

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES
Summary of State Board of Education Agenda Items
February 16-17, 2006

OFFICE OF INNOVATION AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

- 08-b. Approval to begin the Administrative Procedures Act process: To revise the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

The revisions in the workbook reflect the changes to be made for use in the 2006 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Model under the *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001. As indicated in the revision history directly following the cover page, the changes appear on pages 18, 21-22, 39, and 59 in the workbook. Only pages with revisions are included with changes highlighted in yellow.

Back-up material attached

Recommendation: Approval

OFFICE OF INNOVATION AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

08-b. Approval to begin the Administrative Procedures Act process: To revise the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Mississippi Statewide Accountability System

Revisions:

March 21, 2003

October 10, 2003

March 25, 2004

May 28, 2004

May 9, 2005

June 22, 2005

February 9, 2006 (Draft)

Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)



U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

**Chronological Listing of Revisions
(Original Workbook Plus Amendments)**

March 21, 2003 Original Workbook (USDE approval letter dated 03/18/2003)

October 10, 2003 First Revision (USDE approval letter dated 10/17/2003)

Critical Element 1.1 (page 11)
Critical Element 3.2 (pages 22-23)
Critical Element 7.2 (page 46)
Critical Element 7.3 (page 47)

March 25, 2004 Second Revision (USDE approval letter dated 05/28/2004)

Critical Element 2.1 (page 17)
Critical Element 5.3 (page 39)
Critical Element 5.4 (page 40)

May 28, 2004 Third Revision

Critical Element 2.1 (page 17)
Critical Element 5.3 (page 39)
Critical Element 5.4 (page 40)
Critical Element 10.1 (page 52)

May 9, 2005 Fourth Revision (USDE approval letter dated 05/09/2005)

Critical Element 1.3 (page 13) – Proficiency Index "Partial Credit" Logic
Critical Element 3.1 (pages 20 & 23) – Confidence interval changed to 99%
Critical Element 3.2 (page 22) – Split grade spans model for LEA improvement

June 22, 2005 Fifth Revision (USDE approval letter dated 06/29/2005)

Critical Element 3.2 (pages 22 & 59) – Transitional 2% flexibility for 2005 only

February 6, 2006 Sixth Revision (USDE approval letter dated XX/XX/2006)

Critical Element 2.2 (page 18) – State's definition of Full Academic Year
Critical Element 3.2 (pages 21-22, 59) – Transitional 2% flexibility for 2006 only
Critical Element 5.3 (page 39) – Some non-SCD students considered not tested

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.1 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>§ 200.20(e)</p> <p>Ref. ?</p> </div>	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The following definition of full academic year was approved by the Mississippi State Board of Education in **March 2006**. The definition is consistent and applied statewide for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP and in the calculations for the achievement and growth models. Although the definition specifically relates to student enrollment within the same school for a full academic year, the same logic is used to determine whether the student was enrolled in the same district/LEA and in the state for AYP decisions at those levels.

Spring Testing Data (MCT and Traditional Schedule SATP)

- End of Month 8 School = Same School on the **7** Earlier End of Month Records (Month 1 through Month 7)
- End of Month 7 School = Same School on the 6 Earlier End of Month Records (Months 1 through 6)

Fall Testing Data (SATP Semester/Block Schedule)

- End of Month 3 School = Same School on End of Month 1 and Month 2 Records

Spring Testing Data (SATP Semester/Block Schedule)

- End of Month 8 School = Same School on End of Month 5, 6, and 7 Records

Note: Students will be considered enrolled in Month 1 of the school year if they have an entry date prior to August 27. This will include initial enrollment of students enrolled at the end of Month 9 the previous year as well as any additional students entering the school/district through August 26. This definition is less stringent than several states that define FAY as enrollment during testing dates the current and previous school years.

References:

School Level Accountability Model Based on Achievement and Growth: Approved by the Mississippi State Board of Education for Use in Fall 2003, Mississippi Department of Education, October 2002. [M]

The School Accountability Model: Understanding the School Level Models for Achievement and Growth and Using the School Accountability Model Reports, Mississippi Department of Education, November 2002, p. 22. [N]

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p> <div data-bbox="228 590 553 684" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> § 200.20(a)(1)(i) See 3.2b </div> <div data-bbox="228 726 553 837" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> § 200.20(a)(1)(ii) [aggregate] See 7.1 </div> <div data-bbox="228 1031 553 1104" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> § 200.20(b)(1) </div> <div data-bbox="228 1184 553 1257" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> § 200.20(c)(1)(i) </div>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p> <div data-bbox="1049 516 1393 667" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> § 200.20(c)(1)(i) See 10.1 See notes from 12/17/02 conference call w/USDE. </div> <div data-bbox="1049 821 1393 951" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> § 200.20(b) actual text: "...the school or LEA makes AYP..." </div> <div data-bbox="1065 1125 1393 1199" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> § 200.20(b)(2) </div>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The method used for determining whether each subgroup, public school, and district/LEA makes AYP is stated below and is illustrated on the flowchart on the next page.

For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress in reading/language arts or in mathematics, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives and each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments. However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA makes AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment. In order to meet AYP on the other academic indicator(s), the school/LEA must meet the State's criteria for other academic indicators.

The sequence of steps used in determining AYP is important. The sequence, shown clearly on the flowchart (for steps 1-4), follows.

1. Calculate the n-count for the subgroup (or aggregate group, as appropriate) and compare the value to the minimum n criterion (see 5.5). If the n-count is smaller than the minimum n criterion, the subgroup is not used in determining AYP. Note: A subgroup with an n-count too small to count toward AYP at the school level may be large enough to count toward AYP at the district/LEA and/or state levels.
2. Calculate the assessment participation rate value for the subgroup [or student aggregate] (see 10.1 and 10.2). If the participation rate does not meet the criterion of 95%, in reading/language arts or in mathematics, the subgroup did not make AYP in that subject area.
3. If the participation rate is at least 95%, apply the appropriate confidence interval to the subgroup's proficiency percentage to determine whether the subgroup met the annual measurable objectives.
4. If the subgroup did not make AYP under the criteria in step 3, apply the test to determine whether AYP was met under the alternative method (sometimes called "safe harbor").
5. Apply test against additional academic indicator(s) for the aggregate (not the subgroups).

The determination of AYP will be made annually for each public school and each district/LEA in three areas – reading/language arts, mathematics, and other academic indicators. The AYP determinations from steps 1-5 above will be reported annually in the NCLB Report Cards.

For 2006 AYP Only. See Appendix C for transitional flexibility for certain schools and districts.

School Improvement. Failure to make AYP over consecutive years -- defined as failure of ANY subgroup or the student aggregate failing to make AYP in the same content area (reading/language or mathematics) or the student aggregate failing to make progress on the other academic indicator(s) – will result in a Title I school being identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as specified in NCLB. For a school to exit from improvement status, it must meet AYP for two consecutive years in the area(s) that triggered improvement.

LEA Improvement. For LEAs, Title I improvement status will be determined by tracking annual results on the "split grade spans" model. For reading/language arts and mathematics, separate proficiency indexes are calculated for each grade span (3-5, 6-9, 10-12). The LEA meets the subject area criterion if all subgroups meet the criterion in at least one of the grade spans. For other academic indicators, the LEA meets the criterion if either the attendance rate criterion (elementary/middle) or the graduation rate criterion (high school) is met. An LEA that fails to meet the criterion in any area (reading/language, mathematics, or other academic indicators) for two consecutive years will be identified for improvement. For an LEA to exit from improvement status, it must meet the "split grade spans" criteria above for two consecutive years in the area(s) that triggered improvement. See Appendix B for additional information on the split grade spans model.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.1 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>§ 200.6(a)(2)(i-ii) [regarding assessment, not use of the data for accountability] is not consistent with IDEA97, regs, guidance.</p> <p>1111(b)(3)(C)(iii & xii) require valid and reliable data for instructional use.</p> </div>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>§ 200.6(a)(2) and future regs can specify "how" for AYP</p> </div>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All students in Mississippi public schools are required to participate in the statewide assessment program and the data for all students who have been in the school (or district or state, as appropriate) for a full academic year (see 2.2 and 2.3) are included in the achievement, growth, and AYP calculations. Although students with disabilities may receive certain testing accommodations or modifications, they may not be exempted from the assessment or accountability system based on demographics, instructional program, or type of school. See Critical Element 2.1, for exceptions based on a medical emergency.

In Mississippi, testing modifications include instructional level testing on the MCT and the use of alternate assessments, if those options are recommended by the student's IEP team. Instructional level tests and low stakes alternate assessments are based, appropriately, on the learning goals and objectives in the student's IEP. With few exceptions, students participating in instructional level testing and alternate assessments are not proficient at their peer grade levels. To ensure valid and reliable assessment information for instructional purposes and to comply with the **August 2005 USDE non-regulatory guidance** requiring that AYP decisions be made based on student performance on grade level standards, **non-SCD** students participating in instructional level and alternate assessments will be considered "**not tested**." SCD students scoring "proficient" or "advanced" on an instructional level test or the **Mississippi Alternate Assessment for the Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF)** will be subject to the limitation (cap) for including those "proficient" scores consistent with the USDE final rule (34 CFR, Part 200, December 9, 2003) and **the August 2005 USDE non-regulatory guidance**.

*Although **non-SCD students participating in** instructional level and alternate assessment will be considered "**not tested**," students whose IEP committees recommend those options will not automatically be administered tests corresponding to their peer grade levels. Such tests would produce data that would be meaningless for instructional purposes and would violate 1111(b)(3)(C)(iii & xii).*

Students with disabilities will be students whose IDEA eligibility flag (the SPED flag in MSIS) is "Y" (Yes) at the end of month 8 (closest approximation to the test administration dates).

References:

Legal Corner: Alternate Assessment, Phillips, S., NCME Newsletter, 10:3, September 2002. [T]
Assessing One and All: Educational Accountability for Students with Disabilities, Elliott, S., Braden, J., and White, J., Council for Exceptional Children, 2001. [T]
Making Valid and Reliable Decisions in Determining Adequate Yearly Progress, CCSSO (CAS and ASR SCASS Study Groups), December 2002, p. 84. [O]

Appendix C

Implementation of Option 1 Transitional Flexibility in the 2006 AYP Model

The system of computer programs will run the entire approved AYP model for districts and schools and make separate AYP determinations for reading/language arts (RLA), mathematics (MTH), and other academic indicators (OAI).

The school and district level results from the above AYP run will be captured in a SAS dataset. A computer program will read those results and determine whether each school and district meets the criterion for having the transitional 2% rule applied. The program will examine each school/district's AYP determinations in RLA and MTH. If the school/district missed AYP solely due to the performance of the IEP subgroup (i.e., all other subgroups met the testing participation and proficiency requirements) and the participation rate for the IEP group was 95% or greater, the transitional 2% rule will be applied.

Under "Option 1," a proficiency adjustment constant must be calculated based on the total enrollment in the grades assessed and the percentage of students that are IDEA eligible (classified as students with disabilities for NCLB reporting and AYP purposes). Using the USDE formula, the percentage of IDEA students equivalent in size to 2% of the enrollment in the grades assessed comprises the proficiency adjustment constant. **Based on the above calculations, the adjustment constant for 2005 was 21% in both Reading/Language and Math. The 2006 value can be calculated in late May and is expected to be similar.**

For each school or district that meets the criteria to have the transitional 2% rule applied, the proficiency adjustment constant will be added to the IEP subgroup proficiency index calculated in the basic AYP model. Mississippi's AYP model uses a proficiency index that allows data to be combined across grade levels. The resulting index value is a measure of how far above or below the AMO the subgroup fell and is in the form of a "proficiency percentage difference." A proficiency index value of 0 or greater indicates that the subgroup met the AMO. A negative proficiency index indicates that the subgroup proficiency fell below the AMO. During the basic AYP run, a confidence interval is applied to the subgroup proficiency index for making the RLA and MTH AYP determinations.

When applying the transitional 2% rule for schools and districts satisfying the criteria, the proficiency adjustment constant will be added to the IEP subgroup proficiency index. If the sum is 0 or greater, the AYP determination for the IEP group will be "Met." The sum of the raw proficiency index and the constant must be at least 0 – no confidence interval will be used when applying the transitional 2% rule.

For each school/district at which the transitional 2% rule is applied, the adjusted AYP determination(s) will replace the AYP determination(s) in the AYP results SAS dataset. All adjusted AYP determinations will be flagged in the final file so that they can be identified on the school and district level AYP reports.

The computer program for identifying schools and districts satisfying the criteria for the transitional 2% rule, making proficiency level adjustments, and making AYP determinations for RLA and MTH will be used only for running the 2006 AYP model. Subsequent changes in the state's AYP model will be based on the final 2% rule (final regulations).