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This descriptive case study investigated eight magnet schools in the Clarksdale Municipal School District (CMSD) in relation to Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) accountability status and expenditures before and after implementation of the magnet school program for the purpose of determining whether positive or negative changes occurred. Using multiple school district and statewide data sources, the investigation was delimited to CMSD to assist school district officials in clearly and concisely determining whether or not the decision to establish eight magnet schools resulted in a positive outcome in relation to MDE accountability status and expenditures. The accountability status and expenditures were analyzed for the 8 schools four school years prior to implementation of the magnet school program and 5 years following implementation. A conversion chart was developed to ensure that comparisons could be made between the school years reported prior to magnet school implementation and the school years in which the magnet school concept was implemented. Positive changes in relation to accountability status occurred in 2 (25%) of the 8 CMSD schools after implementation of the magnet school program. Magnet school implementation had a
negative, little, or no impact in regard to accountability status for 6 (75%) of the 8 schools. Implementation of the magnet school program did not improve accountability status for CMSD schools in general. Implementation of the magnet school program appears to have a negative effect on per student expenditures as prior to the magnet school concept being implemented, the school district’s per student expenditures average was 10% lower than the per student expenditures average for the state of Mississippi as a whole and after implementation, the school district’s per student expenditures average was 10% higher than the per student expenditures average for the state. Overall, implementation of the magnet school program increased per student expenditures for CMSD in general, but did not have a positive impact on accountability status for the majority of the participant schools.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Code of Federal Regulations (HR 1, TITLE V, Part C, section 5302) states that a magnet school may be defined as “a public elementary school, secondary school or education center that offers a specialized curriculum capable of attracting substantial numbers of students from different ethnic backgrounds” (United States Department of Education [USDE], 2013a, p.1). Magnet schools offer specialized curricula through specific disciplines such as mathematics or through specialized teaching methodologies such as the Montessori approach and the International Baccalaureate. School districts often encourage their schools to select these specialized curricula in order to attract students of different ethnic backgrounds and reduce minority group isolation.

Usually, magnet schools are grounded in a particular theme and funded with local, state, and federal funds (Magnet Schools of America [MSA], 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; USDE, 2013b).

Magnet schools have been in existence in the United States since the 1960s protest over school desegregation. At their inception, magnet schools were founded to address educational inequity by reducing racial isolation in schools and offering school choice to parents (MSA, 2014b).

Although magnet schools have increased in number since their inception, magnet schools have not caught on in great numbers in Mississippi. As of the 2012-2013 school
year, there were 24 magnet schools operating in the state. Of the 24 schools, 12 were located in the Mississippi Delta, primarily in the cities of Clarksdale and Cleveland (Clarksdale Municipal School District [CMSD], 2015; Columbus Municipal School District, 2015; Public School Review, 2013).

This study investigated eight magnet schools in the CMSD in relation to Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) accountability status and per student expenditures before and after implementation of the magnet school program for the purpose of determining whether positive or negative changes occurred.

The study is presented in five chapters: (1) introduction; (2) literature review; (3) method; (4) findings and discussion; and (5) summary, conclusions, and recommendations. The study also includes a bibliography and appendixes providing resource references and specific materials relative to the investigation.

Subdivided into four sections, the introductory chapter addresses (1) problem statement, purpose, and research questions; (2) significance of the study, (3) method, and (4) limitations and delimitations. Terms unique to the study are defined in context as needed.

**Statement of the Problem, Purpose, and Research Questions**

The problem addressed in this study focused on the lack of knowledge among CMSD officials regarding whether or not the decision to establish eight magnet schools resulted in a positive outcome in relation to MDE accountability status and per student expenditures.

CMSD’s eight magnet schools are: (1) Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School, grades served: Pre K-5, student enrollment: 282; (2) George H.

According to the current superintendent, D. Dupree (personal communication, May 13, 2013), each of the schools included in the investigation began magnet school operations at the start of the 2008-2009 school year. All eight schools operated throughout the 2012-2013 school year.

The purpose of the study was to systematically investigate each magnet school’s accountability status and per student expenditures before and after implementation of the magnet school program for the purpose of determining whether positive or negative changes occurred. Nine research questions guided the investigation:

1. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?
2. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

3. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

4. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

5. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

6. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?
7. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

8. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

9. What effect did the implementation of the magnet school concept have on per student expenditures for the school district?

Although the study did not involve human subjects per se, permission to conduct the study was sought and received from the Office of Research Compliance. The office’s mission is to respectfully guide and serve the Mississippi State University community while engaging in research through compliance and ethical practices in order to protect the University, researchers, and research subjects.

Although the study utilized a limited amount of personal communication, data collection was largely based on archival documents and records (e.g., MDE reports) accessible to the public. Correspondence granting permission to conduct the study from the Office of Research Compliance staff, a subsidiary of the Office of Research and Economic Development (ORED), and information pertaining to personal correspondence may be found in the appendix section.
Significance of the Study

The study’s primary significance is its value to CMSD’s top administrators and governing board members. The investigation makes it possible for school district officials to clearly and concisely determine whether or not the decision to establish eight magnet schools resulted in a positive outcome in relation to MDE accountability status and per student expenditures. Such knowledge should prove beneficial for future decision-making purposes.

This study also has significance for educational leaders and policymakers in education throughout Mississippi and the nation in general. At present, information regarding the outcomes of the Clarksdale magnet schools movement is not easily accessible. This investigation produces readily available information for educators and policymakers alike.

Considering that magnet schools have not caught on in Mississippi, the findings from this study could prove to be an impetus for starting more magnet schools. It is also very likely that some school districts may be considering converting regular schools to magnet schools. Assessing the impact of magnet schools on student achievement (via accountability status) should help determine if they are a viable option.

Method

The research design of this investigation may be referred to as a descriptive case study. According to Tobin (2013), a descriptive case study is a focused and detailed study in which suppositions and interrogatives concerning a phenomenon are carefully examined and delineated. The main goal of the descriptive case study is to investigate a phenomenon in detail and depth. For this particular case study, CMSD constitutes the
phenomenon. The case involves CMSD’s eight magnet schools located in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

Collection of data for the investigation involved multiple school district and statewide sources. Data were primarily collected archival documents and records accessible to the public. Data were collected for each the nine research questions.

Charts, tables, and graphs were used to analyze data collected. These techniques for displaying data for the purpose of analysis provided excellent display tools because they visually communicated information. Complicated information is often difficult to understand and requires illustration. Charts, tables, and graphs help increase understanding (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

More detailed information regarding the study’s research design, case parameters, data collection, and data analysis may be found in Chapter III.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

The primary limitation of this study was that it is a case study addressing eight magnet schools in one school district: CMSD in Clarksdale, Mississippi. Inferences drawn essentially apply only to the district in which the schools are located. Results cannot be readily generalized to other school districts or states.

Another limitation of this study that needs to be noted is the investigation’s nature as a case study addressing magnet schools in only one state: Mississippi. Inferences drawn essentially apply only to the state in which the schools are located. Results cannot be readily generalized to schools in other states.

A third limitation that also should be noted is that the investigation was limited to time periods: the school years from the 2003-2004 through 2006-2007 and the school
years 2008-2009 through 2012-2013. Inferences drawn essentially apply only to those particular time periods. Results cannot be readily generalized to future time periods due to constantly changing conditions affecting public schools.

Because of the emphasis put on practical value, the investigation was purposely delimited to CMSD for the following purpose: to assist school district officials to clearly and concisely determine whether or not the decision to establish eight magnet schools resulted in a positive outcome in relation to MDE accountability status and per student expenditures.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The literature review chapter provides foundational support for this research study analyzing eight magnet schools in the CMSD. The study investigated each magnet school’s accountability status and per student expenditures before and after implementation of the magnet school program for the purpose of determining whether positive or negative changes occurred.

The literature review is subdivided into four sections. The sections address (1) brief history of the CMSD, (2) magnet schools movement in the nation and Mississippi, (3) three selected studies addressing the impact of magnet to schools, and (4) per student expenditures comparisons.

**Brief History of the CMSD**

The factual material pertaining to the history of CMSD is based on the seminal work entitled A History of Clarksdale, Mississippi, Public Schools from 1905-1907 written by Ellard (1977); personal communication with current and past CMSD superintendents; general circulation public documents and publications; and student enrollment, per student expenditures, and accountability reports made available to the public by the MDE.

According to Ellard (1977), the first public school in Clarksdale was opened in 1884 with one teacher and an enrollment of eight students. From this small beginning,
the public school system grew into a municipal school district in 1890 by action of the mayor and city council.

In 1905, Harvey B. Heidelberg became the first superintendent of the Clarksdale public schools. At that time, the district had one six-room wooden school building and a faculty composed of Heidelberg and three teachers serving the white children while Negro students attended school held in a church rented by the city and staffed by a faculty of three (Ellard, 1977).

During the early years of public education in Clarksdale, Heidelberg provided leadership to improve the schools and designed a program of instruction for the students of the community. Heidelberg directed the construction of schools and the adoption of a course of study (Ellard, 1977).

From 1916-1945, the public schools experienced growth and numerous seminal events that shaped the school district. The first salary schedule for teachers was adopted, attendance zones for two white schools were established, and a bond issue was passed by the city for the construction of a new high school (Ellard, 1977).

In 1955, after 50 years of service, Heidelberg retired and Robert Mayo was selected to succeed him. Under Mayo’s leadership an effort by the city and county to consolidate the secondary schools finally completed, the school district was reorganized, and the new elementary school constructed in 1952 was renamed in honor of Heidelberg (Ellard, 1977).

From 1960 to 1975, several developments shaped the district into what it is currently. Gycelle Tynes was named superintendent in 1960. During his tenure, the joint operation of secondary schools with the county school district was terminated ending a
successful partnership that offered outstanding secondary education for white students in Clarksdale (Ellard, 1977).

Tynes led the district to prominence through construction of up-to-date facilities for Negro students including a new elementary school, auditorium, and home-making and library building at the Negro High School. In 1967, on the heels of the improvements made to the Negro schools, the district gained membership of all of its schools in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 ultimately led to the racial desegregation of the school system under Tynes’s leadership (Ellard, 1977).

Robert Ellard was named superintendent in 1972. Under Ellard’s leadership, the district erected and operated a Vocational-Technical School. Also, under court order and through a desegregation plan, the district integrated its schools with smooth transition which was a surprise to many community members (Ellard, 1977).

By 1975, the city of Clarksdale had a population of 22,673. The school system included seven elementary schools, one seventh-grade intermediate school, one junior high school, and one high school. The faculty was composed of 1 superintendent, 1 assistant superintendent, 11 principals, and 187 teachers (Ellard, 1977).

According to D. Harrell (personal communication, March 17, 2015), superintendent from 1995-2000, Carl Weeden became superintendent in 1992. During this time it became apparent to the community that there was a need for school facility improvement. Much discussion came concerning the building of a new high school for the district.
In 1995, Donnell Harrell was named superintendent. At that time, the district had three black board members creating a black majority on the school board. Harrell was the first black superintendent of the district. Under Harrell’s leadership, a new high school was constructed, community involvement became a key focus, and recruitment of quality teachers emerged as an issue (D. Harrell, personal communication, March 17, 2015).

In 2000, Wilma Wade became superintendent. Wade was CMSD’s first black female superintendent. Under Wade’s guidance, the district had its desegregation plan revised in order to close two of its aging schools. Student enrollment had begun to decline during this time and the need for eight elementary schools had diminished. During this time there was a district focus on the programs on the vocational-technical education, including culinary arts and cosmetology (W. Wade, personal communication, March 17, 2015).

In 2007, Dennis Dupree was named superintendent. At the start of Dupree’s term the district had an enrollment of 3,543 students. Enrollment continued to decline, the district had become 94% black, and parents of students began to voice issues about the attendance zones in relation to the desegregation plan. In response, Dupree launched a plan to provide school choice. This plan included revising the desegregation plan and implementing magnet schools on a district-wide basis. Under this plan, eight magnet schools were created: the magnet school creation included all of the district’s elementary and middle schools (D. Dupree, May, 13, 2013).
The Magnet Schools Movement in the Nation and Mississippi

According to Magnet Schools of America (MSA), the organization serving as the major resource for the material presented in this section, magnet schools have been in existence in the United States since the 1960s protest over school desegregation. At their inception, magnet schools were founded to address educational inequity. Magnet schools helped to address educational inequity by reducing racial isolation in schools and offering school choice to parents (MSA, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c).

MSA reported that in the latter portion of the 1960s, school districts across the United States were in upheaval due to resistance to forced desegregation of schools. At that time, many parents either moved to suburban districts to prevent their children from being bused away from neighborhood schools or opted for private education for their children. This led to school administrators and boards of education to begin developing volunteer methods for reducing racial isolation in schools (MSA, 2014a).

In 1968 in Tacoma, Washington, an elementary school called McCarver was the first school created to lower racial isolation. This was done by providing a choice to parents. In 1969, Trotter Elementary School in Boston, Massachusetts opened for the same purpose. Both of these first schools offered a unique organizational pattern guaranteeing continuous progress education. Students would progress at their own rates. At this time, however, neither of these schools was called a magnet. These schools were referred to as alternative schools (MSA, 2014a).

In 1970, using $6 million of financial support from the federal government, Minneapolis, Minnesota embarked upon an alternative experiment in the southeast section of the city. This Minneapolis district created four elementary schools and one
high school with different organizational designs. Of the four elementary schools, one was coined as “free” due to students being given the autonomy to direct their own education. Another school type was termed as “open” as it had an informal classroom arrangement. The third school was deemed as a “continuous progress” school. And, the fourth was traditional and labeled “contemporary.” All four were successful. MSA contends that these schools were a success because the teachers and students wanted to be there, and the parents were free to choose the school site for their own children (MSA, 2014a).

In Dallas, Texas in 1971, Skyline High School emphasized the concept of career strands. Skyline High School lured students of all kinds, both rich and poor. Skyline also attracted Hispanic, African American, Asian, and White students from throughout the city (MSA, 2014a).

Skyline High School also offered adult classes in the evenings. It never seemed to close because some students attended the full-day program, some attended part-time, and others after the school day (MSA, 2014a).

It was during this time in Texas that the school began describing the effectiveness of its Performing and Visual Arts Schools as working like a “magnet” in its luring of students (MSA, 2014a).

The term magnet school took hold. By 1975, the term was being applied to the types of financial assistance being contemplated at the federal level (MSA, 2014a).

Around the same time, Cincinnati developed numerous schools. The school options included the first public Montessori school and foreign language schools in the primary grades (MSA, 2014a).
By 1980, the majority of metropolitan areas of the United States had systems of magnet schools. This was due to federal courts aiding the augmentation of magnet school education (MSA, 2014a).

Between 1982 and 1991, the total number of magnet schools increased by more than double, from 1,019 to 2,433. As a result, magnet school enrollment nearly tripled from 441,000 to 1.2 million students (MSA, 2014a).

Assistance from the federal government fostered the development of magnet schools. The Emergency School Aid Act from 1972–81 and the Magnet Schools Assistance Program from 1985 until present influenced the increase in the number of magnet programs (MSA, 2014a).

By 2001–02, over 3,100 magnet schools were operating in 230 school districts. Currently, there are more than 4,000 magnet schools serving students in the United States (MSA, 2014a).

Until the early 1970s, federal district courts primarily mandated that school systems racially desegregate using their own solutions. Yet, in rejecting a multiple district solution to segregation in Detroit, the courts approved special enrichment programs as an aid to overcoming the impact of past discrimination. Subsequent to this decision, every court order that forced schools to desegregate had a voluntary component. This voluntary component became known as the magnet school. Correspondingly, the courts discovered that by including the voluntary component more desegregation could take place, while improving the quality of education (MDE, 2014a).

Currently, the United States Department of Education administers the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP), a discretionary grant, to aid magnet schools in
providing an array of specialized education programs stressing subjects such as mathematics, science, technology, language immersion, visual and performing arts and humanities. Some magnet schools use distinctive instructional methods such as the Montessori design, the international baccalaureate, or the early college enrollment program (I. Phillips, personal communication, May 20, 2015; USDE, 2013b).

As of the 2011-2012 school year, there were 98,817 operating public elementary and secondary schools in the nation. Of that total, 2,949 were reported to be magnet schools. In brief, slightly over 3% of public schools operating in the nation were magnet schools (Keaton, 2012).

According to Keaton (2012) the three leading magnet school states in 2012 were Michigan, Florida and California. Michigan had 464 magnet schools, Florida had 414 magnet schools, and California had 282 magnet schools.

MSA (2014a) estimates that there are more than 4,000 magnet schools serving students in the United States.

Although magnet schools have increased in number since their inception, magnet schools have not caught on in great numbers in the state. As of the 2012-2013 school year, there were 24 magnet schools operating in Mississippi. Of these schools, 12 were located in the Mississippi Delta, primarily in the Clarksdale and Cleveland school districts. The three leading cities for magnet schools were Clarksdale (eight schools), Cleveland (four schools), and Jackson (three schools). Overall, Mississippi’s 24 magnet schools were located in eight different cities (CMSD, 2015; Cleveland School District, 2015; Columbus Municipal School District, 2015; Public School Review, 2013).
Selected Studies Addressing Magnet Schools

This section of the literature review focuses on three selected studies addressing the impact of magnet schools. The three research studies were (1) Accountability Evaluation of magnet school programs: A value-added model approach, (2) Magnet schools and peers: Effects on mathematics achievement, and (3) Can interdistrict choice boost student achievement? The case of Connecticut’s interdistrict magnet school program.

Study 1: Accountability Evaluation of Magnet School Programs: A Value-added Model Approach

The first of the selected studies was the Accountability evaluation of magnet school programs: A value-added model approach (Adcock & Phillips, 2000). This study was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research in New Orleans in April of 2000.

The study was conducted in 1999 in Prince George’s County Public Schools in Upper Marlboro, Maryland. Prince George’s County Public Schools is one of the nation’s 25 largest school districts. The district has 207 schools and over 124,000 students. The district also serves a diverse student population from urban, suburban, and rural communities (Prince George’s County Public Schools, 2015).

The purpose of the study was to estimate the degree that magnet program experience contributes to student achievement independent of all other factors.

The sample drawn for the study included 9,048 third and fifth grade Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) tested students enrolled in the same school for two consecutive years. These students had also taken the Otis Lennon Student
Abilities Test OLSAT test covering five cognitive areas: verbal comprehension, verbal reasoning, pictorial reasoning, figural reasoning, and quantitative reasoning (Adcock & Phillips, 2000).

The design of the study was described as a non-randomized comparison group pretest-posttest. The design involved the experimental group receiving the treatment of two years of magnet programs and the comparison group not receiving the treatment. The post-test was the MSPAP composite results in the six content areas administered to third and fifth graders in May 1998 (Adcock & Phillips, 2000).

The analysis used was value added. It employed a two-level hierarchical linear analysis to measure the impact of a magnet school program. This model examined the contrasts of the achievement among students in the magnet school programs (Adcock & Phillips, 2000).

The findings of the study determined the following: (1) most elementary school students in the magnet programs performed as well or better than non-magnet students on the MSPAP, (2) outcomes were mostly attributed to the fact that more capable students enrolled in the magnet school programs, and (3) when previous student ability was taken into account, students in the magnet school program did not perform better than students in the non-magnet programs (Adcock & Phillips, 2000).

It is important to note that this study, due to it being one of the key studies on magnet schools in the literature even though it did not demonstrate the value of the program per se, influenced the decision to start the magnet schools program in Clarksdale, Mississippi.
The second selected study was the Magnet schools and peers: Effects on mathematics achievement (Ballou & Liu, 2007). The study was conducted in a moderately large school district in the South. The study focused on students in Grades 5 and 6. At the time of the study was conducted, the district served 70,000 students of which nearly 50% of those students were eligible for the federal free and reduced lunch program. The district was racially mixed serving approximately 40% White, 48% Black, and 8% Hispanic.

The school district operated two types of magnet schools: selective academic magnets (with eligibility determined by grades and test scores) and non-academic magnets. One academic magnet school served Grades 5-8, while the other academic magnet school served Grades 7-12 (Ballou & Liu, 2007).

The purpose of the study was to estimate the effects of magnet school attendance on student outcomes in mathematics. The study used lottery randomization to study the impact school choice had on student outcomes utilizing data on magnet and non-magnet schools over the course of four school years: 1999-2003 (Ballou & Liu, 2007).

The study produced three findings. First, positive benefits were found in relation to mathematics achievement for students in some grades from attending magnet schools. Secondly, some positive benefits were attributable to attending school with similar peer groups. Thirdly, peer-group effects have a substantial influence on students’ academic achievement. The third finding indicated that the effect of attending a school where 75% of the students are poor and Black negatively impacts achievement compared to attending a school in which only 25% of the students are poor and Black (Ballou & Liu, 2007).
It is also important to note that this study, due to it being one of the key studies on magnet schools in the literature demonstrating the value of the program, influenced the decision to start the magnet schools program in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

**Study 3: Can Interdistrict Choice Boost Student Achievement?: The Case of Connecticut’s Interdistrict Magnet School Program**

The third study was *Can interdistrict choice boost student achievement?: The case of Connecticut’s interdistrict magnet school program* (Bifulco, Cobb, & Bell, 2009). Conducted in Connecticut in 2007, the study included students from Hartford, New Haven, and Waterbury. The study involved 553 students in Grades 4, 6 and 8.

The purpose of the study was to investigate Connecticut’s interdistrict magnet schools to estimate their impact on student outcomes. Also, the study provided verifiable estimates of the impact of the magnet program on desegregation. The information was useful for determining the need for policy concerning magnet schools in relation to increasing student achievement (Bifulco et al., 2009).

The design of the study was quasi-experimental. The study used pre-treatment test score measures and post-test score treatment to provide estimates of the effects of interdistrict magnet schools on student achievement in mathematics and reading (Bifulco et al., 2009).

The study resulted in several findings. First, the findings indicated that attendance at an interdistrict magnet high school had positive effects on mathematics and reading achievement. Secondly, the findings indicated that attendance at an interdistrict magnet middle school had positive effects on reading achievement. Thirdly, interdistrict magnet schools provide greater integration, higher achieving peer group environments,
and positive effects on student achievement overall. The authors posited that these schools provide a model that can help solve problems associated with racial and economic isolation (Bifulco et al., 2009).

Once again, it is important to note that this study, due to it being one of the key studies on magnet schools in the literature demonstrating the value of the program, influenced the decision to start the magnet schools program in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

**Per Student Expenditures Comparisons**

This section provides an analysis of CMSD’s averages for 2003-2004 through 2012-2013 and compare these costs to Mississippi’s statewide average per student expenditures averages for the same timeframe. All data presented are publicly accessible and available (J. Haynes, personal communication, January 14, 2015; MDE, 2014c).

The school years of 2003-2004 through 2007-2008 represent the period prior to implementation of the magnet school concept in the school district. CMSD’s average per student expenditures (for five years) before implementation of the magnet schools program ranged from a low of $6,446 to a high of $7,714 (J. Haynes, personal communication, January 14, 2015; MDE, 2014c).

Correspondingly, the statewide average cost per student, during this same time period, ranged from a low of $6,794 to a high of $8,737. Also, during this time, the five-year average per student expenditures for CMSD was $7,004; the five year average per student expenditures for the state of Mississippi was $7,807 (J. Haynes, personal communication, January 14, 2015; MDE, 2014c).

The school years of 2008-2009 through 2012-2013 represent the period after implementation of the magnet school concept in the school district. CMSD’s average per
student expenditures (for five years) after implementation of the magnet schools program ranged from a low of $8,523 to a high of $10,065 (J. Haynes, personal communication, January 14, 2015; MDE, 2014c).

Correspondingly, the statewide average cost per student, during this same time period, ranged from a low of $8,896 to a high of $8,921. Also, during this time, the five-year average per student expenditures for CMSD was $9,354; the five year average per student expenditures for the state of Mississippi was $8,886 (J. Haynes, personal communication, January 14, 2015; MDE, 2014c).

The information provided in a chart format below presents per student average costs for both CMSD and the state for the periods before and after magnet school implementation for Clarksdale in particular and for Mississippi as a whole.
Table 1

*Per student expenditures 2003-2004 through 2012-2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clarksdale Municipal School District</th>
<th>Mississippi Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>$6,446.00</td>
<td>$6,794.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>$6,652.59</td>
<td>$7,207.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$7,024.64</td>
<td>$7,996.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$7,182.02</td>
<td>$8,298.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$7,714.20</td>
<td>$8,737.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Average</td>
<td>$7,003.89</td>
<td>$7,806.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$8,523.19</td>
<td>$8,895.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$9,056.07</td>
<td>$8,930.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$9,333.17</td>
<td>$8,752.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$9,791.53</td>
<td>$8,932.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$10,065.25</td>
<td>$8,920.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Average</td>
<td>$9,353.84</td>
<td>$8,886.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data show, CMSD per student average costs exceeded Mississippi per student average costs on the whole after implementation of the magnet schools program. Prior to implementation, state costs exceeded CMSD costs; after implementation, CMSD costs exceeded state costs.
CHAPTER III
METHODS

Chapter III presents the methodology utilized for this research study analyzing eight magnet schools in the CMSD. The study investigated each magnet school’s accountability status and per student expenditures before and after implementation of the magnet school program for the purpose of determining whether positive or negative changes occurred.

The chapter is subdivided into four sections. The sections address (1) research design, (2) case parameters, (3) data collection, and (4) data analysis.

Research Design

The research design of this investigation may be referred to as a descriptive case study. According to Tobin (2013) and Fraenkel and Wallen (2009), a descriptive case study is a focused and detailed study in which suppositions and interrogatives concerning a phenomenon are carefully examined and delineated. The main goal of the descriptive case study is to investigate a phenomenon in detail and depth. For this particular case study, CMSD constitutes the phenomenon.

According to Clause (2015), a descriptive case study design can be applied to a research problem when there is a need to describe a given state of affairs. In descriptive research, the focus is on describing existing conditions without analyzing relationships among variables. This particular investigation focuses on developing a clear picture of
school accountability status and related per student expenditures associated with CMSD’s eight magnet schools.

**Case Parameters**

For this particular study, the case involves CMSD’s eight magnet schools located in Clarksdale, Mississippi. The eight magnet schools are Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School, George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School, Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School, J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School, Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School, Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School, Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology, and W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies.

Each of the schools included in the investigation began magnet school operations at the start of the 2008-2009 school year. All eight schools operated throughout the 2012-2013 school year (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

The study investigated each magnet school’s accountability status and per student expenditures before and after implementation of the magnet school program for the purpose of determining whether positive or negative changes occurred. Nine research questions guided the investigation:

1. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?
2. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

3. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

4. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

5. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

6. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?
7. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

8. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

9. What effect did the implementation of the magnet school concept have on per student expenditures for the school district?

Documents and records made accessible to the public due to state and federal legislation provided the information needed to address the aforementioned questions. No confidential material or data pertaining to human subjects per se were utilized in conducting this study.

**Data Collection**

Collection of data for the investigation involved multiple school district and statewide sources. Data were primarily collected from public documents and records (Mississippi Department of Education [MDE], 2004, 2010, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Clarksdale Municipal School District Personnel Department, 2012; J. Haynes, personal communication, January 14, 2015). Data were collected for each research question as follows:
1. Public documents and reports were used to determine the accountability status of each CMSD magnet school for a specified number of school years using the MDE’s Mississippi Assessment and Accountability System.

2. Specifically, accountability status for each CMSD magnet school were utilized for the following school years: 2003-2004 through 2012-2013.

3. Public documents and reports were examined to collect CMSD data pertaining to per student expenditures for the following school years: 2003-2004 through 2012-2013.

4. Public documents and reports were examined to collect statewide data pertaining to per student expenditures for the following school years: 2003-2004 through 2012-2013.

Data collected were organized in relation to the nine research questions. Each of the nine questions was treated as a discrete entity. Care was taken to collect data from documents and records available to the public in accordance with Mississippi statutes and federal regulations. No confidential material was collected.

Personal correspondence was relied upon in a limited way in order to interpret CMSD events and issues occurring in relation to implementation of the magnet schools program. Permission was sought and received prior to referring to any specific personal communication.
Data Analysis

Charts, tables, and graphs were used to analyze data collected. These techniques for displaying data for the purpose of analysis provided excellent display tools because they visually communicated information.

Complicated information is often difficult to understand and requires illustration. Charts, tables, and graphs help increase understanding. Charts, tables, and graphs possess the power to visually illustrate data sets. Graphic imagery, however, must be accurate in order to convey information efficiently. Ideally, they should also be aesthetically pleasing. Graphic imagery in the format of line graphs was used to analyze and present data. Analyzing data by means of line graphs significantly enhances comprehension of the study’s results through making comparisons, showing relationships, and highlighting trends (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

Data collected were visually analyzed, as well as numerically analyzed, and displayed for each of the nine research questions guiding the study.

Mississippi Accountability Model

The Mississippi Accountability Model (S. Curry, personal communication, October 16, 2015; MDE, 2009) figured prominently in the analysis of data collected. Particular focused was placed on MDE’s school accountability model for the following school years: 2003-2004 through 2012-2013. The following paragraphs address the model.

The school accountability model used by the state for the school years of 2003-2004, 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007 combined the results of two indexes to produce a school performance classification known as an accountability rating. The model used
the Basic Achievement Index (BAI) and the Higher Achievement Index (HAI) to determine values for student achievement levels at the end of the school year. The 2004 through 2007 model did not factor in the academic growth of the students during the school year (S. Curry, personal communication, October 16, 2015; MDE, 2009).

In the years following magnet school implementation (2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013), MDE made changes to its statewide accountability system. The changes involved moving away from a system of accountability status that included a performance classification system indicated by levels graded on a scale of 1-5 with corresponding labels: Low Performing, Underperforming, Successful, Exemplary, and Superior Performing (S. Curry, personal communication, October 16, 2015; MDE, 2009).

The approach used from the 2009-2010 school year forward factored in academic growth to determine a school’s accountability rating (S. Curry, personal communication, October 16, 2015; MDE, 2009).

The new model used the following possible terminologies to indicate accountability status: Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At Risk of Failing, and Failing (S. Curry, personal communication, October 16, 2015; MDE, 2009).

According to S. Curry (personal communication, October 16, 2015) and MDE (2009), the new model also included Quality of Distribution Index (QDI), which included a number calculated from Mississippi Curriculum Test (MCT) scores in Mathematics and Language Arts based on the following algorithm (1 x % of students scoring Basic) + (2 x % of students Proficient) + 3 x % of students scoring Advanced) combined with Growth
Status (Met, Not Met) and High School Completion Index/Graduation Rate. Scale score data from two years were compared to determine the academic growth of students over that period in relation to a predicted growth value. Simply put, the model questioned: Did students reach their expected academic growth targets?

To provide a clear picture of the Statewide Accountability System, Table 2 shows the History of the Mississippi Statewide Accountability System Results for Mississippi schools. Column one outlines the accountability year based on SY Assessment Results), column two shows district possible accreditations and column three outlines school performance classifications for the time periods reported in this study.
Table 2

History of Mississippi Statewide Accountability System Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Year (based on SY Assessment Results)</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 (SY2007-08)</td>
<td>Accreditation Status (Accredited, Advised, Probation, Withdrawn)</td>
<td>For the 2008 Accountability system, no state school level accountability results were assigned, due to a new assessment being given during SY2007-08.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 (SY2008-09), 2010 (SY2009-10), &amp; 2011 (SY2010-11)</td>
<td><strong>Accountability Status</strong> (Accredited, Advised, Probation, Withdrawn) <strong>Accountability Status</strong> (same as school formula)</td>
<td>Accountability Status (Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At Risk of Failing, Failing): <strong>Quality of Distribution Index</strong> ((1 x % Basic) + (2 x % Proficient) + 3 x % Advanced)) combined with <strong>Growth Status</strong> (Met, Not Met) and <strong>High School Completion Index/Graduation Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (SY2011-12)</td>
<td>Same as in 2011, except that letter grades were assigned to each <strong>Accountability Status</strong>, as follows: A-Star, B-High Performing, C-Successful, D-Academic Watch, F-Low Performing, F-At Risk of Failing, F-Failing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (SY2012-13)</td>
<td>Same as in 2011, except that letter grades were the only <strong>Accountability Status</strong>; terminology (i.e., Star) was removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 indicates that for the school years 2003-2004 through 2007-2008 that the state utilized a five point system (Level 1 through Level 5) in assigning accountability statuses. It also shows that for the school years 2009-2010 through 2012-2013 that the state used a QDI and introduced a new terminology along with letter grades as the model shifted.

Further details of the intricacies of the Mississippi Statewide Accountability model can be found on the MDE (2014c) website Superintendent Annual Reports for each school year.

For the purposes of this study, a conversion chart has been developed to ensure that comparisons can be made between the school years reported prior to magnet school implementation and the school years in which the magnet school concept was implemented. As mentioned earlier, in school years 2008-2011 and 2012-2013 there was a change in the assignment of accountability statuses based on the shift to ranges of QDI combined with Growth Status and High School Completion Index/Graduation rate versus Levels 1-5 used in 2003-2004 through 2006-2007. In order to make comparisons, the researcher has converted these ranges of scores for school years 2008-2011 and 2012-2013 to Level 1 Low Performing, Level 2 Under Performing, Level 3 Successful, Level 4 Exemplary and Level 5 Superior Performing as shown in Table 2.

In Table 3, the first column shows the accountability statuses for school years 2003-2007. Also in Table 3, the second column shows the score ranges for 2008-2011 that equate to the accountability statuses for 2003-2007. The third column shows the score ranges for 2012-2013 that equate to the accountability statuses for 2003-2007.
Table 3

Mississippi School Accountability Status Conversion Chart for School Years 2003-2004 through 2012-2013 (School Years Prior to Magnet School Implementation and Five Years Following Magnet School Implementation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Low Performing</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Under Performing</td>
<td>100-132</td>
<td>100-132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 Successful</td>
<td>133-165</td>
<td>133-165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 Exemplary</td>
<td>166-199</td>
<td>166-199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 Superior Performing</td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the reporting years atop each column. Table 3 provides the conversion of levels and accountability statuses for each reporting year and the corresponding score ranges used by the MDE during the 2008-2011 school years and the 2012-2013 school year. This table allows the researcher to compare the accountability status from year to year amidst the changes in the statewide accountability systems that occurred in 2008-2011 and 2012-2013.
Chapter IV presents the findings and discussion of the findings for the investigation titled Analysis of the Clarksdale Municipal School District’s eight magnet schools in relation to accountability status and per student expenditures. The findings are presented and discussed in relation to the nine research questions that guided the investigation for each of the eight magnet schools in the Clarksdale Municipal School District.

Throughout the chapter, findings are presented in the format of a line graph. The graph shows the school’s accountability status for four school years prior to magnet school implementation: 2003-2004, 2004-2005, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007. Mississippi (MDE) did not report accountability status for the 2007-2008 school year due to transitioning the accountability and assessment systems (S. Curry, personal communication, April 30, 2015).

In the line graphs, the vertical axis shows MDE’s assigned accountability rating. The assigned accountability status ranges from 1-5: a score of “1” signifies that a school is Low Performing, a score of ”2” signifies that a school is Under Performing, a score of “3” signifies that a school is Successful, a score of “4” signifies that a school is Exemplary, and a score “5” signifies that a school is Superior Performing. The horizontal axis indicates the particular school year for which the accountability rating was assigned.
Readily accessible public record data are shown in the graphs. Data were made available to the public by MDE (2014a).

To make comparisons between the school years prior to magnet school implementation and the school years after the magnet concept was implemented, a conversion was made. The accountability model used during the later school years was modified to fit the accountability model used by the MDE during the former school years. Accountability status were converted using the conversion chart shown in Chapter III.

**Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School**

Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School, in its current location, was established in 1959 (Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District, [CMSSD], 1959). This school was originally constructed to serve as an elementary school for African-American students. Its original name was Booker T. Washington Elementary School. This name was initially used for the first public school for Negroes in 1919 in lieu of the name Public School #2 (Ellard, 1977).

The name of the school has since changed and is currently Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School. The change in name was due to the adoption of the magnet school concept (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

The school was erected under the supervision of the then Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District Board of Trustees. Robert Mayo was the school district superintendent. The school remained segregated until 1970 (Ellard, 1977).

Booker T. Washington was designated as a magnet school in 2008 (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013). At the time of being designated a magnet school, the student enrollment was 262 in Kindergarten through grade 5 (MDE, 2014b).
Demographics for the 2012-2013 school year indicate the school served grades PreK-5 with an enrollment of 282 students. The school employed 1 principal, 18 teachers, 1 guidance counselor, 1 speech pathologist, 3 personal care providers, 7 paraprofessionals (teacher assistants), 1 educational interpreter, 1 secretary, 1 cafeteria manager, 4 food services employees, and 2 custodians (Clarksdale Municipal School District Personnel Department [CMSDPD], 2012).

Of the 39 school employees, 21 employees were certificated. Of the 21 certificated staff members, 14 had Class A (Bachelor’s degree) certification and seven had Class AA (Master’s degree) certification (CMSDPD, 2012; MDE, 2012c).

Figure 1 presents a breakdown of certificated staff experience as professional educators into six tiers: 0-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, 11-15 years of experience, 16-20 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience, and 25 or more years of experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of certificated staff members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years of experience</td>
<td>9 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years of experience</td>
<td>2 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years of experience</td>
<td>0 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years of experience</td>
<td>1 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years of experience</td>
<td>2 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or more years of experience</td>
<td>7 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.* Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School faculty and staff years of experience as professional educators for the 2012-2013 school year.

Findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, 11 (52%) of the certificated staff members had 10 years or less experience as professional educators, while 10 (48%)
of the certificated staff members had 16 or more years of experience. In brief, the findings indicate that the school’s certificated staff was closely balanced between relatively inexperienced and experienced staff members.

The first of nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:

1. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

Figure 2 shows MDE accountability status of Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School for four years prior to magnet school implementation.

![Figure 2](image)

*Figure 2.* Booker T. Washington accountability status: Four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 2 indicates that Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School was Level 3 Successful for the 2003-2004 school year and the 2005-2006 school
year; and Level 2 Under Performing for the 2004-2005 school year and for the 2006-2007 school year. In brief, the school was rated Level 3 Successful twice and Level 2 Under Performing twice during the four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 3 also presents MDE accountability status of Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School in the format of a line graph. The graph shows the school’s level of accountability for five school years of magnet school implementation: 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (MDE, 2014a).

Findings indicate that Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School was Level 1 Low Performing for the 2008-2009 school year, Level 2 Under Performing for the 2009-2010 school year and the 2011-2012 school year, and Level 3 Successful for the 2010-2011 school year and the 2012-2013 school year.
It should be noted that the previous principal retired in 2011-2012. A new principal was hired who in the previous year worked as an administrative intern under the previous principal (CMSDPD, 2012). However, given the limited timeframe, it is not possible to determine the impact of the new principal on accountability.

It should also be noted that according to the district personnel director, teacher turnover did not appear to be a significant factor in terms of accountability (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).

In brief, the school was Level 1 Low Performing once, Level 2 Under Performing twice, and Level 3 Successful twice during the five years of magnet school implementation. Data presented in the graphs appear to indicate that magnet school implementation had little or no impact in regard to accountability status. The school never reached Level 4 or 5.

**George H. Oliver Academy of Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School**

George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School was established in 1962 (CMSSD, 1962). This school was originally constructed to serve as an elementary school for African-American students. The school’s original name was George H. Oliver Elementary School. The school received this name due to the unanimous recommendation by Negro Principals and leaders in the district to give it this name in honor of the first Negro Principal in the school district who served for over fifty years (Ellard, 1977).

The name of the school has since changed; it is currently George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School. The change in name was due to the adoption of the magnet school concept (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).
The school was erected under the supervision of the then Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District Board of Trustees. Robert Mayo was the school district superintendent. The school remained segregated until 1970 (Ellard, 1977).

George H. Oliver was designated as a magnet school in 2008 (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013). At the time of being designated a magnet school, the student enrollment was 355 in Kindergarten through Grade 5 (MDE, 2014b).

For the 2012-13 school year, the school served Kindergarten through Grade 5 with an enrollment of 297 students. The school employed 1 principal, 18 teachers, 1 guidance counselor, 1 speech pathologist, 2 personal care providers, 6 paraprofessionals (teacher assistants), 1 secretary, 1 cafeteria manager, 4 food services employees, and 3 custodians (CMSDPD, 2012).

Of the 38 employees, 21 were certificated. Of the 21 certificated employees, 10 staff members had Class A (Bachelor’s degrees) certification and 11 had Class AA (Master’s degrees) certification (CMSDPD, 2012; MDE, 2012c).

Figure 4 presents a breakdown of certificated staff experience as professional educators into six tiers: 0-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, 11-15 years of experience, 16-20 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience, and 25 or more years of experience.
Findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, seven (33%) of the certificated staff members had 10 years or less experience as professional educators. Findings also show that 15 (67%) of the certificated staff members had 10 or more years of experience. In brief, the findings indicate that the school’s certificated staff was very experienced on the whole.

The second of nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:

2. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at the George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

Figure 5 shows MDE accountability status of George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School for four years prior to magnet school implementation.
George H. Oliver accountability status: Four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 5 indicates that George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School was Level 2 Under Performing for the 2003-2004 school year, but moved to Level 3 Successful for the 2004-2005 school year, the 2005-2006 school year, and the 2006-2007 school year. In brief, the figure shows that Booker T. Washington was Level 2 Under Performing once and Level 3 Successful three times during the four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 6 also presents MDE accountability status of George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School in the format of a line graph. The graph shows the school’s level of accountability for five school years of magnet school implementation: 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (MDE, 2014a).
Findings indicate that George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School was Level 1 Low Performing for the 2008-2009 school year and then reached Level 2 Under Performing for the 2009-2010 school year, the 2010-2011 school year, the 2011-2012 school year, and the 2012-2013 school year.

It should be noted that in mid-year in 2010-2011, a teacher who had served as an administrative intern was assigned to the position of principal. It is not possible, however, to determine the impact of this employee on accountability status (CMSDPD, 2012).

It should also be noted that according to the district personnel director, teacher turnover did not appear to be a significant factor in regard to accountability status (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).
In brief, the school rose from Low Performing in the first year to Under Performing in the second year, but remained Under Performing for four consecutive years. It should be noted that the school reached Level 3 three times prior to magnet school implementation, but never higher than Level 2 thereafter. Data presented in the graphs indicate that magnet school implementation had a negative impact in regard to accountability status.

**Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School**

Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School was established in 1949 (CMSSD, 1949a). This school was originally constructed to serve as an elementary school for African-American students. Its original name was Heidelberg Elementary School Building in honor of the first superintendent of the school district (CMSSD, 1949b; Ellard, 1977).

The name of the school has since changed; it is currently Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School. The change in name was due to the adoption of the magnet school concept (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

The school was erected under the supervision of the then Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District Board of Trustees. Harvey B. Heidelberg was the school district superintendent. The school remained segregated until 1970 (Ellard, 1977).

Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School was designated as a magnet school in 2008 (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013). At the time of being designated a magnet school, the student enrollment was 292 in Kindergarten through Grade 5 (MDE, 2014b).
Demographics for the 2012-13 school year indicate the school served grades PreK-5 with an enrollment of 272 students. The school employed one principal, 14 teachers, 1 guidance counselor, 1 speech pathologist, 5 paraprofessionals (teacher assistants), 1 secretary, 1 cafeteria manager, 3 food services employees, and 2 custodians (CMSDPD, 2012).

Of the 29 employees, 16 were certificated. Of the 16 staff members, 12 had Class A (Bachelor’s degrees) certification and 4 had Class AA (Master’s degrees) certification (CMSDPD, 2012; MDE, 2012c).

Figure 7 presents a breakdown of certificated staff experience as professional educators into six tiers: 0-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, 11-15 years of experience, 16-20 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience, and 25 or more years of experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of certificated staff members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years of experience</td>
<td>9 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years of experience</td>
<td>3 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years of experience</td>
<td>3 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years of experience</td>
<td>0 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years of experience</td>
<td>0 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or more years of experience</td>
<td>1 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7.* Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School faculty and staff years of experience as professional educators for the 2012-2013 school year

Findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, 12 (75%) of the certificated staff members had 10 years or less experience as professional educators, while 4 (25%) of the certificated staff members had 11 or more years of experience. In brief, the
findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year the majority of the school’s certificated staff was relatively inexperienced.

The third of nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:

3. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at the Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

Figure 8 shows MDE accountability status of Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School for four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 8. Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School accountability status: Five years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 8 indicates that Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School was Level 3 Successful for the 2003-2004 school year, Level 3 Successful in the 2004-2005 school
year, Level 2 Under Performing for the 2005-2006 school year and Level 3 Successful for the 2006-2007 school year. In brief, the figure Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School was Level 3 Successful three times and Level 2 Under Performing once during the four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 9 also presents MDE accountability status of Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School in the format of a line graph. The graph shows the school’s level of accountability for five school years of magnet school implementation: 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (MDE, 2014a).

Figure 9. Heidelberg STEAM Magnet Elementary School accountability status: Five years of magnet school implementation.

Findings indicate that Heidelberg STEAM Magnet Elementary School was Level 1 Low Performing for the 2008-2009 school year, Level 2 Under Performing for the
2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years, Level 4 Exemplary for the 2011-2012 school year, and Level 5 Superior Performing for the 2012-2013 school year.

It should be noted that the previous principal was replaced mid-year in 2010-2011 (L. Jones, personal communication, June 25, 2015). A new principal was hired. The new principal appears to have had a positive impact on accountability status.

It should also be noted that according to the district personnel director, teacher turnover does not appear to be a significant factor as it relates to the flux in accountability status indicated in Figure 9 (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).

In brief, the school was Level 1 Low Performing once, Level 2 Under Performing twice, Level 4 Exemplary once, and Level 5 Superior Performing once during the five years of magnet school implementation. Prior to magnet school implementation, the school never achieved an accountability rating higher than Level 3. Data presented in the graphs appear to indicate that magnet school implementation had a positive impact on accountability status.

**J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School**

The J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School was constructed in 1966 (CMSSD, 1966). It opened its doors for students in 1967 under the name of Riverton Junior School High (Ellard, 1977).

The name of the school changed to J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School in 2008 due to the adoption of the magnet school concept (CMSD, 1986; D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2014).
The school was erected under the supervision of the then Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District Board of Trustees. Gycelle Tynes was the school district superintendent. The school remained segregated until 1970 (Ellard, 1977).

J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School was designated as a magnet school in 2008 (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2014).

At the time of being designated a magnet school, the student enrollment was 245 in Kindergarten through grade 5 (MDE, 2014b).

Demographics for the 2012-13 school year indicate the school served grades Kindergarten through grade 5 with an enrollment of 176 students. The school employed 1 principal, 12 teachers, 1 guidance counselor, 7 paraprofessionals (teacher assistants), 1 instructional interventionist, 1 secretary, 1 cafeteria manager, 4 food services employees, and 2 custodians (CMSDPD, 2012).

Of the 30 employees, 14 were certificated. Of the 14 certificated staff members, 9 had Class A (Bachelor’s degrees) certification, 4 had Class AA (Master’s degrees) certification, and 1 had Class AAAA certification (CMSDPD, 2012; MDE, 2012c).

Figure 10 presents a breakdown of certificated staff experience as professional educators into six tiers: 0-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, 11-15 years of experience, 16-20 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience, and 25 or more years of experience.
Findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, 4 (29%) of the certificated staff members had 10 years or less experience as professional educators, while 10 (71%) of the certificated staff members had 11 or more years of experience. In brief, the findings indicate the school’s certificated staff was relatively balanced across all tiers of experience.

The fourth of nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:

4. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at the J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

Figure 11 shows MDE accountability status of J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School for four years prior to magnet school implementation.
Figure 11. J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School accountability status: Four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 11 indicates that J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School was Level 2 Under Performing for the 2003-2004 school year, Level 3 Successful for the 2004-2005 school year, and Level 2 Underperforming for the 2005-2006 school year and the 2006-2007 school year. In brief, the figure shows that J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School was Level 2 Under Performing for three years and Level 3 Successful once during the four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 12 also presents MDE accountability status of J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School in the format of a line graph. The graph shows the school’s level of accountability for five school years of magnet school implementation: 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (MDE, 2014a).
Findings indicate that J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School was Level 2 Under Performing for the 2008-2009 school year, the 2009-2010 school year, and the 2010-2011 school year, but increased to Level 3 Successful for the 2011-2012 school year before returning to Level 2 Under Performing for the 2012-2013 school year.

It should be noted that the same principal was in place for the duration of the time period analyzed (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014). Principal leadership appeared to make little difference in regard to accountability.

It should also be noted that according to the district personnel director, teacher turnover did not appear to be a significant factor as it relates to the flux in accountability status indicated in Figure 12 (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).
In brief, the school was Level 2 Under Performing four times and Level 3 successful only once during the five years of magnet school implementation. The school never reached Level 4 or 5. Data presented in the graphs indicate that magnet school implementation had a little or no impact on accountability status.

**Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School**

Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School was established in 1956 (CMSSD, 1956). This school was originally constructed to serve as an elementary school for White students. Its original name was Kirkpatrick Elementary School (Ellard, 1977).

The name of the school has since changed and is currently Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School. The change in name was due to the adoption of the magnet school concept (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

The school was erected under the supervision of the then Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District Board of Trustees. Harvey Heidelberg was the school district superintendent. The school remained segregated until 1970 (Ellard, 1970).

Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School was designated as a magnet school in 2008 (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

At the time of being designated a magnet school, the student enrollment was 265 in Kindergarten through grade 5 (MDE, 2014b).

Demographics for the 2012-13 school year indicate the school served PreK through Grade 5 with an enrollment of 299 students. The school employed 1 principal,
18 teachers, 1 guidance counselor, 1 speech pathologist, 7 paraprofessionals (teacher assistants), 1 instructional interventionist, 1 secretary, 1 cafeteria manager, 4 food services employees, and 2 custodians (CMSDPD, 2012).

Of the 37 employees, 21 were certificated. Of the 21 certificated staff, 11 had Class A (Bachelor’s degrees) certification and 10 had Class AA (Master’s degrees) certification (CMSDPD, 2012; MDE, 2012c).

Figure 13 presents a breakdown of certificated staff experience as professional educators into six tiers: 0-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, 11-15 years of experience, 16-20 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience, and 25 or more years of experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of certificated staff members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years of experience</td>
<td>5 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years of experience</td>
<td>3 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years of experience</td>
<td>0 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years of experience</td>
<td>4 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years of experience</td>
<td>3 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or more years of experience</td>
<td>6 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School faculty and staff years of experience as professional educators for the 2012-2013 school year.

Findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, eight (38%) of the certificated staff members had 10 years or less experience as professional educators, four (19%) had 16-20 years of experience while nine (43%) of the certificated staff members had 16 or more years of experience. In brief, the findings indicate that for the 2012-2013
school year approximately 60% of the school’s certificated staff had 16 or more years of experience.

The fifth of nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:

5. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

Figure 14 shows MDE accountability status for the Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School for four years prior to magnet school implementation.

![Graph showing accountability status](image)

*Figure 14.* Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School accountability status: Four years prior to magnet school implementation.
Figure 14 indicates that Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School was Level 3 Successful for the 2003-2004 school year and the 2005-2006 school year, but was Level 2 Under Performing for the 2004-2005 school year and the 2006-2007 school year.

MDE accountability level status for Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Magnet School are presented in the Figure 15 line graph for five school years following magnet school implementation: 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (MDE, 2014a).

![Figure 15. Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School accountability status: Five years after magnet school implementation.](image)

Findings indicate that Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School was Level 2 Under Performing for the 2008-2009 school year, the 2009-
2010 school year, the 2010-2011 school year, and the 2012-2013 school year. The Level 3 Successful rating was achieved for the 2011-2012 school year.

It should be noted that there were no changes in principal leadership for the duration of the time period analyzed (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014). Changes in principal leadership were not a factor.

It should also be noted that according to the district personnel director, teacher turnover appears to be not a significant factor as it relates to the flux in accountability status indicated in Figure 15 (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).

In brief, the school’s accountability rating was Level 2 Under Performing four times and Level 3 Successful once during the five years of magnet school implementation. The school never reached Level 4 or 5. Data presented in the graphs indicate that magnet school implementation had a negative impact on accountability status.

Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School

Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School was established in 1955 (CMSSD, 1955a). This school was originally constructed in 1954-1955 to serve as an elementary school for White students. Its original name was Eliza Clark Elementary School (Ellard, 1977).

The name of the school has since changed and is currently Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School. The change in name was due to the adoption of the magnet school concept (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).
The school was erected under the supervision of the then Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District Board of Trustees. Harvey B. Heidelberg was the school district superintendent. The school remained segregated until 1970 (Ellard, 1977).

Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School was designated as a magnet school in 2008 (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

At the time of being designated a magnet school, the student enrollment was 271 in Kindergarten through grade 5 (MDE, 2014b).

Demographics for the 2012-13 school year indicate the school served PreK through Grade 5 with an enrollment of 274 students. The school employed 1 principal, 18 teachers, 1 guidance counselor, 7 paraprofessionals (teacher assistants), 1 secretary, 1 cafeteria manager, 3 food services employees, and 2 custodians (CMSDPD, 2012).

Of the 34 employees, 20 were certificated. Of the 20 certificated staff members, 10 had Class A (Bachelor’s degrees) certification and 10 had Class AA (Master’s degrees) certification (CMSDPD, 2012; MDE, 2012c).

Figure 16 presents a breakdown of certificated staff experience as professional educators into six tiers: 0-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, 11-15 years of experience, 16-20 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience, and 25 or more years of experience.
Findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, 13 (65%) of the certificated staff members had 10 years or less experience as professional educators, while 7 (35%) of the certificated staff members had 11 or more years of experience. In brief, the findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, the school’s certificated staff was made up of relatively inexperienced staff although 25% of the staff was highly experienced having 25 or more years of professional education experience.

Question six of the nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:

6. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at the Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to the accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

Figure 17 shows MDE accountability status of the Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School for four years prior to magnet school implementation.
Figure 17. Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School accountability status: Four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 17 indicates that Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School was Level 4 Exemplary for the 2003-2004 school year and maintained a Level 3 Successful for the 2004-2005 school year, the 2005-2006 school year, and the 2006-2007 school year. Simply put, the figure shows that Myrtle Hall received Level 4 Exemplary and Level 3 Successful status during the four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 18 also presents MDE accountability status of the Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School in the format of a line graph. The graph shows the school’s level of accountability for five school years of magnet school implementation: 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (MDE, 2014a).
Findings indicate that Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School was Level 2 Under Performing for the 2008-2009 school year, the 2009-2010 school year, and the 2010-2011 school year. The climbed to Level 4 Exemplary for the 2011-2012 school year and the 2012-2013 school year.

It should be noted that a new principal began work at the school during the 2004-2005 school year (T. Matthews, personal communication, June 30, 2015). The principal was in place for the institution of the magnet concept and remained in leadership through the 2009-2010 school year. Another new principal was hired for the 2010-2011 school year (V. Davis, personal communication, June 29, 2015). This new principal remained in leadership through the 2012-2013 school year.

It should also be noted that according to the district personnel director, teacher turnover appears to be not a significant factor as it relates to the changes in accountability status indicated in Figure 18 (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).
In brief, the accountability rating of the school was Level 2 Under Performing three times, but then increased to Level 4 Exemplary twice during the five years of magnet school implementation. Data presented in the graphs appear to suggest, after a slow start, that magnet school implementation had a positive impact on accountability status.

**Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology**

Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology Magnet School was established in 1955 (CMSSD, 1955b). This school was originally constructed in 1954-1955 to serve as an elementary school for White students. Its original name was Oakhurst Elementary School (Ellard, 1977).

The name of the school changed to Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology. The change in name was due to the adoption of the magnet school concept (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

The school was erected under the supervision of the then Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District Board of Trustees. Harvey B. Heidelberg was the school district superintendent. The school remained segregated until 1970 (Ellard, 1977).

Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology was designated as a magnet school in 2008 (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

At the time of being designated a magnet school, the student enrollment was 388 in Grades 6 through 8 (MDE, 2014b).

Demographics for the 2012-13 school year indicate the school served grades 6 through 8 with an enrollment of 480 students. The school employed 1 principal, 1 assistant principal, 21 teachers, 1 guidance counselor, 1 paraprofessional (teacher
assistants), 1 in-school suspension instructor, 2 secretaries, 1 cafeteria manager, 4 food services employees, and 2 custodians (CMSDPD, 2012).

Twenty-four of the 36 employees were certificated. Twelve of the 24 certificated staff members had Class A (Bachelor’s degrees) certification and 12 had Class AA (Master’s degrees) certification (MDE, 2012c; CMSDPD, 2012).

Figure 19 presents a breakdown of certificated staff experience as professional educators into six tiers: 0-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, 11-15 years of experience, 16-20 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience, and 25 or more years of experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of certificated staff members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years of experience</td>
<td>8 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years of experience</td>
<td>9 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years of experience</td>
<td>2 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years of experience</td>
<td>2 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years of experience</td>
<td>0 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or more years of experience</td>
<td>3 certificated staff members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 19.* Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology faculty and staff years of experience as professional educators for the 2012-2013 school year.

Findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, 17 (71%) of the certificated staff members had 10 years or less experience as professional educators, while seven (29%) of the certificated staff members had 11 or more years of experience. In brief, the findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year the school’s certificated staff was relatively inexperienced.
Question seven of the nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:

7. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at the Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

Figure 20 shows MDE accountability status of the Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology for four years prior to magnet school implementation.

![Figure 20](image)

*Figure 20. Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology accountability status: Four years prior to magnet school implementation.*

Figure 20 indicates that the Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology was Level 3 Successful for the 2003-2004 through 2006-2007 school years. In brief, the school was rated Successful all four years prior to magnet school implementation.
Figure 21 also presents MDE accountability status of the Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology in the format of a line graph. The graph shows the school’s level of accountability for five school years of magnet school implementation: 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (MDE, 2014a).

![Graph showing accountability status](image)

**Figure 21.** Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology accountability status: Five years after magnet school implementation.

Findings indicate that Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology Magnet School was Level 2 Under Performing for the 2008-2009 school year, the 2009-2010 school year, for the 2010-2011 school year, for the 2011-2012 school year, and for the 2012-2013 school year.

It should be noted that the principal of Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School for the 2004-2005 school became principal of Oakhurst Academy of
Science and Technology in the 2005-2006 school year (L. Downing, personal communication, June 29, 2015). This principal was involved in the initial implementation of the magnet school concept. This principal remained in place through the 2009-2010 school year. A new principal was hired in 2010 and remained for the duration of the time period analyzed (V. Davis, personal communication, June 29, 2015). Change in leadership didn’t appear to matter in regard to accountability.

It should also be noted that according to the district personnel director, teacher turnover appears to be not a significant factor as it relates to the flux in accountability status indicated in Figure 21 (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).

In brief, the accountability status of the school was Level 2 Under Performing five times during the five years of magnet school implementation. Data presented in the graphs suggest that magnet school implementation had a negative impact on accountability status. The school went from Successful status to Under Performing status.

**W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies**

W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies was established in 1952 (CMSSD, 1952). This school was originally constructed in 1951-1952 to serve as a junior-senior high school for African-American students. Its original name was W. A. Higgins School in honor of the school’s principal and Director of Negro Schools (Ellard, 1977).

The name of the school has since changed and is currently W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies. The change in name was due to the adoption of the magnet school concept (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).
The school was erected under the supervision of the then Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District Board of Trustees. Harvey B. Heidelberg was the school district superintendent. The school remained segregated until 1970 (Ellard, 1977).

W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies was designated as a magnet school in 2008 (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).

At the time of being designated a magnet school, the student enrollment was 358 in Grades 6 through 8 (MDE, 2014b).

Demographics for the 2012-13 school year indicate the school served grades 6 through 8 with an enrollment of 352 students. The school employed 1 principal, 1 assistant principal, 24 teachers, 1 guidance counselor, 1 instructional specialist, 1 school improvement officer, 1 parent liaison, 1 in-school suspension instructor, 3 paraprofessionals (teacher assistants), 1 computer lab instructor, 1 technology lab technician, 1 instructional interventionist, 1 secretary to the counselor, 1 secretary to the principal, 1 cafeteria manager, 5 food services employees, and 3 custodians (CMSDPD, 2012).

Of the 48 employees, 29 were certificated. Of the 29 certificated staff, 16 had Class A (Bachelor’s degrees) certification, 12 had Class AA (Master’s degrees) certification, and 1 had Class AAAA certification with a Doctorate degree (CMSDPD, 2012; MDE, 2012c).

Figure 22 presents a breakdown of certificated staff experience as professional educators into six tiers: 0-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, 11-15 years of experience, 16-20 years of experience, 21-25 years of experience, and 25 or more years of experience.
Findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, 18 (62%) of the certificated staff members had 10 years or less experience as professional educators, while 11 (38%) of the certificated staff members had 11 or more years of experience. In brief, the findings indicate that for the 2012-2013 school year, the school’s certificate staff was made up mostly of inexperienced staff members.

Question eight of the nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:

8. What changes in relation to the school’s accountability status occurred at the W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies after implementation of the magnet school concept compared to accountability status assigned prior to implementation?

Figure 23 shows MDE accountability status of the W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies for four years prior to magnet school implementation.
Figure 23. W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies accountability status: Four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 23 indicates that W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies was Level 3 Successful for the 2003-2004 school year and the 2004-2005 school year, but was Level 2 Under Performing for the 2005-2006 school year and the 2006-2007 school year. Simply put, the figure shows that W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies was Level 3 Successful twice and Level 2 Under Performing twice during the four years prior to magnet school implementation.

Figure 24 also presents MDE accountability status of the W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies in the format of a line graph. The graph shows the school’s level of accountability for five school years of magnet school implementation: 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (MDE, 2014a).
Findings indicate that W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies was Level 1 Low Performing for the 2008-2009 school year and the 2009-2010 school year; and Level 2 Under Performing for the 2010-2011 school year and the 2011-2012 school year. The school improved to Level 3 Successful for the 2012-2013 school year.

It should be noted that a new principal was hired in 2010-2011 (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).

The school was also awarded the School Improvement Grant for 3.75 million dollars for a three year period requiring the school to implement a school improvement plan. (D. Dupree, personal communication, May 13, 2013).
However, given the timeframe for this study and the changes in the principal leadership, it is not possible to determine the impact of the new principal and grant funding on accountability.

It should also be noted that according to the district personnel director, teacher turnover appears to be not a significant factor in regard to accountability status (V. Brown, personal communication, April 15, 2014).

In brief, accountability status for the school were Level 1 Low Performing twice, and Level 2 Under Performing twice before improving to Level 3 Successful during the five years of magnet school implementation. Data presented in the graphs appear to suggest that magnet school implementation had a negative impact on accountability status in general. The school dropped from a Successful rating for four straight years before returning to a level 3 Successful rating.

**Financial Implications**

For the five years prior to the magnet school concept being implemented in the CMSD, the expenditure per student (combined elementary and secondary amount) was $7,003.89. For Mississippi as a whole, the expenditure per student was $7,806.64 for the same period. For the same number of years (2008-2009 through 2012-2013) after CMSD implemented the magnet school concept, the expenditure per student (combined elementary and secondary amount) was $9,353.84. For Mississippi as a whole, the expenditure per student was $8,886.23 for the same period (MDE, 2014b).

The final question of the nine research questions that guided the investigation asked:
9. What affect did the implementation of the magnet school concept have on expenditures per student for the school district?

Figure 25 presents a breakdown of expenditures per student for CMSD and the state. Mississippi statewide average per student expenditures for the 2008-2009 school year through the 2012-2013 school year. Column one displays the school years, column two shows the per student expenditures for CMSD, and column three shows the Mississippi statewide average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clarksdale Municipal School District</th>
<th>Mississippi Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$8,523.19</td>
<td>$8,895.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$9,056.07</td>
<td>$8,930.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$9,333.17</td>
<td>$8,752.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$9,791.53</td>
<td>$8,932.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$10,065.25</td>
<td>$8,920.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Year Average</td>
<td>$9,353.84</td>
<td>$8,886.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 25.* Clarksdale Municipal School District and Mississippi statewide average expenditures per student: 2008-2009 through 2012-2013.

Figure 25 shows that for the five years following the magnet school concept being implemented in the school district, the average expenditure per student (combined elementary and secondary amount) was $9,353.84. For Mississippi as a whole, the average expenditure per student was $8,886.23 for the same period. CMSD expended $467.61 more than the Mississippi statewide average (MDE, 2014b).

Findings also indicate that during the first year of magnet school implementation CMSD expended $372.67 less than the Mississippi statewide average (MDE, 2014b). In the four subsequent school years of magnet school implementation, the district expended
more than the Mississippi statewide average each year. For the 2009-2010 school year, the district expended $125.76 more than the Mississippi statewide average. For the 2010-2011 school year, the district expended $581.11 more than the Mississippi statewide average. For the 2011-2012 school year, the district expended $859.52 more than the Mississippi statewide average. And for the 2012-2013 school year, the district expended $1,144.32 more than the Mississippi statewide average. In short, CMSD per student expenditure exceeded the statewide average.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for this research study analyzing eight magnet schools in the CMSD. The study investigated each magnet school’s accountability status and per student expenditures before and after implementation of the magnet school program for the purpose of determining whether positive or negative changes occurred.

Summary

The study titled *An analysis of the Clarksdale Municipal School District’s eight magnet schools in relation to accountability status and per student expenditures* was presented in five chapters: (1) introduction; (2) literature review; (3) method; (4) findings and discussion; and (5) summary, conclusions, and recommendations. The study also included a references list and appendixes providing resource references and specific materials relative to the investigation.

Chapter I presented content in four sections. The introductory chapter addressed (1) problem statement, purpose, and research questions; (2) significance of the study; (3) method; and (4) limitations and delimitations.

Chapter II reviewed pertinent literature. The chapter provided a brief history of CMSD, the magnet schools movement in the nation and Mississippi, three selected
studies addressing magnet schools, and per student expenditures comparisons before and after implementation of the program.

Chapter III covered the methods used in the investigation. The chapter focused on the research design, case parameters, data collection, and data analysis. Attention was focused on the following school years: 2003-2004 through 2006-2007 and 2008-2009 through 2012-2013.

Chapter IV presented the findings and discussion of the findings for the investigation. The findings were presented and discussed in relation to the nine research questions that guided the investigation for each of CMSD’s eight magnet schools. The findings were presented in the format of line graphs showing accountability status for four school years prior to magnet school implementation: 2003-2004, 2004-2005, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007 and five school years after implementation: 2008-2009 through 2012-2013.

The present chapter, Chapter V, summarized the investigation, presented conclusions based on the findings, and made recommendations for future action.

**Conclusions**

As mentioned in the introduction chapter, the study investigated each magnet school’s accountability status and per student expenditures before and after implementation of the magnet school program for the purpose of determining whether positive or negative changes occurred. Conclusions drawn are presented on a school by school basis and on the magnet school program as a whole (all eight schools) and the per student expenditures factor.
Positive changes in relation to accountability status did not occur at Booker T. Washington International Studies Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school program (see Chapter IV). Magnet school implementation had little or no impact in regard to accountability status.

Positive changes in relation to accountability status did not occur at George H. Oliver Visual and Performing Arts Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school program (see Chapter IV). As a matter of fact, magnet school implementation had a negative impact in regard to accountability status.

Positive changes in relation to accountability status occurred at Heidelberg STEAM Elementary Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school program (see Chapter IV). Magnet school implementation had a positive impact in regard to accountability status.

Positive changes in relation to accountability status did not occur at J. W. Stampley Aerospace and Engineering Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school program (see Chapter IV). Magnet school implementation had little or no impact in regard to accountability status.

Positive changes in relation to accountability status did not occur at Kirkpatrick Health and Medical Science Elementary Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school program (see Chapter IV). Magnet school implementation had a negative impact in regard to accountability status.

Positive changes in relation to accountability status occurred at Myrtle Hall IV Language Immersion Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school program.
Magnet school implementation had a positive impact in regard to accountability status. Positive changes in relation to accountability status did not occur at Oakhurst Academy of Science and Technology Magnet School after implementation of the magnet school program (see Chapter IV). Magnet school implementation had a negative impact in regard to accountability status. Positive changes in relation to accountability status did not occur at W. A. Higgins Academy of Arts and International Studies after implementation of the magnet school program (see Chapter IV). Magnet school implementation had a negative impact in regard to accountability status. Overall, positive changes in relation to accountability status occurred in only 2 (25%) of the 8 CMSD schools after implementation of the magnet school program. Magnet school implementation had a negative, little, or no impact in regard to accountability status for 6 (75%) of the 8 schools. In brief, implementation of the magnet school program did not improve accountability status for CMSD schools in general. The effect that implementation of the magnet school program concept had on CMSD per student expenditures appears to be negative. Prior to the magnet school concept being implemented, the school district’s per student (combined elementary and secondary programs) cost average was 10% lower than the per student expenditures average (see Chapter II and IV) for the state of Mississippi as a whole ($7,004 compared to $7,807). After implementation, the school district’s per student (combined elementary and secondary programs) expenditures average was 10% higher than the per student
expenditures average (see Chapter II and IV) for the state of Mississippi as a whole ($9,354 compared to $8,886).

In brief, implementation of the magnet school program increased per student expenditures for CMSD in general, but did not have a positive impact on accountability status for the majority of the participant schools.

**Recommendations**

CMSD magnet school program results were analyzed for the following time period: school years 2008-2009 through 2012-2013. The five-year period may have been too short to determine whether the program had a positive or negative effect on MDE accountability status. A longer period of time may be needed for the concept to become assimilated. It is recommended that a second time period be investigated: school years 2013-14 through 2017-2018.

The study did not investigate curriculum content and instructional strategies before and after magnet school program implementation. Were significant changes instituted? Changes made to curriculum content and instructional strategies may prove to be a crucial variable. It is recommended that these factors be investigated for the following school years: 2003-2004 through 2012-2013.

The study did not investigate the type and amount of professional development (e.g., teacher improvement training specifically designed for teaching in magnet schools) that occurred. The type and amount of professional development may prove to be a crucial variable. It is recommended that the type and amount of professional development be investigated for the following time period: school years 2008-2009 through 2012-2013.
Student attendance, discipline, in-and-out enrollment migration were not addressed in the study. At present, it is not known if the program had a positive or negative effect on these issues. It is recommended that student attendance, discipline, in-and-out enrollment migration be investigated for the following time period: school years 2008-2009 through 2012-2013.

To date, no before-and-after magnet school program implementation information is publicly available about other school districts in Mississippi. It is recommended that other Mississippi school districts (e.g., Cleveland Public Schools) providing magnet school programs are similarly investigated (e.g., accountability status).
REFERENCES


APPENDIX A

CLARKSDALE MUNICIPAL SCHOOL DISTRICT AND CLARKSDALE
MUNICIPAL SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOL

BRONZE PLAQUES
The following pictures display the bronze plaques for each Clarksdale Municipal School District school analyzed in this study.

*Figure A1.* Clarksdale Municipal School District (1986). Jerome W. Stampley School.

*Figure A2.* Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District (1949a). Heidelberg Elementary School.
Figure A3. Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District (1949b). Dedication.

Figure A5. Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District (1955a). Eliza Clark Elementary School.

Figure A6. Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District (1955b). Oakhurst School.
Figure A7. Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District (1956). Kirkpatrick Elementary School.

Figure A9. Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District (1962). George H. Oliver School.

Figure A10. Clarksdale Municipal Separate School District (1966). Riverton Junior High School.
APPENDIX B

IRB APPROVAL
The following is a copy of the email concerning IRB approval in relation to this study.

Mississippi State University Mail - Study 12-326: Magnet Schools in the Mississippi Delta. Page 9 of 14

Hello Jodi,

Per our conversation, the purpose of this email is to request an update to my IRB application in light of my change in major advisor (Dr. Dwight Harr is deceased) to Dr. Jack Blandinger and committee members including Dr. Angela Farmer. All of the data continues to be publicly available and the title has been updated to An Analytical Description of Clarksville Municipal School District’s Eight Magnet Schools in Relation to Per Student Costs and Accountability Status. Please let me know how I should proceed.

Thanks,

Edith M. Robinson

On Thu, Oct 18, 2012 at 4:00 PM, <jroberts@research.msstate.edu> wrote:

October 18, 2012

Edith Robinson

RE: IRB Study #12-326: Magnet Schools in the Mississippi Delta: Evaluating the Effects of Poverty, School Type, and Grade Level on GDI

Dear Mr. Robinson:

The review of your study referenced above has been completed. While we sincerely appreciate the submission of your study, it was determined from the review that it does not meet the regulatory definitions for human subjects research. Therefore, IRB approval is not required as the study is currently designed.

The regulatory definition of human subject is listed below:

45 CFR 46.102(f) Human subject means a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains:
(1) Data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or
(2) Identifiable private information.

The IRB understands that all of the information to be used for your study is publicly available. Because your study uses solely existing, publicly available information, the project does not meet the regulatory definition of human subject (i.e., you or not intervening or interacting with individuals, nor obtaining identifiable, private information).

If in the future your study is revised such that it meets this definition, it must be submitted for IRB review and approval prior to the conduct of such human subjects research.

If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at jroberts@research.msstate.edu or call 662-325-2238.

Sincerely,

Jodi Roberts, Ph.D.
IRB Officer

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/?ui=2&ik=57d0192d30&view=pt&qr=IRB&qr=true&te...

10/26/2015

Figure B1. IRB approval email
APPENDIX C

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION USE APPROVAL
The following emails display permission to use personal communication and personal communication concerning publicly available information for this study from D. Dupree, D. Harrell, I. Phillips, J. Haynes, L. Downing, L. Jones, M. Green, S. Curry, T. Matthews, V. Brown, V. Davis, and W. Wade.

Figure C1. D. Dupree, personal communication.
Personal Communication
2 messages

Ed Robinson <emr58@msstate.edu>
To: donellharrell@hotmail.com

Wed, Oct 7, 2015 at 11:58 AM

Hello Mr. Harrell,

Per our conversation, the purpose of this contact is to request permission to use our personal communication concerning CMSO in my dissertation. If you have questions, let me know.

Thanks,

Edwin M. Robinson
662-732-5077

Donell <donellharrell@hotmail.com>
To: Ed Robinson <emr58@msstate.edu>

Set, Oct 10, 2015 at 10:52 PM

Good evening,
You have permission to use our personal communication for your dissertation.

Figure C2.  D. Harrell, personal communication.
Permission to use personal communication information
2 messages

Edwin Robinson <erobinson@durant.k12.ms.us>
To: Irving Phillips <iphillips@iphillips@aol.com>

Wed, Oct 7, 2015 at 1:54 PM

Hello Dr. Phillips,

The purpose of this contact is to request permission to use our personal communication concerning "what magnet schools are" in my dissertation. If you have questions, let me know.

Thanks,

Edwin M. Robinson
Superintendent of Education
Durant Public School District
Durant, MS 38053
Cell: (662)792-6077
Office: (662)792-3175

iphillips@iphillips@aol.com <iphillips@iphillips@aol.com>
To: erobinson@erobinson@durant.k12.ms.us

Wed, Oct 7, 2015 at 1:56 PM

Permission granted.

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE device

Figure C3.  I. Phillips, personal communication.
Figure C4. J. Haynes, personal communication.
Figure C5. L. Downing, personal communication.
Figure C6.  L. Jones, personal communication.
Figure C7. M. Greene, personal communication.
There was a "pause" in statewide accountability for the 2007-2008 assessment year (2008-2009 rating year) due to transitioning accountability and assessment systems. For the 2007-2008 assessment year (2008-2009 rating year), schools did not receive any state accountability ratings, but they did receive federal AYP designations. You can read a more detailed narrative of the factors leading to this pause in the document titled MSAS U 2011 in the Archived section of Accountability’s public SharePoint site.

STACI M. CURRY Director, Accountability Services
Office of Accreditation and Accountability

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P.O. Box 771 | Jackson, MS 39205-0771
Tel 601.359.1873 | Fax 601.359.5527
www.mde.k12.ms.us
Twitter: @MissDeplEd

Figure C8. S. Curry, personal communication.
Permission to use personal communication

2 messages

**Ed Robinson <emr58@mastate.edu>**
To: tmatthews@cmsd.k12.ms.us

Wed, Oct 7, 2015 at 11:42 AM

Hello Dr. Matthews,

I attempted to contact you via phone. The purpose of this contact is to request permission to use our personnel communication concerning when you were principal in CMSD in my dissertation. If you have questions, let me know.

Thanks,

Edwin M. Robinson
662-792-6077

**Toya Matthews <tmatthews@cmsd.k12.ms.us>**
To: Ed Robinson <emr58@mastate.edu>

Fri, Oct 9, 2015 at 9:01 AM

Good morning,

You have my permission to use the communication.

Toya Harrell-Matthews

*Sent from my iPhone*

[Emailed text hidden]

**Figure C9.** T. Matthews, personal communication.
Permission to use personal communication

2 messages

Ed Robinson <emr58@msstate.edu>  
To: vbrown@cmsd.k12.ms.us  
Wed, Oct 7, 2015 at 11:27 AM

Good day to you Ms. Brown,

Per our conversation, I am requesting permission to use our personal communication concerning CNSD personnel in my dissertation. Thanks in advance.

Edwin M. Robinson

vbrown@cmsd.k12.ms.us <vbrown@cmsd.k12.ms.us>  
To: Ed Robinson <emr58@msstate.edu>  
Thu, Oct 8, 2015 at 8:11 PM

Yes. You have my permission.

Sent from my iPad
[Quoted text hidden]

Figure C10.  V. Brown, personal communication.
Figure C11. V. Davis, personal communication.
Figure C12. W. Wade, personal communication.
The following list of names includes the Clarksdale Municipal School Administrator recommendations for February 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Step/Years</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dr. Dorothy Prestwich</td>
<td>AAAA-15</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kamilah Jones</td>
<td>AA-4</td>
<td>School Business Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pearline Newell</td>
<td>AA-35</td>
<td>Federal Programs/Testing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gina Burn Foster</td>
<td>AA-25</td>
<td>Director, Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shirley Cole</td>
<td>A-41</td>
<td>Director, School Food Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lewis Whatley</td>
<td>AAA-19</td>
<td>Director, Support Services/Special Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. James Miller</td>
<td>AA-16</td>
<td>Coordinator, Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Venesia Griffin Brown</td>
<td>AA-14</td>
<td>Coordinator, Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Toya Harrell-Matthews</td>
<td>AAA-13</td>
<td>Elementary Curriculum Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Linda Downing</td>
<td>AA-30</td>
<td>Secondary Curriculum Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dr. Leila Kemp</td>
<td>AAAA-14</td>
<td>Principal, CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Herbert Smith</td>
<td>AA-1</td>
<td>Asst. Principal, CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reginald Griffin</td>
<td>AA-14</td>
<td>Asst. Principal, CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Patricia Dennis</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Asst. Principal, CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Jonathan Page</td>
<td>AAA-1</td>
<td>Asst. Principal, CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sally Olivi</td>
<td>AA-30</td>
<td>Director, Vocational Tech Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Edwin Robinson</td>
<td>AA-4</td>
<td>Principal, HMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Delores Harris</td>
<td>AA-34</td>
<td>Asst. Principal, HMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Fredrick Robinson</td>
<td>AA-17</td>
<td>Principal, OMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Valencia Rhodes</td>
<td>AA-2</td>
<td>Asst. Principal, OMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Sharron Montgomery</td>
<td>AA-16</td>
<td>Principal, GHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lowanda Tyler-Jones</td>
<td>AA-9</td>
<td>Principal, HES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Barbara Akon</td>
<td>AA-24</td>
<td>Principal, JWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. SuzAnne Walton</td>
<td>AA-32</td>
<td>Principal, KES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Valerie Davis</td>
<td>AA-8</td>
<td>Principal, MH#4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure D1.* School board minutes February recommendations for 2012-2013 administration.
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RECOMMENDATIONS pp. 92-102
**Figure E1.** Clarksdale Municipal School District certified staff recommendations for May 2012-2013.
## Non-Certified Recommendations, FY 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawanda Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohnada Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaToyia Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Hayes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keisha Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Sullinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo D. Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa Sierra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jermaine Drummond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Britter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiaja Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santia Rusha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmine Burnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro시 Calvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanhkhanh Manuvelas Chinnar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freddie Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria R. Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshtra Dervey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald A. Ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLARKSDALE HIGH SCHOOL**

**Parent Center**

1. Basic Orby Jones  
   (Numbers: AA-23, Position: Home School)
2. Parent Center Coordinator
3. Nancy Sullinger  
   (Numbers: AA-8, Position: Counselor)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Ross</td>
<td>AA-16 Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Davis</td>
<td>AA-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael L. Edwards</td>
<td>A-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelle Foster</td>
<td>A-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Freeman</td>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Gatto</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewell Griffith-Golds</td>
<td>AA-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickey Gipson</td>
<td>AA-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin C. Gant</td>
<td>AA-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrencher</td>
<td>AA-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Sanders</td>
<td>A-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E1 (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloetha Stevenson-Jamison</td>
<td>AA-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta Stewart</td>
<td>A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karisma Swinney Ford</td>
<td>A-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonia Staley</td>
<td>AA-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Thomas</td>
<td>A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah B. Trione</td>
<td>A-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taponea Wells</td>
<td>A-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie Wheaton</td>
<td>AA-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lura Ferguson</td>
<td>AA-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Beverly White</td>
<td>AAAA-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Bird</td>
<td>A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Bishop</td>
<td>AA-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Brooks (Referee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Furch</td>
<td>AA-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary J. Green</td>
<td>A-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrey George</td>
<td>A-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela G. Griffin</td>
<td>A-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Harman</td>
<td>A-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Harris</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy McGaskill</td>
<td>A-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Moseall</td>
<td>A-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinel Murder Windrick</td>
<td>AA-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona L. Myers</td>
<td>AA-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Neely</td>
<td>A-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Peyton</td>
<td>AA-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Scott</td>
<td>AA-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick B. Seals</td>
<td>A-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camille Shepherd</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tafjim</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Thomas</td>
<td>AA-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Tuggle</td>
<td>AA-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danelle Tucker</td>
<td>A-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Walker</td>
<td>A-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenzie Watson</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA ALLEN</td>
<td>AA-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Allen</td>
<td>Counselor 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Doss-Chatman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Brooks</td>
<td>A-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemerson Gates</td>
<td>A-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharice Gray</td>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterine Harrell</td>
<td>AA-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores G. Harris</td>
<td>A-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alina Hicks</td>
<td>AA-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Holman</td>
<td>AA-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosely B. Johnson</td>
<td>AA-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnette J. Luckett</td>
<td>A-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie B. Luckett</td>
<td>AA-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Mackey</td>
<td>A-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Mabey</td>
<td>AA-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renelle McRitchie</td>
<td>A-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estella D. McConnell</td>
<td>AA-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda C. Ross</td>
<td>A-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Raysof</td>
<td>A-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Savoy</td>
<td>AA-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanie White</td>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethel:**
14. Joanie White (Retires) - A-30
142. Nancy Force (Retires) - A-29
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Tillo</td>
<td>AA-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary H. Brown</td>
<td>A-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Caperal</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Down</td>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Jackson</td>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Lee Moe</td>
<td>A-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie M. Morgan-Middleton</td>
<td>A-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joquelyn Montgomery</td>
<td>A-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Newell</td>
<td>A-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia M. Pennington</td>
<td>AA-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Shepherd</td>
<td>A-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances A. Smith</td>
<td>AA-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Whit</td>
<td>A-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama Winters</td>
<td>A-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Brown</td>
<td>AA-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donniezis Allen</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia R. Brown</td>
<td>A-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eugene Fox</td>
<td>AAAA-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda M. Jackson</td>
<td>A-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey E. Jones</td>
<td>A-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisha Lewis</td>
<td>AA-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio Z. Malcolmia</td>
<td>A-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Moore</td>
<td>A-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlene Newsom</td>
<td>A-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Parish</td>
<td>AA-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Tumage</td>
<td>A-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Zuniga</td>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Tillo</td>
<td>AA-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Allbands</td>
<td>A-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E1 (Continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Loria Title Broom</td>
<td>MA-7</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Sharon Murphy</td>
<td>A-30</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Mary E. Bounds</td>
<td>AA-2</td>
<td>Technology Discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Shirley Fountain</td>
<td>AA-7</td>
<td>Culinary &amp; Related Fds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Arlo Ferguson</td>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>Auto Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Tanja Bradtke</td>
<td>AA-5</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Sandra Robinson</td>
<td>A-6</td>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Albert Taylor</td>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>Bldg. Trades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Certified Recommendations, FY 2012-2013

**CENTRAL OFFICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Adams</td>
<td>4 Ed. Tech. Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bailey</td>
<td>7 Microscopy Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Bennett</td>
<td>30 SPED Case Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Davis</td>
<td>33 MSUS Computer Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace Dawson</td>
<td>1 SPED Admin. Asst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Bradford Fair</td>
<td>7 Title I Computer Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Keeping Hall</td>
<td>12 Dist. Comp. Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Fitzgerald</td>
<td>31 District Bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaeanna Johnson</td>
<td>5 Food Service Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketheria McCaskill</td>
<td>31 Receptionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Timber Miller</td>
<td>10 Payroll Clerk/Bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Henson</td>
<td>2 Technology Aide/Food Service Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara A. Smith</td>
<td>34 Fed. Prog. Bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Talley</td>
<td>1 Bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa C. Turner</td>
<td>34 Sec. to the Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyndia Tyler</td>
<td>31 Food Serv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelia R. Williams</td>
<td>16 Fiscal Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parent Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keyana S. Dailgren</td>
<td>5 Paraprofessional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHS SUPPORT STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>—— Anna Lewis</td>
<td>7 Secretary to the Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—— Thomas Obra Hicks</td>
<td>22 Secretary to the Counselors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Note: This data was used to determine the years of experience and number of certificated teachers for each school in the study.