



Elementary and Middle School Accountability

Implementing No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

*Office of
Accountability*
School Improvement /
nySTART Support Team



Joel I. Klein, Chancellor



The New York State Education Department

NCLB/SED Accountability Expectations

Key Purpose of No Child Left Behind

“...to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging State academic achievement standards and state academic assessments.”

No Child Left Behind holds schools and districts accountable for making “adequate yearly progress” toward meeting the goal of all students reaching academic proficiency by the year 2013-14.

Hold Schools/Districts Accountable for Performance of Disaggregated Student Subgroups

- All continuously enrolled students
- Major racial/ethnic groups
- Students with disabilities
- Limited English proficient students
- Economically disadvantaged students

New York's Definitions of Proficiency

Define proficiency as at or above Level 3 on the elementary/middle language arts and mathematics assessments, and at or above Level 3 on New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) for certain students with disabilities (SWDs).

Define proficiency for language arts and mathematics at the high school level as a score of 65 or higher on the Regents examination in English and math or passing an approved alternative or Level 3 on NYSAA for certain SWDs.

Measurement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

- Use Performance Indices to Measure Adequate Yearly Progress and Attainment of Safe Harbor.
- Establish separate Indices for elementary and middle school language arts and math based on continuously enrolled students.
- Establish separate Indices for high school language arts and math based on annual high school cohort.
- Have Indices range from 0 to 200. Zero means all students are at basic level; 200 means all students are at proficient or advanced levels - the ultimate goal of NCLB.

Accountability Standards

What is Participation Rate? How is it Calculated?

Participation Rate

Elementary-Middle Level

For an accountability group with 40 or more students to make Adequate Yearly Progress in **English language arts (ELA) and mathematics**, 95 percent of students enrolled at the time of test administration must have valid scores on an appropriate assessment.

In 2007–08, if the participation rate of an accountability group falls below 95 percent, the Department will calculate a weighted average of the 2006–07 and 2007–08 participation rates. If the average participation rate equals or exceeds 95 percent, the group will meet the participation requirement.

Sample calculation for group below 95 percent participation in 2007–08:

Year	Enrollment	Tested	Rate
2007–08	50	47	94%
2006–07	50	49	98%
Average	100	96	96%

Participation Rule for Grades 4 and 8 Science

To make AYP in science, a school with at least 40 students in the “All Students” group (composed of grade 4 and/or grade 8 students) must have valid science scores for at least 80 percent of students enrolled at the time of test administration.

Medically Excused

If a student in grades 3 through 8 is incapacitated by illness or injury during the entire test administration and make-up period for English language arts, mathematics, or science, the student is not counted in the denominator when participation rates are calculated. To use this flexibility, the district must have on file documentation from a medical practitioner that the student was too incapacitated to be tested.

How is Performance Measured?



Department of
Education

Joel I. Klein, Chancellor

Measuring Performance

At the *elementary and middle levels*, student performance is measured using State assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science.

Assessment performance is defined at four levels:

Level 1 = Basic

Level 2 = Basic Proficiency

Level 3 = Proficient

Level 4 = Advanced Proficiency

Calculation of the Performance Index (PI)

A **Performance Index (PI)** is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group, indicating how that group performed on a required State test (or approved alternative) in English language arts, mathematics, or science. PIs are determined using the following equations:

Elementary-Middle Levels:

PI = [(number of continuously enrolled tested students scoring at Levels 2, 3, and 4 + the number scoring at Levels 3 and 4) ÷ number of continuously enrolled tested students] X 100

Calculating the Grades 3-8 Performance Index for Schools with Grades 3-5

Test Grade	Number of Students	Levels			
		1	2	3	4
3	35	12	7	10	6
4	43	3	6	20	14
5	<u>30</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>
TOTAL	108	21	23	40	24

$$\text{Index} = ((23+40+24+40+24)/108)*100=140$$

Note: The methodology is the same regardless of how many grade levels (3-8) a school serves.

Elementary- and Middle-Level Accountability Assessments

At the elementary and middle levels, the assessments that are used when determining performance indices for an accountability group are shown below.

<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Eligible Students</u>	<u>Performance Levels</u>
New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and State Assessments in Science (Grade 4 Science, Grade 8 Science, and Regents Science in lieu of grade 8 Science)	All Students	1-4
New York State Alternate Assessment	Students with Severe Cognitive Disabilities	1-4

Accountability Standards: What is the Difference Between AMO and EAMO?

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and State Standards for 2007–08

The **Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)** is the PI value that signifies that an accountability group is making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100% of students will be proficient in the State's learning standards in ELA and math by 2013–14. The **State Standards** are the PI values that signify minimally satisfactory performance in science.

Elementary-Middle Level

English Language Arts AMO	= 133
Mathematics AMO	= 102
Science State Standard	= 100

Effective AMOs

An **Effective AMO** is the lowest PI that an accountability group of a given size can achieve in a subject for the group's PI not to be considered significantly different from the AMO for that subject. If an accountability group's PI equals or exceeds the Effective AMO, the group is considered to have made AYP.

Effective Annual Measurable Objectives (Effective AMOs) for 2007–08

Subject	AMO	Number of Students Participating (Valid Scores)																	
		30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-119	120-149	150-219	220-279	280-399	400-589	590-979	980-1899	1900-5299	5300+
ELA 3-8	133	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	Effective AMOs
Math 3-8	102	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	
HS ELA	165	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	
HS Math	159	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	

Further information about confidence intervals and Effective AMOs is available at:
<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/school-accountability/confidence-intervals.htm>

What is Safe Harbor?

2007–08 Safe Harbor Calculation for ELA and Math

Safe Harbor is an alternate means to demonstrate AYP for accountability groups whose PI is less than their Effective AMO. The Safe Harbor Target calculation for ELA and math for 2007–08 using the 2006–07 PI is:

$$\text{Safe Harbor Target} = \{2006-07PI\} + [(200 - \{2006-07PI\}) \times 0.10]^*$$

For a group to make safe harbor in English or math, it must meet its Safe Harbor Target and also meet the science (at the elementary/middle level) qualification for safe harbor. To qualify at the elementary/middle level, the group must make the State Standard or its Progress Target in science in grades 4 and/or 8.

Sample 2007-08 Safe Harbor Calculation Based on 2006-07 PI

2006–07 ELA Effective AMO = 107 (group size = 42)

2006–07 elementary/middle-level ELA PI = 90

2007–08 Safe Harbor Target:

$$90 + [(200 - 90) \times 0.10] = 101$$

In 2006-07 this group did not make its Effective AMO. It was assigned a safe harbor target for 2007-08 based on the PI it achieved.

Sample Calculation To Determine if Group make AYP in 2007-08

2007–08 ELA PI = 104

2007–08 ELA Effective AMO = 107

2007–08 Safe Harbor Target = 101

Though this group's PI for 2007–08 (104) was less than its Effective AMO (107), the PI was greater than its Safe Harbor Target (101). Therefore, this group made its Safe Harbor Target. To make AYP, the group must also qualify to make safe harbor. To qualify, the science PI for this group must equal or exceed the State Standard or its Progress Target in grades 4 and/or 8 science.

Science: Qualifying for Safe Harbor in ELA and Math in 2007–08

To qualify to make safe harbor in ELA and math at the elementary/middle level, the PI for elementary/middle level science combined for a group must equal or exceed the State Standard (100) or the group's Progress Target.

2007-08 Safe Harbor Target Calculations for Groups With Fewer than 30 Students in 2006-07

2007-08 safe harbor targets for elementary/middle level ELA and mathematics were not calculated for accountability groups with fewer than 30 continuously enrolled, tested students in 2006-07. If in 2007-08 a school has an accountability group with 30 or more students that has no 2007-08 safe harbor target, SED will combine student scores for 2005–06 and 2006–07 to calculate the target. If in the combined years, there were still not 30 or more tested students in the group, the group will be assigned a Safe Harbor Target of 20.

If an accountability group's Safe Harbor Target for 2007–08 exceeds its Effective AMO, the Safe Harbor Target on the *Accountability and Overview Report* will be printed as the Effective AMO.

Science Progress Targets

Progress Targets are determined in science at the elementary/middle level* for groups that do not meet the State Standard. To make AYP in science the “All Students” group must meet the State Standard or its Progress Target. To qualify for safe harbor in ELA and math, an accountability group must meet the State Standard or make its Progress Target. Progress Targets in science for the following year can be found on the *Accountability and Overview Report* part of the *New York State School Report Card*.

**If a school includes only grade 4 or grade 8, the science PI and Progress Target will be based on that grade.*

Elementary/Middle Level Science Progress Targets

Progress Targets are calculated in science at the elementary/middle level for schools whose performance is below the State Standard. Schools that make their Progress Target are considered to have made AYP in science and to qualify for safe harbor in ELA and math in grades 3-8.

At the elementary/middle level, the Science Progress Target is the value that the PI for the “All Students” group must equal or exceed. For 2007–08, this target is determined by adding one point to the 2006–07 PI.

Example:

2007–08 State Science Standard = 100

2006–07 PI = 97

2007–08 Science Progress Target = $97 + 1 = 98$

Sample Qualification for ELA Safe Harbor for Group in School with Grades 6-8

2006–07 Elementary/Middle-Level Science PI = 97

2007–08 Science Progress Target = $97 + 1 = 98$

2007–08 Science PI = 99

2007–08 Science State Standard = 100

Though this group's PI for 2007–08 (99) was less than the State Standard (100), the PI was greater than its Progress Target (98). Therefore, this group qualifies to make Safe Harbor in elementary/middle-level ELA and math. To make Safe Harbor in ELA or math, the group must also meet its Safe Harbor Target in that subject.

What is the Difference Between State and Federal Improvement Status?

School-Level Improvement Identification

To be identified for improvement status, a school must fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years on the same measure. The school may fail to make AYP for those two years because of two different accountability groups (e.g., White students in one year and Asian students in the next year).

If a previously identified school fails to make AYP on the measure for which it was identified, it moves to the next highest status on the continuum.

If an identified school makes AYP, it remains in the same status on the continuum.

To be removed from improvement status on a measure, the school must make AYP on that measure for two consecutive years. The school may remain or be placed in improvement status on another measure for which it has not made AYP.

Sample Identifications of Schools for NCLB/SED Improvement Status

School A fails to make AYP in the following groups:

- >Elementary/middle-level ELA for White Students in 2006–07
- >Elementary/middle-level Math for Economically Disadvantaged Students in 2007–08

School A is **not** identified for improvement because it has **not** failed to make AYP for two consecutive years on the same measure.

School B fails to make AYP in the following groups:

- >Elementary/middle-Level ELA for Asian Students in 2006–07
- >Elementary/middle-level ELA for LEP Students in 2007–08

School B **is** identified for improvement because it **has** failed to make AYP for two consecutive years on the same measure (elementary/middle-level ELA).

Determining State Status

Example:

Years of Failure to Make AYP in a Subject and Grade	Status
1	Good Standing
2*	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) — Year 1
3	SRAP — Year 2
4	SRAP — Year 3
5	SRAP — Year 4
6	SRAP — Year 5

*A school must fail to make AYP for two consecutive years to be placed in improvement status. A school that makes AYP for two consecutive years is removed from improvement status for the subject and grade in which it was identified.

Determining Federal Status

Schools that do not receive Title I funding do not have a federal status.

To become a School in Need of Improvement, a school must fail to make AYP for two consecutive years in which it receives Title I funding.

If a school in federal improvement status stops receiving Title I funding, a record of its last status is maintained until it resumes receiving Title I funding. State status would continue regardless of the federal status.

When funding resumes, the school assumes the status it would have had in the first year that it did not receive funding.

However, if a school without funding makes AYP for two consecutive years, it will be in good standing when funding resumes.

Determining Federal Status (cont.)

Example:

Years of Failure Under Title I to Make AYP in a Subject and Grade	Status
1	Good Standing
2*	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) — Year 1
3	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) — Year 2
4	Corrective Action
5	Planning for Restructuring
6	Restructuring – Year 1

*A school must fail to make AYP for two consecutive years to be placed in improvement status. A school that makes AYP for two consecutive years is removed from improvement status for the subject and grade in which it was identified.

What is the Accountability for Limited English Proficient Students?

Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

The New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) was introduced in 2002–03.

All LEP students in grade K–12 must take the NYSESLAT annually.

LEP students in grades 3 through 8 enrolled in U.S. schools (not including Puerto Rico) for less than one year (enrolled on or after January 2, 2007) were not required to take the NYSTP ELA assessment in January 2008. For such students who did not take the ELA assessment, valid scores on the NYSESLAT Reading/Writing and Speaking/Listening components will meet the ELA participation requirement.

NYSESLAT performance levels will not be used in calculating the Performance Index. LEP students meeting the criteria to use the NYSESLAT in lieu of the ELA will not be included in the Performance Index calculation.

What is the Accountability for Students with Disabilities?

New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA)

- NYSAA performance levels are counted the same as general assessment (NYSTP, etc.) levels when determining PIs for English, mathematics, and science.
- The CSE determines if a student meets the criteria.
- When testing ungraded students with disabilities the student must be administered the correct test for their age, as specified in the New York State Student Information Repository System (SIRS) Policy Manual.
- Students' earned performance levels will be used to calculate the PIs for the school in which they are enrolled.

Accountability Attribution for Students with Disabilities (SWDs)

■ Elementary and middle schools may not see assessment results for all of their students with disabilities in the nySTART verification reports because based on state rules, attribution of students with disabilities for a school's accountability is dependent on the district in which the student resides. Generally, if a student is enrolled in an elementary or middle school within the district in which he or she resides, accountability for the student will be attributed to the school in which he or she is enrolled. However, if a student is enrolled in a school in another district, accountability for the student will not be attributed to that school.

■ **Note:** For high school students, the district of residence is construed to be any of the 32 geographic districts in NYC. Therefore, high school SWD performance is always attributed to the last diploma-granting school in which the student was enrolled.

Accountability Attribution for Students with Disabilities (cont.)

- Accountability for all students with disabilities enrolled in District 75 elementary, middle, and high schools is attributed to the student's district of residence but is not attributed to any individual school.
- Accountability for a student with disabilities in elementary and middle grades who is enrolled in a general education school geographically located in the student's district of residence is attributed to the school of instruction and the district of instruction.
- Accountability for a student with disabilities in elementary and middle grades who is enrolled in a general education school not geographically located in the student's district of residence is attributed to the district of residence. Accountability for this student rolls up to the district but is not attributed to any individual school.
- Accountability for a student with disabilities in high school who is enrolled in a general education school (regardless of where the student resides) is attributed to the school of instruction (last diploma-granting school in which the student was enrolled) and the district of instruction.

What is the Flexibility Rule in Determining AYP for Students with Disabilities?

Flexibility Rule for Eligible Schools

If a school meets the criteria, the Department will add 34 points to the Performance Index of the students with disability group.

If the adjusted Performance Index equals or exceeds the AMO for the measure, the students with disability group will be judged to have made AYP and the school will make AYP on that measure.

Criteria for Schools To Use Flexibility

A school is eligible to use this flexibility on the elementary/middle level English language arts (ELA) and/or mathematics accountability measures, if it meets the following criteria:

- The only accountability group that does not make AYP on that measure is the students with disability group.
- 95 percent of enrolled students with disabilities were tested on that measure.

Example 1

In elementary/middle-level ELA, West Elementary School is accountable for four groups: All students, Students with Disabilities, White students, and Black students.

95 percent of enrolled students in each group were tested.

The Performance Index of each group except the students with disability group exceeded its Effective AMO; therefore, each group except the Students with Disabilities group made AYP.

The students with disability group:

- Effective AMO = 114
- Safe Harbor Target = 110
- Performance Index = 106 (did not make AYP)

Because East Elementary School meets the criteria to use the flexibility, the Department will add 34 points to its Performance Index:

- $106 + 34 = 140$

The adjusted Performance Index (140) is higher than the AMO for elementary/middle-level ELA (133).

Therefore, East is judged to have made AYP in elementary/middle-level ELA.

Example 2

In elementary/middle level mathematics, East Elementary School is accountable for four groups: all students, Students with Disabilities, White students, and economically disadvantaged students.

95 percent of enrolled students in each group were tested.

The Performance Index of each group except the students with disability group exceeded its Effective AMO; therefore, each group except the students with disabilities group made AYP.

The students with disabilities group:

- Effective AMO = 72
- Safe Harbor Target = 70
- Performance Index = 49 (did not make AYP)

Because West elementary school meets the criteria to use the flexibility, the Department will add 34 points to its Performance Index:

- $49 + 34 = 83$

The adjusted Performance Index (83) is less than the AMO for elementary/middle-level mathematics (102).

Therefore, West is judged to have *not* made AYP in elementary/middle-level mathematics.

Example 3

In elementary/middle-level ELA, South Middle School is accountable for four groups: all students, students with disabilities, White students, and limited English proficient students.

95 percent of enrolled students in each group were tested.

The Performance Index of the “all students” and White groups exceeded their Effective AMOs; therefore, they made AYP.

The Performance Index of the LEP group was below its Effective AMO and it did not make safe harbor; therefore, the group did not make AYP.

Because the LEP group did not make AYP, the school is not eligible for flexibility for the students with disabilities group.

Therefore, South Middle School is judged to have *not* made AYP in elementary/ middle-level ELA.

Example 4

In elementary/middle-level ELA, North Middle School is accountable for four groups: all students, students with disabilities, White students, and Hispanic students.

95 percent of enrolled students in each group except the students with disabilities group were tested.

The Performance Index of each group except the students with disability group exceeded its Effective AMO; therefore, each group except the students with disabilities group made AYP.

Because the school failed to test 95 percent of students in the students with disabilities group, the school is not eligible for flexibility for the students with disabilities group.

Therefore, North Middle School is judged to have *not* made AYP in elementary/middle-level ELA.

How are Schools with Special Circumstances Held Accountable?

Small Schools

If an elementary or middle school does not test 30 continuously enrolled students in ELA or mathematics in 2007–08, the scores of continuously enrolled students tested in 2006–07 and 2007–08 will be combined to determine the PI.

If a school still does not have 30 students on which to base a decision, the school is subject to special procedures for determining AYP; i.e. – self assessment.

If the “All Students” group includes at least 30 students in 2007–08, results for 2006–07 and 2007–08 will NOT be combined for the other accountability groups. This is true even if there are fewer than 30 tested students in the other accountability groups.

Small Schools (cont.)

For accountability groups that include 30 students in 2007–08 but did not include 30 students in 2006–07, the scores of continuously enrolled tested students in that group in 2005–06 and 2007–08 will be combined to determine the 2007–08 safe harbor and progress targets.

If, after combining two years of data, the group still does not have 30 students on which to determine qualification for safe harbor based on science, the school or group is given credit for having made safe harbor if it made its ELA or math target.

Accountability for Schools That Serve Only Students Below Grade 3

Schools that serve only students below grade 3 and, consequently, do not participate in State assessments are called “feeder” schools.

Accountability decisions for feeder schools that serve grade 1 and/or grade 2 are based either

- 1) on the performance of schools with grade 3 in the same district, or
- 2) on a procedure called “backmapping.”

Accountability for Feeder Schools in Districts Where All Elementary Schools Make AYP

- If all district elementary schools with grade 3 enrollment make AYP in ELA, math, or science, the feeder schools in the district, including K-1 schools, are considered to have made AYP in the subject(s).
- This only applies if the NYCDOE submits data for the feeder schools to the NYSED. If NYSED has no data for a feeder school, it is considered not to have made AYP.

Accountability for Feeder Schools That Do Not Have Backmapping Data

- Feeder schools that are required to do backmapping are those whose highest grade is grade 1 or grade 2.
- These schools are required to have data submitted to the NYSED by NYCDOE. If they do not have data submitted to NYSED, they are considered *not* to have made AYP.

Accountability for Feeder Schools in Districts Where Some Elementary Schools Do Not Make AYP: Backmapping

- Feeder schools with grades 1 and/or 2 are accountable for the performance of their former students when these students take the grade 3 assessments in another school within the district. Feeder schools are responsible for the performance of students who were continuously enrolled in the feeder school's highest grade (grade 1 or 2). The students' grade 3 Repository records must identify the feeder school attended by the student in the Service Provider field. To determine if the feeder school made AYP, the ELA and math PIs of students enrolled in the feeder school are calculated and compared with the Effective AMOs and/or Safe Harbor Targets. *The PI in science is determined and compared with the Science Standard and/or Progress Target.*
- For schools serving only kindergarten, special evaluation processes are used to determine AYP.