2017-2018 Administrator Survey Analysis Results

Prepared For Mississippi Student Testing Task Force Committee Meeting

03/29/2019

Yan Li, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Development
yli@mdek12.org
VISION
To create a world-class educational system that gives students the knowledge and skills to be successful in college and the workforce, and to flourish as parents and citizens

MISSION
To provide leadership through the development of policy and accountability systems so that all students are prepared to compete in the global community
MISSISSIPPI STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

1. All Students Proficient and Showing Growth in All Assessed Areas

2. Every Student Graduates from High School and is Ready for College and Career

3. Every Child Has Access to a High-Quality Early Childhood Program

4. Every School Has Effective Teachers and Leaders

5. Every Community Effectively Uses a World-Class Data System to Improve Student Outcomes

6. Every School and District is Rated “C” or Higher
Survey Overview
Survey Overview

- Valid response rate to the administrator’s survey was 64 percent.

- 85 percent of survey participants completed the questionnaire.

- Overall, less than two-thirds districts validly responded to the survey.
A, B, and C districts had significantly higher response rates than D and F districts.

Half of the D and F districts didn't respond to the survey.
Survey Overview

• Majority of the valid survey respondents used vendor-created assessments in their districts.

95 percent of valid respondents reported that their districts used vendor-created assessments in 2017-2018.

- Not using vendor-created assessments
- Using vendor-created assessments
Analysis Results
Analysis Results

• Reported data show that administrators on average have higher rate of finding the surveyed vendor-created assessments “very helpful”, compared to teachers.

In general, higher percentage of administrators find the following reading assessment very helpful, compared to teachers.

CASE ELA by TE21 is rated the most helpful Reading assessment by both administrators and teachers.

- Very Helpful Rate by Teacher
  - CASE ELA: 53%
  - CASE English II: 50%
  - i-Ready ELA: 47%
  - NWEA MAP ELA: 37%
  - STAR Reading: 33%
  - DIBELS: 22%

- Very Helpful Rate by Administrator
  - CASE ELA: 51%
  - CASE English II: 51%
  - i-Ready ELA: 51%
  - NWEA MAP ELA: 45%
  - STAR Reading: 40%
  - DIBELS: 29%

In general, higher percentage of administrators find the following math assessment very helpful, compared to teachers.

I-Ready Math by Curriculum Associates is rated the most helpful Math assessment by both administrators and teachers.

- Very Helpful Rate by Teacher
  - i-Ready Math: 47%
  - CASE Math: 46%
  - CASE Algebra I: 44%
  - NWEA MAP Math: 35%
  - STAR Math: 30%

- Very Helpful Rate by Administrator
  - i-Ready Math: 49%
  - CASE Math: 44%
  - CASE Algebra I: 48%
  - NWEA MAP Math: 42%
  - STAR Math: 35%
Analysis Results

• Survey questions:

What is the length of one administration in **minutes** for a student without time accommodations?

> “Student testing time for one administration of one assessment”

Examples:  
- STAR by Renaissance Learning [15, 180]
- CASE by TE21 [50, 280]

How many **school days** does it take the district to test **all** students for one administration?

> “District administration time for one administration of one assessment” *

Examples:  
- STAR by Renaissance Learning [1, 20]
- CASE BY TE21 [1, 15]
Analysis Results

Technology issues with **districts’ broadband** and **vendors’ software** are rated the top two factors that prolong the test administration for an individual student beyond the expected minutes of administration.

The top two factors prolong test administration time for an individual student are technology issues with district broadband and technology issues with vendor software.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Technology issues with district broadband/internet</th>
<th>Technology issues with vendor software</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NWEA MAP ELA</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWEA MAP Math</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-Ready Math</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE English II</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-Ready ELA</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR Math</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR Reading</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE ELA</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE Algebra I</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE Math</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Technology issues with district broadband/internet
- Technology issues with district hardware
- Students forgetting logins or passwords
- User error/trouble understanding how to use the testing platform
- Others
Analysis Results

- Lack of availability of **test-capable devices** contributed approximately 50% to the cause of districts taking longer time to test all students.

The most significant factor affecting the amount of time it takes the district to test all students is the availability of test-capable devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Availability of test-capable devices</th>
<th>District broadband/internet</th>
<th>Availability of proctors</th>
<th>District-level test preparedness</th>
<th>School-level test preparedness</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE Math</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR Reading</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE ELA</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR Math</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWEA MAP ELA</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE English II</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-Ready ELA</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE Algebra I</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-Ready Math</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWEA MAP Math</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis Results

• Survey question:

How frequently does the district administer the test in terms of the number of times per year?

“Frequency of test administration for one assessment in 2017-2018”

Examples: STAR by Renaissance Learning [1, 11]
CASE by TE21 [1, 4]
Analysis Results

Student total testing time for all vendor-created assessments in 2017-2018

= student testing time for one administration of assessment 1 * frequency of test administration for assessment 1 + ... + student testing time for one administration of assessment N * frequency of test administration for assessment N

District total administration time for all vendor-created assessments in 2017-2018

= district administration time for one administration of assessment 1 * frequency of test administration for assessment 1 + ... + district administration time for one administration of assessment N * frequency of test administration for assessment N
Analysis Results

- Students from A and F districts on average spent relatively more testing time on vendor-created assessments, compared to students from other districts.

A districts and F districts are the top two districts where students had longer testing time in 2017-2018 school year. The correlation between the average of student's total testing time and district's performance is -0.14 (weak).
C and D districts on average spent more time than other districts administering vendor-created assessments.

C districts and D districts are the top two districts who spent more time in administering tests in 2017-2018 school year. The correlation between the average total test administration time and district's performance is -0.11 (weak).
Analysis Results

- Neither student’s testing time nor district’s administration time spent on ELA assessments has a strong correlation with district’s ELA proficiency level.

In 2017-2018, the longer testing time a student spent in total on ELA assessments at a district, the lower the district's ELA proficiency. The correlation was -0.13.

In 2017-2018, the longer administration time a district spent in total on ELA assessments, the lower the district's ELA proficiency. The correlation was -0.07.
Analysis Results

- Neither student’s testing time nor district’s administration time in Math assessments has a strong correlation with district’s Math proficiency level.

In 2017-2018, the longer testing time a student spent in total on Math assessments at a district, the lower the district’s Math proficiency. The correlation was -0.14.

In 2017-2018, the longer administration time a district spent in total on Math assessments, the lower the district's Math proficiency. The correlation was -0.11.
Recommendation and Next Steps
Recommendation/Next Steps

• Survey design should allow respondents to go back and change answers for enhanced accuracy.

• More clear and rigorous definition for “testing effort” is indispensable.

• More qualitative data collection and analysis are needed for further investigation.

• More aggregate-level survey questions are required for a broader perspective.
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