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year under NCLB. These schools must offer school choice and must offer supplemental services, such as tutoring, to students. These 2 schools were in our 11 schools identified in need of improvement last year.
- 3 schools will be under Corrective Action under NCLB. They have missed AYP for 3 years. They must offer choice, supplemental services and one other action (to be determined by MDE). All 3 of these schools were in our 11 identified in need of improvement last year.

So, 6 of the 11 schools identified for improvement last year are still in need of improvement. 5 of those 11 improved enough to roll off of the list, but we added 4 new

ones (included in the 5 in School Improvement for the 1<sup>st</sup> year under NCLB above). Thus, we had a net improvement of 1 less school on improvement this year.

With regard to accreditation levels, preliminary results look like:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u># Schools</u>	<u>% Schools</u>
Level 5	Superior-Performing	151	18.3%
Level 4	Exemplary	222	27.0%
Level 3	Successful	307	37.3%
Level 2	Under-Performing	110	13.4%
Level 1	Low-Performing	33	4.0%
	TOTAL	823	

So, 680 or 82.6% of our schools are performing at a level determined to be successful. We now have to target those 143 that are not providing the level of education that they should to the students. The 10 schools mentioned earlier designated as “Priority schools” are included in the 33 Level 1 schools above. (NOTE: This is the first year under Mississippi’s new accountability model, that schools have received an accreditation level, so there is no comparative data for last year.)

MDE provided preliminary AYP results for both the district and school level. Based on 865 schools with preliminary AYP determinations, school results look like:

Schools meeting AYP in reading/language arts	499	(58% of 866)
Schools meeting AYP in mathematics	459	(56% of 813)
Schools meeting AYP on the other academic indicators	462	(53% of 864)
Schools meeting all AYP requirements - reading/language arts, math & all other	256	(30% of 866)

*(NOTE: I do not know why the “of \_\_\_” numbers vary. Nor do I know what comprises “other academic indicators,” but I’ll get answers to both of these from MDE.)*

So, only 30% of our schools demonstrated enough progress this year for all of our students to be “proficient” in 12 years as called for in NCLB. In Mississippi, AYP is determined by the percentage of students who reach the proficient or advanced levels on the four-level scale developed by the state.

Based on 152 districts with preliminary AYP determinations, district results look like:

Districts meeting AYP in reading/language arts	43	(28% of 152)
Districts meeting AYP in mathematics	40	(27% of 150)
Districts meeting AYP on the other academic indicators	50	(33% of 152)
Districts meeting all AYP requirements - reading/language arts, math & all other	22	(14% of 152)

As I mentioned in my earlier memo regarding these results, it is extremely possible for a school to be superior under the state's accreditation levels, but to be classified as not making AYP under NCLB. This is because our state model measures whether students as a whole have met a baseline score for performance or have made a certain amount of growth toward that score. NCLB requires each racial and socio-economic subgroup (white, black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, economically disadvantaged, special education, and English as a second language) to be reported and to make adequate yearly progress. Every subgroup must make AYP in order for the entire school to make AYP.

My home district of Pass Christian is a perfect example. All 4 schools within the district have a preliminary accreditation of Level 5 Superior-Performing. However, neither the high school nor the middle school made AYP in reading or in math. Likewise with South Panola – 5 of the 6 schools (elementary isn't assigned yet) have a preliminary accreditation of Level 3 – Successful. But, the junior high, middle school and high school all did not make AYP in reading or in math.

I've suggested to MDE that we might want to provide an indicator of how many subgroups within a school made AYP in order to give the public a more accurate picture of the school, but I don't know yet if they are going to do this. I got this idea from a NGA conference call. North Carolina indicated that 9 of the 10 subgroups or 4 of the 10 subgroups, etc. within a school made AYP in order to keep the story positive and to give the most realistic description of the school.

I'm going to really get into the data school by school and district by district today. I've also got some questions for clarification for MDE staff. I'll keep you posted as to my analysis and findings. Again, these preliminary results will not be final and released until September 12. MDE will be releasing the test scores for each school this Thursday. I'll be attending the briefing that the department is conducting next Thursday (the 21<sup>st</sup>) for legislators and members of the Public Education Forum.

REMINDER: THIS INFORMATION IS EMBARGOED. PLEASE DO NOT SHARE THIS MEMO WITH ANYONE.