



# Implementing *No Child Left Behind:* A Strategic Assessment

Prepared by:  
Danar Hussain  
Rob Jackson



November 21, 2002

### **Our states face major challenges to the implementation of *NCLB*.**

- Extend existing testing regimens
- Report disaggregated subgroup data
- Base AYP on disaggregated results
- Bring full accountability to all schools

## II. State Comparison



These states varied widely in terms of preparedness for *NCLB*.

	<i>NAEP Ranking</i>	<i>Grades Tested</i>	<i>Levels of Accountability</i>	<i>Existing AYP</i>	<i>Data Disaggregation</i>
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Above national Average	4, 8, 10	District, school, and student	Based on MCAS scores	Ethnicity; LEP; disability
<b>Maryland</b>	At national average	3, 5, 8	Schools; students (via exit exams)	Based on school performance index	Gender; ethnicity
<b>Michigan</b>	At national average	4, 5, 7, 8	Schools; students	Based on “gap” analysis	Gender; ethnicity; migrant status <sup>1</sup>
<b>Minnesota</b>	Below national average	3, 5, 8, 10	District; school; student	Based on learning “profile”	Disability; LEP; free lunch
<b>New York</b>	At national average	4, 5, 8, 11	District, school, and student	Gap reduction analysis	Race, poverty, LEP, gender <sup>2</sup>
<b>Texas</b>	Above national average	3 <i>through</i> 8; 10, 11, 12	District, school, student	Growth in proficiency <sup>3</sup>	Ethnicity; gender; special education
<b>South Carolina</b>	At national average	3 <i>through</i> 8; 10, 11, 12	District, school, student	Absolute <i>and</i> growth in proficiency	Gender, ethnicity, free lunch
<b>South Dakota</b>	<i>Does not participate</i>	2, 4, 8, 11	<i>None</i>	For Title I purposes: proficiency growth	“Available”

<sup>1</sup> Michigan also disaggregates by LEP and disability status.

<sup>2</sup> Note, however, that New York is *not* able to disaggregate data for its high school exit examination. Only testing in grades 4 and 8 can be disaggregated.

<sup>3</sup> Texas’ AYP also requires that schools have below a six percent annual dropout rate.

### III. State Analysis: Massachusetts



## Massachusetts will double its testing regime to comply with *NCLB*.

#### State Profile

- NAEP scores above national average (33% proficient in math, 37% proficient in reading)
- 77% white, 5% LEP, 25% free/reduced lunch
- 97% in Title-1 school; \$8,300 per-pupil expenditures



***Wealthy Northeast state, with large white majority***

#### Assessment Measures

- Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) in grades 4, 8, 10
- Overall performance rating for schools: averaging across content areas the percentage of students scoring in the failing and the proficient levels on MCAS tests in two year cycle

#### Accountability Procedures

- Students must pass MCAS to graduate
- Schools are recognized for high performance (Exemplary Schools Program)
- Under-performing schools receive district support and state assistance.
- District evaluated on-site every 5 years.





***141 of 260 districts with less than 90% student competency***

### III. State Analysis: Maryland



**Maryland has been leading the state accountability movement.**

<b>State Profile</b>	<b>Assessment Measures</b>	<b>Accountability Procedures</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NAEP scores at national average (22% proficient in math, 29% proficient in reading)</li><li>• 54% white, 37% African-American, 2% LEP, 30% free lunch</li><li>• 25% in Title-1 schools; \$7,300 per-pupil expenditures</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Maryland State Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) in grades 3, 5, 8</li><li>• MSPAP: &gt;70% at or above satisfactory performance on each subject area MFT/HSA: &gt;90% passing all four tests</li><li>• Attendance rate: &gt;94% Dropout rate: &lt;3%</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Students must pass subject-area exams (H.S.A.) to graduate</li><li>• If school is below School Performance Index (SPI), it may be reconstituted.</li><li>• Schools rewarded \$64,000 for SPI gains for 2 years</li></ul>
 <p><b><i>Significant African-American minority population</i></b></p>		 <p><b><i>46% of schools satisfy Composite Index requirements</i></b></p>

### III. State Analysis: Michigan



## Michigan is well-prepared to implement *NCLB*.

#### State Profile

- NAEP scores at national average (29% proficient in math, 28% proficient in reading)
- 74% white, 19% African-American, 31% free lunch
- \$7,400 per-pupil expenditure



***Average state with average performance***

#### Assessment Measures

- Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) in grades 4, 5, 7, 8
- AYP: closing achieving gap between highest and lowest MEAP/HSPT scores by at least 10% of the gap in math, reading, science, and writing
- A district is not making AYP if one of its schools isn't

#### Accountability Procedures

- Student must pass HSPT test to receive state endorsement; not required for graduation
- Schools not meeting AYP two consecutive years required to rewrite Title I plans or become unaccredited
- The state may take over the Detroit district



***1,106 schools will be identified for improvement***

### III. State Analysis: Minnesota



## Minnesota must add real consequences to its accountability system.

#### State Profile

- NAEP scores above national average (34% proficient in math, 36% proficient in reading)
- 84% white, 4% LEP, 26% free/reduced lunch
- 41% in Title-1 schools; \$6,800 per-pupil expenditure



***Nation's first charter school in St. Paul***

#### Assessment Measures

- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) in grades 3, 5, 8, 10
- School accountability: 60% of students in schools must achieve district outcomes
- District accountability: 80% of students who graduate must pass Basic Skills

#### Accountability Procedures

- Students accountable for MCA scores and Profiles of Learning. Students must pass reading, math, and writing exams to graduate.
- Districts are held accountable only through public reporting



***25 of 51 Title I schools failed to meet AYP, mostly in Minneapolis***

### III. State Analysis: New York



## New York is in the midst of significant revision to its assessment procedures.

State Profile	Assessment Measures	Accountability Procedures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NAEP at national average (26% proficient in math, 34% proficient in reading)</li><li>• 55.2% white; 20.3% African-American; 18.3% Hispanic</li><li>• 36.8% in Title I schools; \$9,344 in per-pupil expenditures</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• New York State Assessment Program; Regents Comprehensive Examination</li><li>• Grades 4, 5, 8, 11</li><li>• Disaggregated by race, poverty, LEP, gender in primary school <i>only</i></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Students must pass Regents Comprehensive Examination to graduate</li><li>• Schools unable to achieve 90% proficiency placed under “Registration Review”</li><li>• State may withdraw registration from underperforming schools</li></ul>



**Significant minority population, primarily in New York City**



**State goal of 90% proficient on State Assessment Program**






**Under current system, 105 schools under registration review, 97 in New York City**

Note: The New York Legislature is currently considering a proposal to use a “gap reduction” methodology for AYP, under which schools below the 90% state goal for proficiency will be released from registration review if they make adequate yearly progress towards that level of proficiency.

### III. State Analysis: South Carolina



## South Carolina is among the most-prepared states to implement *NCLB*.




State Profile	Assessment Measures	Accountability Procedures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NAEP scores at national average (18% proficient in math; 22% proficient in reading)</li><li>• 55.2% white; 42.2% African-American; 1.5% Hispanic</li><li>• 40.2% in Title I schools; \$5,656 in per-pupil expenditures</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (PACT)</li><li>• Grades 3 <i>through</i> 8; exit exam at grade 10</li><li>• Disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, free lunch, disability, grade repeater status, age range</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Students do not graduate before passing PACT</li><li>• Schools rated on “absolute” and “improvement” metrics; even schools meeting state standard do not meet AYP if performance decreases 3 percentage <i>points</i></li><li>• State may take over or close underperforming schools</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>History of low student performance in small districts and minority groups</i></b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>State goal of 75% proficiency in English, 70% in mathematics</i></b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>State estimates that “well over 100 schools” will fail to reach this target</i></b></p>

Note: Currently, South Carolina’s accountability program is shifting between a district-only system to a school-based assessment. On the existing district-based analysis, six districts are “impaired,” and receiving state assistance in improvement planning. The state has estimated the number of schools that will be “impaired” after the accountability standards described here are implemented.

### III. State Analysis: South Dakota



## South Dakota may be technically unable to accommodate *NCLB*.




State Profile	Assessment Measures	Accountability Procedures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State does <i>not participate</i> in NAEP</li><li>• 87.0% white; 9.8% American Indian</li><li>• 46.4% in Title I Schools</li><li>• Significant legal and social history of local control of school districts, particularly Indian cultural schools</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stanford Achievement Test (SAT9) implemented statewide in 1997</li><li>• Grades 2, 4, 8, 11; LEP students exempted and unmeasured</li><li>• State avers that disaggregation is available, but does not exist due to “staff constraints”</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No accountability for students: no exit exam</li><li>• No school- or district-level reporting of data; <i>NCLB</i> application notes “local newspapers” best source for performance data</li><li>• School accountability limited to accreditation program</li></ul>
 <p><b><i>Local officials have successfully resisted educational reform</i></b></p>	 <p><b><i>Title I definition of AYP of 5% growth in SAT9 proficiency</i></b></p>	 <p><b><i>100% of schools meet Title I definition of AYP; standards may be too lax</i></b></p>

Note: South Dakota defines 5% growth in “proficiency” on the norm-referenced SAT9 as a 5% annual increase in the number of students in the state who move from “below basic” to “basic” or from “basic” to “proficient” on the Stanford Achievement Test scoring system.

### III. State Analysis: Texas



## Texas is likely the best-positioned state to implement *NCLB*.

State Profile	Assessment Measures	Accountability Procedures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Above national average on NAEP (24% proficient in math, 28% proficient in reading)</li><li>• 43.1% white; 39.6% Hispanic; 14.4% African-American</li><li>• 56.9% of students in Title I schools; per-student expenditures of \$5,685</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)</li><li>• Administered in grades three <i>through</i> eight; 70% correct responses required for proficiency</li><li>• Scores disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, special education, grade, and LEP status</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Students must pass TAAS exit exam to graduate</li><li>• To be “acceptable,” schools must have 50% TAAS proficiency <i>and</i> dropout rates of less than 6%</li><li>• “Underperforming” schools required annually to show cause why they should not be closed</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Performance has improved markedly after implementation of NCLB-style initiatives</i></b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Significant accommodations for LEP students in grades 3-6; assessments in English by grade 8</i></b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>100 schools deemed underperforming in 2001, concentrated in Austin and Dallas districts</i></b></p>

**Several of these states have significant distance to travel before they will be prepared to fully implement the *No Child Left Behind* mandate.**

- Significant funding is necessary to extend testing throughout grades three through eight
- Legal and political barriers exist to the passage of accountability laws in some states
- Current testing at some levels may not permit data disaggregation as required by *NCLB*
- Existing proficiency and AYP definitions leave several hundred schools failing with limited recourse