

OFFICE OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE
Summary of State Board of Education Agenda Items

February 19-20, 2009

Office of Accreditation

02. Approval to bring the Administrative Procedures Act Process for the State Accountability Rating System

State Superintendent, Dr. Hank Bounds, appointed an Accountability Task Force in late 2007 to begin considering how the state accountability system should be revised in light of the new curriculum frameworks in language arts and mathematics and corresponding assessments that were being implemented. The Accountability Task Force was composed of a diverse group of educators, business, and community leaders. The first meeting of the Accountability Task Force was held in December 2007. The early work of the Task Force considered what defined a top performing school, that is, a school that could compete with any school in the country. The Task Force also considered what defined a failing school. After identifying a broad range of indicators for these two end points of a school performance continuum, the Task Force began the task of narrowing the indicators to those that were readily available to use in an accountability system.

In the fall of 2008 the Accountability Task Force began to develop recommendations for the revised accountability system. These recommendations were shared with the Commission on Accreditation. The Accountability Task Force and Commission on School Accreditation subsequently held several joint meetings in late 2008 and January 2009 to refine the recommendations for the accountability system. The Commission on School Accreditation met on February 5, 2009 to make review and finalize the recommendations to the State Board of Education.

These preliminary recommendations of the Accountability Task Force and Commission on School Accreditation were shared with district superintendents by Dr. Bounds on January 28, 2009. Dr. Bounds held meetings to share the final recommendations of the Commission on School Accreditation and to receive input on February 10 and 12, 2009 in Hattiesburg, Ridgeland, and Grenada.

Recommendation: Approval

Back-up material attached

Accountability System Development Recommendations

February 20, 2009

General Issues

1. The accountability system should provide an accountability designation for schools and districts.
2. The accountability system should move the state toward the goal of national average performance. This purpose might be accomplished:
 - a. through setting growth for high performing schools using targets that would reach national average performance
 - b. by reporting school and district comparisons to the Southeastern average, national average, and high performing state average performance
 - c. by recognizing schools or districts for reaching the Southeastern average, national average, and high performing state average performance levels
3. The accountability system should include an achievement component, a growth (gain) component, and a graduation/dropout component.
4. The accountability system rating labels should be different than the previous system. The recommended accountability system labels, from highest to lowest performing are:

Star School

High Performing

Satisfactory

Low Performing

Academic Watch

At-Risk of Failing

Failing

5. The district rating should be based on the performance of all students in the district (i.e., the district will be treated as one K-12 school).
6. The graduation status and U.S. History test scores of students attending the School of Mathematics and Science and the School of Arts should be assigned to their home school for purposes of accountability.

Achievement Model

7. The Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) should be used to measure achievement. The QDI measures the distribution of student performance on state assessments around the cut points for Basic, Proficient, and Advanced performance. The formula for the QDI is

$$\text{QDI} = \% \text{ Basic} + (2 \times \% \text{ Proficient}) + (3 \times \% \text{ Advanced})$$

8. The performance levels of the QDI should be phased in over three years.
- The highest performance level should have an eventual QDI cut score of approximately 240, which should reflect performance comparable to high performing schools nationally.
 - Performance at a national average level should be linked to a QDI in the second highest performance level initially. The model should become increasingly challenging such that national average level performance is linked to a QDI at the third or middle performance level.
 - The Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) value defining the lowest school/district performance level should be 100.

Proposed Cutpoints on the Quality of Distribution Index (QDI)

Year	Bottom Range				Top Range
2009	Below 100	100-137	138-160	161-199	200-300
2010	Below 100	100-140	141-174	175-219	220-300
2011	Below 100	100-146	147-193	194-239	240-300

9. Algebra I and Biology I scores should be combined across middle/junior high school, 9th grade school, and the corresponding high school. That is, the Algebra I and Biology I results for calculating the QDI will be based on the performance of all students in middle/junior high school, 9th grade school, and the corresponding high school in a given year, and both the middle/junior high school, 9th grade school, and corresponding high school will receive the same QDI for Algebra I and Biology I. Including the performance at both levels will encourage middle schools, 9th grade schools, and high schools to work together to support students taking Algebra I and Biology I when they are ready for the course. A student will contribute equally to the accountability based on their performance level (Minimal, Basic, Proficient, or Advanced) on the assessment regardless of the grade level at which the assessment is first taken.

Growth Model

10. The accountability system should include a growth (gain) model. The actual achievement at a school/district is compared to the expected achievement, based on a regression equation, to determine the degree to which the school/district has met or exceeded its expectation. Technically, the value resulting from the comparison of actual and predicted values is called a residual. A residual value of zero (0) indicates that the achievement at the school/district was exactly as expected. A positive residual value represents achievement above expectation and a negative residual signifies that the school/district failed to meet its achievement expectation.
11. The growth model should have three levels:
 - a. Inadequate Academic Gain
 - b. Appropriate Academic Gain
 - c. Outstanding Academic Gain (An expectation 10% above Appropriate Academic Gain)

Graduation/Dropout Component

12. The High School Completion Index (HSCI) should be included in determining the accountability rating of schools with grades 9-12 and districts and a school or district should demonstrate high performance on the HSCI to receive the highest rating in addition to meeting QDI performance and growth. Districts with schools where 9th grade is contained separate from 10-12 grade will be issued a HSCI value based on the students who actually attended the school containing 9th grade and the 10-12 grade school will be issued a HSCI value based on the students who actually attended the school containing grades 10-12. The High School Completer Index (HSCI) should be based on the status of students five years after first entering ninth grade. Eventually the HSCI should be based on the status of students seven years after first entering seventh grade.
13. The weights for the HSCI student statuses should be:

Standard Diploma	300
Met Requirements Except Graduation Test	150
GED	125
Occupational Diploma	125
Certificate of Attendance	100
Still Enrolled	50
Dropout	-300

14. There should initially be two levels for the HSCI corresponding to the two highest levels of performance on the QDI. The Department of Education should monitor the reporting of this information. The Commission will consider revising or adding levels to the graduation/dropout component in the future.
 - a. The highest level of the HSCI should be a HSCI of 230 or a graduation rate of 80% or higher.
 - b. The second highest level of the HSCI should be an HSCI of 200 or a graduation rate of 75%.

15. As data systems permit, the state should consider including values in the HSCI to recognize students that go beyond the minimum exit criteria.

Examples of High School Exit Status That Are Above the State Minimum

- a. Standard Diploma & AP/Dual Enrollment Credit
- b. Standard Diploma & Vocational Completer
- c. GED & Vocational Completer
- d. Occupational Diploma & Vocational Completer

Goal 3: All third graders will be reading on grade level by 2020. **Accountability System Labels**
 District Level or Any 9-12 School Combination

Goal 1: Reduce the dropout rate to 13% by 2013.

Performance on state tests

Labels

February 20, 2009

Cutpoints on QDI

Goal 1 Component

200 - 300	High Performing	Star School	Star School
200	High Performing	High Performing	High Performing
161 - 199	Satisfactory	High Performing	High Performing
161	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
138 - 160	Low Performing	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
138			
100 - 137	At Risk of Failing	Low Performing	Low Performing
100			
0 - 99	Failing	Academic Watch	Academic Watch

230 HSCI OR Graduation Rate of ≥80%
200 HSCI OR Graduation Rate of ≥75%

Note: The label in the top row cell would apply to any school without graduates.

GROWTH

Inadequate Academic Gain
Appropriate Academic Gain
Outstanding Academic Gain

Goal 2: To increase Mississippi's scores on national assessments to the national average by 2013.

High School Completion Index or Graduation Rate (5-year)

**Accountability System Labels
For Any Combination of K-8 Schools
February 20, 2009**

Goal 3: All third graders will be reading on grade level by 2020.

Performance on state tests

*Cutpoints on QDI
2009*

200 - 300	High Performing	Star School	Star School
200	<hr/>		
161 - 199	Satisfactory	High Performing	High Performing
161	<hr/>		
138 - 160	Low Performing	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
138	<hr/>		
100 - 137	At Risk of Failing	Low Performing	Low Performing
100	<hr/>		
0 - 99	Failing	Academic Watch	Academic Watch
<hr/>			
	Inadequate Academic Gain	Appropriate Academic Gain	Outstanding Academic Gain
	Growth		

Goal 2: To increase Mississippi's scores on national assessments to the national average by 2013.

Proposed Labels

Star School

High Performing

Satisfactory

Low Performing

Academic Watch

At-Risk of Failing

Failing

Proposed Cutpoints on the Quality of Distribution Index (QDI)

Year	Bottom Range				Top Range
2009	Below 100	100-137	138-160	161-199	200-300
2010	Below 100	100-140	141-174	175-219	220-300
2011	Below 100	100-146	147-193	194-239	240-300