

---

---

OFFICE OF GOVERNOR RONNIE MUSGROVE  
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

---

---

**TO:** GOVERNOR  
**FROM:** RILEY  
**SUBJECT:** FINAL 2003 STATEWIDE ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTS  
**DATE:** 9/11/03  
**CC:** RENICK, BOYD, KINNEY, MAYO

---

I've just received the final 2003 statewide accountability results that the State Board of Education will approve tomorrow morning and then announce at the 9:00 press event that you are participating in (LAM is preparing remarks for the event.) There are some significant improvements in the final numbers. According to Dr. Rucker, the difference in these numbers and the numbers they gave us last month is predominantly attributable to corrections/clean ups in the participation rates.

17 schools have been identified for Special Action in accordance with the state or federal accountability plan:

- 10 schools have been designated "Priority Schools" based on their having the lowest achievement and growth in Level 1 Low-Performing School Classifications (State accountability plan)
- 3 Title I 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. (Federal accountability plan)
- 1 Title I school 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. (Federal accountability plan)
- 3 Title I 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). (Federal accountability plan)

You'll remember that MDE identified 11 Title I schools last year for some level of improvement under NCLB. This year the number of Title I schools identified for some level of improvement under NCLB has dropped to 7.

## State Accountability System Results

School performance classifications for 2003-2004:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u># Schools</u>	<u>% Schools</u>
Level 5	Superior-Performing	150	18.2%
Level 4	Exemplary	221	26.9%
Level 3	Successful	309	37.6%
Level 2	Under-Performing	109	13.3%
Level 1	Low-Performing	33	4.0%
	TOTAL	822	

So, 680 or 82.7% of our schools are performing at a level determined to be successful.

### Adequate Yearly Progress Results (Federal)

Schools meeting AYP in 2003:

Schools meeting AYP in reading/language arts	752	(86% of 870)
Schools meeting AYP in mathematics	684	(84% of 816)
Schools meeting AYP on the other academic Indicators (graduation rate for high schools; Growth index for other schools)	467	(54% of 870)
Schools meeting all AYP requirements - reading/language arts, math & all other	432	(50% of 870)

Schools NOT meeting AYP in 2003:

Schools NOT meeting AYP in reading/language arts	118	(14% of 870)
Schools meeting AYP in mathematics	132	(16% of 816)

Districts meeting AYP in 2003:

Districts meeting AYP in reading/language arts	105	(69% of 152)
Districts meeting AYP in mathematics	103	(69% 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	43	(28% of 152)

As I mentioned in my earlier memos 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.