



Mississippi Department of Education

***Options for Future Years of the Statewide
Accountability System***

Office of Research and Statistics

January 2011

Options for Future Years of the Statewide Accountability System

In its original passage of the Mississippi Accountability System, the State Board of Education established a four-year phase-in for increasing the QDI required for schools/districts to reach each of five tiers of academic achievement. On May 21, 2010, the State Board voted to hold the model at the current level and apply the 2009 cut points to calculate 2010 accountability results rather than use the cut points originally established for 2010.

In October 2010, the Mississippi Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) presented recommendations to the State Board concerning the future of the Statewide Accountability System. This report includes an overview of the options available to the Board for future years of the model.

When considering application of the Statewide Accountability System for the current and future years, four options are available. It must be noted that in the predictions within each option, the growth model is assumed to be held constant. These options do not represent any changes to the growth equations; instead, they assume that the same growth equations are used for each year.

Available Options

- I. Implement the model holding at the current levels as applied in 2010.
- II. Continue with the originally-approved implementation timeline and criteria.
- III. Accept the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to retain current QDI cut-points and updating the growth model when a fixed percentage of schools/districts have reached successful or above.
- IV. Phase-in cut-points over an extended period of time allowing for a smaller increase at each “bump” in targets.

Summary Tables of 2009 and 2010 Accountability Results

DISTRICT LEVEL INFORMATION

Table 1. District-Level Accountability Labels for 2009 and 2010				
Label	Number of Districts		Percentage of Districts	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Star	2	3	1%	2%
High Performing	21	24	14%	16%
Successful	38	51	25%	34%
Academic Watch	37	36	25%	24%
Low Performing	0	0	0%	0%
At Risk of Failing	45	32	30%	21%
Failing	8	6	5%	4%

SCHOOL LEVEL INFORMATION

Table 2. School-Level Accountability Labels for 2009 and 2010				
Label	Number of Districts		Percentage of Districts	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Star	34	53	4%	6%
High Performing	142	168	18%	20%
Successful	217	252	27%	31%
Academic Watch	189	187	24%	23%
Low Performing	6	2	<1%	<1%
At Risk of Failing	158	129	20%	16%
Failing	53	29	7%	4%

Table 3. Successful or Above District/Schools in 2010		
	Count	Percentage
Successful and Above Districts	78	51%
Successful and Above Schools	473	58%

Option I – Implement the model holding at the current levels as applied in 2010

Table 4. Phase-In of QDI Cut-Points as Modified in May, 2010						
Cut Score Range	Year					
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Top Range	200-300	200-300	200-300	214-300	227-300	240-300
	166-199	166-199	166-199	176-213	185-226	194-239
	133-165	133-165	133-165	138-175	143-184	147-193
	100-132	100-132	100-132	100-137	100-142	100-146
Bottom Range	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100

Option II – Continue with the originally-approved implementation timeline and criteria

Table 5. Five Year Phase-In of QDI Cut-Points as Modified in May, 2010					
Cut Score Range	Year				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Top Range	200-300	200-300	214-300	227-300	240-300
	166-199	166-199	176-213	185-226	194-239
	133-165	133-165	138-175	143-184	147-193
	100-132	100-132	100-137	100-142	100-146
Bottom Range	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100

Table 6. District-Level Accountability Results Using Scheduled 2011 Cut-Points				
Label	Actual 2010 Results released in September, 2010		Projected 2011 If assessment results remain stable in 2011	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Star	3	2	--	--
High Performing	24	16	18	12
Successful	51	33	50	32
Academic Watch	36	24	42	28
Low Performing	--	--	--	--
At-Risk of Failing	32	21	36	24
Failing	6	4	6	4

Table 7. School-Level Accountability Results Using Scheduled 2011 Cut-Points				
Label	Actual 2010 Results released in September, 2010		Projected 2011 If assessment results remain stable in 2011	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Star	53	7	23	3
High Performing	168	21	149	18
Successful	252	30	255	30
Academic Watch	187	23	210	26
Low Performing	2	<1	2	<1
At-Risk of Failing	129	15	152	19
Failing	29	4	29	4

Option III – Accept the following recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

During the November, 2010 State Board meeting, the TAC presented three recommendations concerning the Statewide Accountability System:

1. Retain current QDI cut scores.
2. Update prediction (Growth) model only periodically using a consistent methodology (such as the 75 percent rule of thumb).
3. Incorporate stability and planned change into the system.

If the TACs' recommendations are accepted, there would be no change to the model for the current school year or the upcoming school year. With only 58% of schools and 50% of districts demonstrating at least "Successful" performance (see Summary Tables on Page 2), the 75% threshold remains considerably higher than current performance. Also, the TAC's recommendations for stability and planned change would require any changes to the model to be implemented in the following year.

Table 8. Retain QDI Cut-Points Using TAC Recommendations					
Cut Score Range	Year				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Top Range	200-300	200-300	200-300	200-300	TBD
	166-199	166-199	166-199	166-199	TBD
	133-165	133-165	133-165	133-165	TBD
	100-132	100-132	100-132	100-132	TBD
Bottom Range	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	TBD

With the acceptance of the TACs recommendations, the Board will still need to consider cut-points for the year that schools/districts reach 75% "Successful" performance. Considering only two years worth of results are available, there is no statistically reliable method for determining when the 75% benchmark will be reached.

For illustrative purposes only, consider that 2010 saw 28% more Successful or above districts and 20% more Successful or above schools (see Summary Tables on Page 2). It is important to remember that after any implementation of a measurement tool, an initial "bump" is experienced as schools/districts become more familiar with the tool. After that initial "bump", the State can expect to see the rate at which districts/schools attain the Successful label to decline. As a result, if the state can maintain an increase in future years, even if the increase is

smaller each year, the following tables illustrate a potential point at which 75% of the districts/schools would reach the “Successful” designation.

Illustrative Tables to Demonstrate a Potential Point at which Districts/Schools May Reach the 75% Benchmark

Table 9. Increase of “Successful or above” Districts (Number in parentheses indicates number of successful or above districts added)						
Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Number of Districts “Successful and above”	61	78 (+17)	92 (+14)	103 (+11)	111 (+8)	117 (+6)
Percentage of Districts “Successful and above”	40%	51%	61%	68%	73%	77%

Table 10. Increase of “Successful or above” Schools (Number in parentheses indicates number of successful or above districts added)						
Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Number “Successful and above”	393	473 (+80)	534 (+61)	577 (+43)	606 (+29)	624 (+18)
Percentage Increase in “Successful and above”	49%	58%	65%	70%	74%	76%

Option IV – Phase-in cut-points over an extended period of time allowing for a smaller increase at each “bump” in targets

Option IV blends the TAC’s recommendation to retain the current cut-points with a scheduled phase-in over time. This option also retains the TAC’s desire for stability and planned change by implementing increases in the following year rather than in the current year.

Table 11. Phase-In of QDI Cut-Points as Modified in May, 2010 with 2-Year Increments

Cut Score Range	Year							
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Top Range	200-300		214-300		227-300		240-300	
	166-199		176-213		185-226		194-239	
	133-165		138-175		143-184		147-193	
	100-132		100-137		100-142		100-146	
Bottom Range	Below 100		Below 100		Below 100		Below 100	

Table 12. Phase-In of QDI Cut-Points as Modified in May, 2010 with 3-Year Increments

Cut Score Range	Year											
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Top Range	200-300		214-300		227-300		240-300					
	166-199		176-213		185-226		194-239					
	133-165		138-175		143-184		147-193					
	100-132		100-137		100-142		100-146					
Bottom Range	Below 100		Below 100		Below 100		Below 100					