Hawaii Department of Education

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)

APPROVED by USDOE on May 28, 2003

Amended, with Approval

1. **August 6, 2003** **(Critical Elements 3.2 and 4.1)**
2. **July 28, 2004** **(Critical Elements 2.1, 3.2, 5.3, 5.4, 7.2, and 10.1)**
3. **July 5, 2005** **(Critical Elements 1.1, 3.2, 5.4, 5.5, and 9.1)**
4. **May 22, 2006** **(Critical Elements 1.1 to 10.2)**
5. **June 22, 2006** **(Critical Element 5.3)**
6. **May 11, 2007** **(Critical Element 5.3)**
7. **August 7, 2008** **(Critical Elements 1.1 to 10.2)**

Final Information
As of August 7, 2008

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

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

F: State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.

P: State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).

W: State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

Status	State Accountability System Element	
Principle 1: All Schools		
F	1.1	Accountability system includes all schools and districts in the state.
F	1.2	Accountability system holds all schools to the same criteria.
F	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the academic achievement standards.
F	1.4	Accountability system provides information in a timely manner.
F	1.5	Accountability system includes report cards.
F	1.6	Accountability system includes rewards and sanctions.
Principle 2: All Students		
F	2.1	The accountability system includes all students
F	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of full academic year.
F	2.3	The accountability system properly includes mobile students.
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations		
F	3.1	Accountability system expects all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14.
F	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress.
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a starting point.
F	3.2b	Accountability system establishes statewide annual measurable objectives.
F	3.2c	Accountability system establishes intermediate goals.
Principle 4: Annual Decisions		
F	4.1	The accountability system determines annually the progress of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:
F - Final policy
P - Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval
W - Working to formulate policy

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems, cont.

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability		
F	5.1	The accountability system includes all the required student subgroups.
F	5.2	The accountability system holds schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups.
F	5.3	The accountability system includes students with disabilities.
F	5.4	The accountability system includes limited English proficient students.
F	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
F	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.
Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments		
F	6.1	Accountability system is based primarily on academic assessments.
Principle 7: Additional Indicators		
F	7.1	Accountability system includes graduation rate for high schools.
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.
F	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.
Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics		
F	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for reading/language arts and mathematics.
Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability		
F	9.1	Accountability system produces reliable decisions.
F	9.2	Accountability system produces valid decisions.
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing changes in assessment and student population.
Principle 10: Participation Rate		
F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the rate of participation in the statewide assessment.
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.

STATUS Legend:
F - Final policy
P - Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval
W - Working to formulate policy

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?	Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System. State has a definition of "public school" and "LEA" for AYP accountability purposes. • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2).	A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System. State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.1)

Every Hawaii public school is required to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and is included in the State's single accountability system. Section 302A-1004(a)(6), *Hawaii Revised Statutes*, requires annual school "report cards"[1] as well as a statewide summary report on school status and improvement. Both Title I and non-Title I schools are part of the State's single accountability system.

[1] "Report card" provision enacted into law by Act 74, Session Laws of Hawaii 1999; and amended by Act 238, Session Laws of Hawaii 2000, and Act 51, Session Laws of Hawaii 2004. The report card

The State has a definition of "public school" and "Local Education Agency" (LEA) for AYP accountability purposes. Section 302A-101, HRS, defines "public school" as " . . . all academic and noncollege type schools established and maintained by the department [Department of Education] and charter schools chartered by the board of education, in accordance with law." The governance and administrative structure of Hawaii's public school system is unique among the states. The Hawaii public school system is a single, unified, statewide K-12 system of schools headed by the State Superintendent of Education and the State Board of Education. The Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) is both the State Education Agency (SEA) and the district or Local Education Agency (LEA). Subsequent notations of "LEA/SEA" in this Workbook will be a reference to the HIDOE's dual role of serving as both the local/district and the state agencies in a single entity.

The state accountability system produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-2, K-8, and K-12 schools), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., juvenile correctional institutions such as Olomana School, and the Hawaii Center for the Deaf and the Blind), and public charter schools.

Virtually all Hawaii public schools have at least one grade level (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 10) assessed under the state assessment program. Those schools which do not have grade levels that are tested under the HIDOE's system-wide assessment program are held accountable for their students' proficiency based on:

1. School-selected assessments of mathematics and reading proficiency. If there are no school-selected assessments or if the school-selected assessments are deemed invalid or unreliable, or both, by the HIDOE for purposes of producing AYP decisions, in accordance with current standards for educational and psychological testing, then
2. The first tested grade in the next school that their students attend. If, due to their schools' configuration, these students will not subsequently attend another Hawaii public school, then
3. The last tested grade in the previous school that their students attended. If these students did not previously attend another Hawaii public school, then
4. State-selected assessments of mathematics and reading proficiency, provided the state-selected assessments are deemed valid and reliable by the HIDOE for purposes of producing AYP decisions, in accordance with current standards for educational and psychological testing,

provided that if future versions of the *Hawaii State Assessment* include test instruments for assessing the reading and mathematics proficiency of students enrolled in grade levels that are ***not*** currently tested

---

described in section 302A-1004(a)(6), *Hawaii Revised Statutes*, is not identical to the state report card described at 20 USC 6311(h)(1)(C) (see Appendix A).

under the HIDOE's system-wide assessment program (e.g., second grade), then the HIDOE will utilize the *Hawaii State Assessment* test instruments.

Most schools meet the minimum group size threshold of forty full academic year students for calculating a proficiency rate, and almost all schools meet the minimum group size threshold for calculating a proficiency rate after two years of data are aggregated (see table below).

Spring State Assessment Reading and Mathematics (school year)	Number of schools with < 40 students (one year of data)	Number of schools with < 40 students after aggregating 2 years of data	Number of schools with < 40 students after aggregating 3 years of data	Total number of Schools
2006-2007	17	8	7	283
2005-2006	15	8	7	282
2004-2005	33	15	10	282
2003-2004	32	21	17	281

For schools with fewer than forty students enrolled for a full academic year, when pooled across all grades assessed, the HIDOE aggregates data for up to three consecutive years in order to meet the minimum group size requirement. If the minimum n-count requirement is not met in a given year even with multi-year aggregation of school-wide data, then the AYP determination is still made using the regular AYP model. In such cases, the reported AYP results include a statement indicating that the results may be unreliable due to the small number of students enrolled in the school available for analysis.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination. If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.2)

All public schools and the LEA/SEA are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making AYP determinations. The HIDOE's definition of AYP establishes baselines or starting points using 2002 data for all schools. All schools are expected to attain annual progress resulting in proficiency among 100% of students in reading and mathematics by 2013-14. For details about the HIDOE's AYP criteria and the method of making AYP determinations, please see responses to:

1. Critical Element 3.1, *"How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?"*
2. Critical Element 3.2, *"How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?"*
3. Critical Element 3.2a, *"What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?"*
4. Critical Element 3.2b, *"What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?"* and
5. Critical Element 3.2c, *"What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?"*

The AYP definition is integrated into the HIDOE's school accountability system.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of *basic*, *proficient* and *advanced* student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?	State has defined three levels of student achievement: *basic*, *proficient* and *advanced*.[2] Student achievement levels of *proficient* and *advanced* determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the *basic* level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the *proficient* and *advanced* levels.	Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.3)

The accountability system is based primarily on the *Hawaii Content and Performance Standards* (HCPS) III State Assessment results in reading and mathematics. The assessment is a custom-designed assessment program to measure student achievement of the *Hawaii Content and Performance Standards*. While the norm-referenced *TerraNova (2nd Edition)* is a part of the state assessment program as required by section 302A-201(d), *Hawaii Revised Statutes*, and State Board of Education Policy #2520, it is important to note that the assessment results used in the accountability system are the standards-based scores from the standards-based sections of the assessment, not the *TerraNova* scores from the norm-referenced sections of the assessment. The HIDOE has defined four, grade-specific (i.e., grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10) levels of proficiency for the standards-based sections of the HCPS III State Assessment in reading and mathematics, which are included at the end of this section. The four proficiency levels are: "Well Below Proficiency", "Approaches Proficiency", "Meets Proficiency", and "Exceeds Proficiency". The performance level descriptors (PLDs) for reading, mathematics, and science

[2] System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

can be viewed at http://www.alohahsa.org/Events/index.php/category/resources-news-events/, accessed August 7, 2008.

The student achievement levels of "Meets Proficiency" (*proficient)* and "Exceeds Proficiency" (*advanced)* determine how well students are mastering the State's academic content standards; and the "Well Below Proficiency" and "Approaches Proficiency" (*basic)* levels of achievement provide information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the *proficient* and *advanced* levels. For purposes of calculating and reporting AYP, the "Meets Proficiency" and "Exceeds Proficiency" levels are considered "proficient" and the "Approaches Proficiency" and "Well Below Proficiency" levels are considered "not proficient." The "proficient" level ("Meets Proficiency" plus "Exceeds Proficiency") is the goal for all public school students and it is the level used for making AYP decisions.

In 2004, the HIDOE began revising its content standards by moving from grade band standards (e.g., K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12 for language arts and mathematics) to grade specific standards (i.e. K-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12). In 2005, the State Board of Education approved the third edition of the *Hawaii Content and Performance Standards* (HCPS III) and the HIDOE began the development of new tests based on the new content standards. The new tests in reading and mathematics were administered to students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 in spring 2007.

In spring 2007, a standard setting panel consisting of more than 100 teachers, school administrators, community members, parents, and university faculty was asked to set the numerical cut scores for the four proficiency levels in reading and mathematics (i.e., "Exceeds Proficiency", "Meets Proficiency", "Approaches Proficiency", and "Well Below Proficiency"). Using actual test items from the spring 2007 *Hawaii State Assessment*, the standard setting panel set the cut scores based on grade specific, performance level descriptions of how much students should know and be able to do in order to be rated as "Exceeds Proficiency", "Meets Proficiency", "Approaches Proficiency", and "Well Below Proficiency".

The standard setting panel's recommended cut scores for the spring 2007 *Hawaii State Assessment* were accepted by the State Board of Education without change in April 2007. All reading and mathematics test results (i.e., proficiency ratings), from spring 2007 onward, will be based on the April 2007 cut scores until the content standards (i.e., HCPS III) are revised, there is a significant change in the design of the test, or the State Board of Education determines that new "cut scores" are needed.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year. State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.	Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.4)

The HCPS III State Assessment for reading and mathematics is administered in the spring (March/April) to permit the assessment of an almost full year of student attainment at the tested grade level. Tests include constructed response and multiple-choice items.

Beginning in 2006, the HIDOE will render preliminary AYP determinations; notify the State Board of Education, schools, and the newsmedia of those preliminary determinations; and announce (via the newsmedia) parents' school choice options, before the beginning of the new academic year in late July. The HIDOE will also require schools to inform the parents of all students who are assigned to a school that has been preliminarily identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring of their school choice option. Parent notification through the school will be in writing and take place no later than the first day of the school year.

Beginning with the 2006-2007 school year, all public schools, except multi-track, year-round schools and charter schools, will be on a single school calendar. The single school calendar adopted by the State

Board of Education specifies the beginning and the end of the academic year (which is not synonymous with the term "full academic year" or FAY).

Final school and LEA/SEA accountability reports and AYP determinations are issued not more than forty days after schools receive their preliminary AYP results. The forty-day timeframe is necessary to accommodate the school-level appeals process described in Critical Element 9.2, *"What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?"* Schools notify parents and make school choice available upon receipt of their *preliminary* accountability results, including AYP results (i.e., "met" or "not met") and NCLB status (e.g., "corrective action" and "restructuring"). Once *final* accountability results are issued, the HIDOE revises its list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to reflect any additions or deletions resulting from the school-level appeals process. In cases where a school that was preliminarily identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring does not appear on the final list of schools identified for the same, the school will be so informed and relieved of prospective requirements. Any school choice commitments (i.e., transportation costs) that were made based on *preliminary* accountability results are honored for the remainder of the school year.

The HIDOE requires schools to offer public school choice to students enrolled in first year school improvement schools and to provide public school choice and supplemental educational services and take intervening actions appropriate to the number of years of school improvement or corrective action. The established timelines are consistent with NCLB.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?	The State Report Card includes all the required data elements (see Appendix A for the list of required data elements). The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year. The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible. Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups.	The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements. The State Report Card is not available to the public.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.5)

The state accountability report card and school report cards for each Hawaii public school are produced and published electronically. The report cards include each of the data elements required by section 1111(h)(1)(C) of PL 107-110 except as noted below.

To be calculated accurately, the retention rate for elementary and middle school students (selected by the HIDOE as the third – or "other" – academic indicator required by NCLB) requires the enrolled grade level for each target student at the beginning of the subsequent academic year. Those data are obtained from the official enrollment count student rosters, which are created at the end of the second week of school. Any other data used for calculating retention rates would be subject to unacceptable rates of error. Likewise, the graduation rate (which is a true graduation rate, based on tracking individual students over four years) requires accurate identification of each student's status at the end of the senior academic year. Those data are only available after the close of the academic year and the receipt of students' final grades. Consequently, the HIDOE's retention and graduation rates are "lagging" rates. To be clear,

schools' retention rates and graduation rates are lagged one school year. The annual measurable objectives for retention rate and graduation rate are not lagged.

The HIDOE reports the percentage of classes in a school and in the LEA/SEA that are not taught by "highly qualified" teachers. The criteria that define of a highly qualified teacher can be found in the HIDOE's "Highly Qualified Teacher State Plan" (April 2007) at http://doe.k12.hi.us/teacherquality/Hawaii_HQT_Plan_FINAL_APPROVED_062607.pdf, accessed August 7, 2008, 44 pp. In general, these criteria can be grouped into three very broad categories: education/licensing (e.g., having at least a Bachelor's Degree *and* holding the appropriate teaching field license for assignment in the subject-matter area), certification (e.g., passing the appropriate PRAXIS II tests in each core academic subject taught), and placement (e.g., being properly assigned at the appropriate grade levels).

Downloadable, print-ready versions of LEA/SEA and school report cards are accessible via the Assessment Resource Center Hawaii website at http://arch.k12.hi.us.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?[3]	State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are: • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs.	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.6)

The HIDOE uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are applied uniformly across all public schools and the LEA/SEA.

Per the requirements of NCLB, sanctions and interventions are imposed by the LEA/SEA on all public schools through its single accountability system.

In Hawaii, both Title I and non-Title I schools are subject to the specific sanctions required by section 1116 of the NCLB law. Under NCLB, the State recognizes public schools as high performing that meet or exceed all State standards and achieve AYP for all applicable disaggregated groups of students. The State recognizes rapidly improving public schools that have made AYP for all applicable disaggregated groups of students for three consecutive years. Schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress are subject to improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Academic achievement is recognized by two programs: the national *No Child Left Behind Blue Ribbon Schools Program* and *Hawaii's Distinguished Schools Program*. All public elementary and secondary schools that meet the stringent criteria of the *No Child Left Behind Blue Ribbon Schools Program* are

[3] The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB (§200.12(b)(40)).

honored as schools that have made significant progress in closing the achievement gap or whose students achieve at very high levels. The *Hawaii's Distinguished Schools Program* is a revision of a previous statewide public school recognition program.

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System. The definitions of "public school" and "LEA" account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(2.1)

The definitions of "public school" and "LEA" account for all public school students enrolled in the LEA/SEA, regardless of program or type of public school. (See Critical Element 1.1, *"How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?"*)

All students enrolled at the time of testing are expected to participate in the *Hawaii State Assessment*. A school's "participation rate count date" is the Monday of the week when the school administers the first reading or mathematics test session to the majority of its students. (If Monday is a state holiday, then the school's participation rate count date is Tuesday.) A school's participation rate count date operationally defines "enrolled at the time of testing" and comprises the denominator of the assessment participation rate measure used in determining AYP for the state, for the school, and for all required student subgroups. For purposes of systemwide accounting, the HIDOE uses March 1st or, if March 1st falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the first Monday in the month of March as a fixed census date. For related details, see responses to:

1. Critical Element 2.2, *"How does the State define "full academic year" for identifying students in AYP decisions?"*
2. Critical Element 2.3, *"How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?"* and
3. Critical Element 10.1, *"What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State*

assessments for use in AYP determinations?"

Make up sessions are given for students absent from school on scheduled testing dates. *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* results are included in the school and LEA/SEA determination of AYP. Although students with disabilities and limited English proficient students may receive certain testing accommodations, no students are exempted from the assessment or accountability systems.
(See Critical Element 5.3, *"How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?"*, and Critical Element 5.4, *"How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?"*)

Students who are exempted from the *Hawaii State Assessment,* the *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment,* or the *Hawaiian Aligned Portfolio Assessment*, at the written request of their parents, count for participation purposes. Every school is expected to inform parents upon parent request of the procedures for submitting a written exemption request. In addition, every school is expected to inform parents of the importance of the assessment and the impact of their child not participating in the same. No school, however, may solicit or encourage a written exemption request on behalf of any child or group of children.

The state assessment program's "Student Participation and Accommodations Handbook" (Systems Accountability Office, Student Assessment Section) provides all HIDOE personnel at the school, district, and state level with information regarding the *Hawaii Content and Performance Standards, Third Edition* (HCPS III) State Assessment participation criteria for various student populations. The guide is updated annually and distributed via memorandum from the State Superintendent to school and support staff. Adherence to the guide is required by administrative directive. Guidelines require that all students must participate in the state assessment program. Assessment administration guides and training activities, together with stringent testing administration procedures, assure compliance with these requirements.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define "full academic year" for identifying students in AYP decisions?	The State has a definition of "full academic year" for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP. The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.	LEAs have varying definitions of "full academic year." The State's definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade. The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(2.2)
The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide. "Full academic year" is defined as continuous enrollment from March 1st of one school year to March 1st of the next school year; provided that if March 1st falls on a Saturday or Sunday, then the HIDOE will use the first Monday in the month of March as a fixed census date. A full academic year comprises no more than 365 days, except during "leap" years and years in which March 1st falls on a Saturday or Sunday. A student attending the same school from March 1st of one school year to March 1st of the next school year, i.e., for a full academic year, is included when determining if the school has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) on the academic achievement proficiency measures. A student attending more than one public school in the State (LEA/SEA) during the full academic year is included when determining whether the LEA/SEA has made AYP on the academic achievement proficiency measures.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?	State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year. State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.	State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability. State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability. State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(2.3)

The State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year. The student data elements used to determine which students have attended the same public school or LEA/SEA for a full academic year are collected in the statewide Student Information System. The statewide data system includes a unique student identifier that enables the HIDOE to account for individual student enrollment and mobility.

Students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school to another public school within the State are attributed to the LEA/SEA for the purposes of computing AYP and reporting.

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?	The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts[4] and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.	State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014. State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.1)

The State's timeline for AYP ensures that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement (i.e., "Meets Proficiency" or "Exceeds Proficiency") in reading and mathematics, no later than 2013-14.

Starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives were set separately for reading and mathematics. Using 2002 state assessment data, baselines were established using the percent of students in the school ranked at the 20th percentile of enrollment. The 20th percentile method provided higher values (i.e., 30% for reading and 10% for mathematics) than the method based on the percent of students proficient in the lowest achieving subgroup (i.e., 6% proficient in reading among students with disabilities and 2% proficient in mathematics for students with disabilities). As required by NCLB, the higher values of the two methods were adopted as the AYP starting points or baseline values. The following tables provide the HIDOE's starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives. The HIDOE's definition of Adequate Yearly Progress results in all students meeting or exceeding the proficient level of academic achievement in reading and mathematics no later than 2013-14.

[4] If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

Reading, Percent of Students Proficient Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10)													
Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Baseline	30												
Inter. Goal	(30)			44			58			72		86	100
Annual Objective	(30)	30	30	44	44	44	58	58	58	72	72	86	100

Mathematics, Percent of Students Proficient Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10)													
Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Baseline	10												
Inter. Goal	(10)			28			46			64		82	100
Annual Objective	(10)	10	10	28	28	28	46	46	46	64	64	82	100

To meet the expectations represented by these intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, schools and districts must make substantial and continuous improvement. The annual measurable objectives for the 2013-14 academic year require that 100% of students reach the proficient levels of performance in reading and mathematics.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?	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. 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.	State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.2)

In determining whether each subgroup, school, as well as the LEA/SEA overall, meet the annual measurable objectives, the HIDOE computes participation rates, calculates the percent of students who achieve the proficient level or higher, implements a uniform averaging procedure, and employs the safe harbor provision.

- *Participation requirements* - Schools in which at least 95% of the students enrolled at the time of testing take the state assessments will meet the AYP standard for participation in the state assessment. Schools in which less than 95% of any student subgroup takes the state assessment will not meet the AYP standard for assessment participation, provided the size of the subgroup meets the minimum number required for making inferences about participation (40 students). (See Critical Element 5.5, *"What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes . . . [and] . . . accountability purposes?"*, for the rationales for the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which data are used.) If the size of the subgroup is less than forty students, then a participation rate of less than 95% for that subgroup will not result in a failure to meet the AYP participation standard. Participation requirements will be applied in the same way when determining whether the LEA/SEA as a whole met the AYP standard for participation in the state assessment. Participation requirements are applied separately for reading and mathematics.

  If a school or subgroup, or both, does not meet the 95% requirement, then the Department uses data from the previous year to average the participation rate data for the school or subgroup, or both, as needed. If this two-year average does not meet the 95% requirement, then the Department uses data from the previous two years to average the participation rate data for a school or subgroup, or both, as needed. If this three-year average does not meet the 95% requirement, then the school is deemed to have not met this requirement. (See Critical Element 10.1, *"What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?"*, for a description of the Secretary of Education's March 29, 2004, policy for calculating schools' participation rates.)

- *Uniform averaging procedure* - Averaging pertains to both grade levels and years.

  Grade levels

  The HIDOE pools or combines (which is equivalent to averaging) the percent proficient across grades within a school building and the LEA/SEA to determine AYP. The percent proficient is calculated based on the number of tested students that were enrolled for a full academic year. AYP is determined separately for reading and mathematics.

  Years

  In addition, the HIDOE averages the most recent two years of test scores (including the current year's scores) and compares the results to the current year's test scores. The highest percent proficient is used to determine the school's and the LEA's/SEA's AYP status. This approach

rewards schools for efforts that result in strong single-year achievement gains and minimizes the potential for falsely inferring that a school building or the LEA/SEA has failed to make AYP. Since the 2001-02 school year was the first time that the HCPS II State Assessment was administered, averaging across years was implemented following the 2002-03 administration of the state assessment.

- *Safe harbor provision* - If one or more subgroups within a school or the LEA/SEA, or if a school or the LEA/SEA as a whole, fail to meet the annual measurable proficiency objective, then the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA still makes Adequate Yearly Progress if *both* of these conditions are met:
  1. The percentage of students in the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA who are not proficient decreases (improves) by at least 10% over one year (e.g., from spring 2005 to spring 2006), by at least 19% over two years (e.g., from spring 2004 to spring 2006), or by at least 27% over three years (e.g., from spring 2003 to spring 2006).

     In calculating the percentage decrease, the HIDOE first computes the difference between the current year's (e.g., spring 2006) average percent not proficient and the preceding year's (e.g., spring 2005) average percent not proficient in order to determine whether the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA achieved the criterion of a 10% reduction. If the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA does not achieve a 10% reduction, then the HIDOE computes the difference between the average percent not proficient over two years (e.g., from spring 2004 to spring 2006) in order to determine whether the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA achieved the criterion of a 19% reduction. If the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA does not achieve a 19% reduction, then the HIDOE computes the difference between the average percent not proficient over three years (e.g., from spring 2003 to spring 2006) in order to determine whether the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA achieved the criterion of a 27% reduction; and
  2. The students in that subgroup, school, or the LEA/SEA meet the annual measurable objective for the other academic indicator (i.e., retention rate for elementary and middle/intermediate schools or graduation rate for high schools).

AYP will be determined using 2002 data as the baseline. The starting points are calculated pursuant to the NCLB law and rule requirements. The same starting point and annual, measurable goals apply to all student subpopulations resulting in 100% proficiency of all students by 2013-14.

The method used for determining whether each student subgroup, public school, and the LEA/SEA make AYP is summarized below. The method is applied separately to reading and to mathematics. Data are

pooled across all grade levels in the school or LEA/SEA. The sequence of steps used in determining AYP is important.

1. Calculate the n-count for the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA) and compare the value to the minimum n criterion of forty for making inferences about student proficiency. (See Critical Element 5.5, *"What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes . . . [and] . . . accountability purposes?"*) If the n-count is smaller than the minimum n criterion for making inferences about student proficiency (forty), then the subgroup is not used in determining AYP. Otherwise, continue to Step 2.

   Note: All subgroups at the school level, whether with an n-count too small to count toward AYP or not, are "rolled up" into the overall, aggregate school proficiency scores.

   Note: For those few unique schools for which the total number of students enrolled in all the assessed grade levels is fewer than the minimum n-count, assessment data for the school is aggregated (as noted in Critical Element 1.1, *"How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?"*) over two consecutive years or more, if necessary, in order to meet the minimum n-size requirement. If the minimum n-count requirement is not met in a given year even with multi-year aggregation of school-wide data, then the AYP determination is still made using the regular AYP model. In such cases, the reported AYP results include a statement indicating that the results may be unreliable due to the small number of students enrolled in the school available for analysis.
2. Compute the percent of proficient students for the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA) using the current year's test scores and the average of the two most recent year's scores (including the current year). If either or both computed percents proficient is equal to or greater than the established annual measurable objective, then AYP is met. Otherwise, AYP may not have been met, the final determination of which is subject to the "safe harbor provision" implemented in Step 3.
3. If the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA) did not meet AYP under Step 2, then the specific requirements of the "safe harbor provision", as stipulated above, are invoked. If both conditions of the safe harbor provision are satisfied, then AYP for proficiency of the subgroup is met. Otherwise, AYP is not met.

   Note: In determining the percentage decrease in the percent of students not proficient, data used for the computation from the preceding year(s) may not satisfy the minimum n-count requirements for making inferences about subgroup proficiency. In that situation, the safe harbor computation is still made but associated AYP results include a statement indicating that the results may be unreliable due to the small number of students available for analysis.
4. Calculate the assessment participation rate for the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school

or LEA/SEA) in accordance to the "participation requirements" stipulated above. (See also Critical Element 10.1, *"What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?"*, for related details.) Compare the participation rate calculated to the minimum n criterion of forty for making inferences about student participation. (See Critical Element 5.5, *"What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes . . . [and] . . . accountability purposes?"*) If the n-count is smaller than the minimum n criterion for making inferences about student participation (forty), then the subgroup is not used in determining AYP for participation rate. Otherwise, continue to Step 5.

5. Compare the calculated assessment participation rate to the 95% criterion. If the calculated assessment participation rate is equal to or greater than 95%, then AYP is met for the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA). Otherwise, AYP is not met.
6. For the other required AYP indicators (i.e., graduation rate for high schools and retention rate for elementary and middle/intermediate schools), determine at the aggregate level of school or LEA/SEA, as appropriate, if the measurable annual target has been met. If the computed graduation or retention rate is equal to or greater than the specified annual target value, then the measurable annual target is met. If the annual measurable target is met, then AYP is met. Otherwise, AYP is not met.

   Note: Disaggregation by subgroups is not necessary for purposes of determining AYP for the other required indicators. Only aggregate school-wide (and LEA/SEA level) values are needed. Disaggregated subgroup data for the other required indicators is necessary, however, for use in implementing the safe harbor provision in Step 3.

Failure to make AYP for two consecutive years - defined as failure of ANY subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA, if applicable) to not make AYP on the SAME indicator (i.e., reading, mathematics, graduation or retention rate) - will result in the school (or LEA/SEA) being identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as specified in NCLB.

For any school (or the LEA/SEA) to exit from improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, it must meet AYP for two consecutive years.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?	Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement. Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level. A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools).	The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.2a)

NCLB requires that "data for the 2001-2002 school year" shall be used to define the starting point for the accountability system. Using data from the 2001-02 school year, the HIDOE established separate

starting points in reading and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement. The tables included in the response to Critical Element 3.1, *"How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?"*, show the starting point values established for each assessment.

The HIDOE calculated the State's starting points for reading and for mathematics using NCLB-prescribed methodology. According to NCLB, the starting points for reading and for mathematics are to be based on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.

The State used the required procedures to establish a common starting point for all grade levels assessed. The starting points for reading and for mathematics are the same for all schools and all student subgroups. The 20th percentile method provided higher values (i.e., 30% for reading and 10% for mathematics) than the method based on the percent of students proficient in the lowest achieving subgroup (i.e., 6% proficient in reading among students with disabilities and 2% proficient in mathematics for students with disabilities). As required by NCLB, the higher values of the two methods were adopted as the AYP starting points or baseline values: 30% for reading, 10% for mathematics. A report of the methodology and results for setting the starting points was accepted by the State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and is published on the web at http://arch.k12.hi.us.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments. The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline. The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.	The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives. The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.2b)

The values for the HIDOE's annual measurable objectives are given above in the response to Critical Element 3.1, *"How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?"* The HIDOE established annual measurable objectives that are consistent with its intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments. The HIDOE established separate reading and mathematics statewide annual measurable objectives, uniform for all grades assessed, among which assessment data were pooled or combined, that identify a minimum percentage of students that must meet the proficient level of academic achievement. Between intermediate goals, annual measurable objectives utilize the same percent proficient as the most recent intermediate goal.

The reading and mathematics annual measurable objectives are applied to each school, as well as to each subgroup at the school and LEA/SEA levels, to determine AYP status. When determining the results statewide and for schools with multiple levels, as well as for subgroups within them, each annual measurable objective is applied to all grades assessed separately for reading and mathematics.

The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.

The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each subgroup of students, and for the LEA/SEA.

A report of the methodology and results for setting the annual measurable objectives was accepted by the State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and is published on the web at http://arch.k12.hi.us.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline. • The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. • Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.	The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals. The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.2c)

Please see the response to Critical Element 3.1, "*How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?"*, above. The first incremental increase takes effect in the 2004-05 school year. Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.

A report of the methodology and results for setting the intermediate goals was accepted by the State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and is published on the web at http://arch.k12.hi.us.

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually.[5]	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(4.1)

AYP decisions for each public school and the LEA/SEA are made annually. Failure to make AYP for two consecutive years - defined as the failure of any subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA, if applicable) to not make AYP on the same indicator (i.e., reading, mathematics, graduation or retention rate) – results in the school (or LEA/SEA) being identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as specified in NCLB. This approach is consistent with *No Child Left Behind's* goal of successfully remediating subject performance deficiencies and mitigates the potential for falsely inferring that a school or LEA/SEA is not meeting AYP standards. For a description of the procedures on how AYP decisions are determined annually for each required subgroup, public school, and for the LEA/SEA, please see:

1. Critical Element 3.1, *"How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?"* and
2. Critical Element 3.2, *"How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?"*

The following school-level examples illustrate key features of the implementation of NCLB-required sanctions within the context of not making AYP in the same content area or subject for two consecutive years. Note that, in terms of meeting annual measurable objectives, there is only one difference between

[5] Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

Scenario #1 and #2 and, that is, in Scenario #1 the reading targets are met in Year 5 while in Scenario #2 the reading targets are not met in Year 5. The accountability consequence of that difference in terms of schoolwide NCLB sanction status in Year 5 is considerable.

Scenario #1

Year	Both *Annual Reading Targets Met?	Both *Annual Math Targets Met?	Annual Targets for Other Indicators Met?	Made AYP? Reason(s)	NCLB Sanction Status**			
					Reading	Math	Other	**Schoolwide**
1	No	Yes	Yes	No, due to reading.	0	0	0	0
2	No	Yes	Yes	No, due to reading.	SI1	0	0	SI1
3	No	Yes	Yes	No, due to reading.	SI2	0	0	SI2
4	Yes	No	Yes	No, due to math.	SI2+	0	0	SI2
5	Yes	No	Yes	No, due to math.	0++	SI1	0	SI1

* "Annual targets" in reading and mathematics refer to the annual measurable objectives (targets) for (a) the percent of students achieving at the proficient level or higher and (b) the minimum required assessment participation rate (i.e., 95%).
** SI1: School Improvement Year 1; SI2: School Improvement Year 2; CA: Corrective Action
\+ Based on Year 4 results, even though the school met the reading targets, it will remain in SI2 because two consecutive years of making the targets in the same subject are needed in order to remove NCLB sanctions attributable to failure to attain the targets in that subject.
++ Based on Year 5 results, since the school attained the reading targets for two consecutive years, its sanction status due to reading is removed. However, concurrently the school did not attain the mathematics targets in Years 4 and 5, so its NCLB sanction status following Year 5 is SI1 due to mathematics.

Scenario #2

Year	Both *Annual Reading Targets Met?	Both *Annual Math Targets Met?	Annual Targets for Other Indicator Met?	Made AYP? Reason(s)	NCLB Sanction Status**			
					Reading	Math	Other	**Schoolwide**
1	No	Yes	Yes	No, due to reading.	0	0	0	0
2	No	Yes	Yes	No, due to reading.	SI1	0	0	SI1
3	No	Yes	Yes	No, due to reading.	SI2	0	0	SI2
4	Yes	No	Yes	No, due to math.	SI2	0	0	SI2
5	No	No	Yes	No, due to reading and math.	CA***	SI1	0	CA

* "Annual targets" in reading and mathematics refer to the annual measurable objectives (targets) for (a) the percent of students achieving at the proficient level or higher and (b) the minimum required assessment participation rate (i.e., 95%).
** SI1: School Improvement Year 1; SI2: School Improvement Year 2; CA: Corrective Action
*** Based on Year 5 results, the school will enter CA due to reading. This occurs because the "trigger" for increasingly severe sanctions (due in this case to reading) remains in effect until removed by attaining the targets for two consecutive years.

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency. Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.	State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.1)

Subgroups used in determining Adequate Yearly Progress include:

- Economically disadvantaged
- Major racial and ethnic groups - American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, White, Hispanic
- Students with disabilities, and
- Students with limited English proficiency.

The inclusion of all required student subgroups in the determination of Adequate Yearly Progress will be ensured by the State's use of the same complete student roster file for determination of relevant group membership that is used by the State to determine students' eligibility for participation in the statewide assessment. This roster identifies each student's race or ethnicity, status as economically disadvantaged or not, special education status, English proficiency status, gender, and status as a migrant student or not.

Race or ethnicity and gender are recorded in the student roster by schools at the time of students' initial enrollment (via Form SIS-10). Economic disadvantage is identified annually through determination of

eligibility for free or reduced cost school lunch. Students from families receiving public assistance are identified directly by the State Department of Human Services. Special education status is drawn from the HIDOE's special education database system. Limited English proficiency is denoted in the records when a child is referred for English for Second Language Learner program services. And status as a migrant student is obtained annually from the HIDOE's office for migrant student services.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.2)

All public schools and the LEA/SEA are held accountable for student subgroup achievement – economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students – through the AYP determination, provided the subgroup meets the minimum group size requirement. From its Student Information System and state assessment databases the HIDOE is able to match student demographic data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups. For each subgroup and school, AYP determinations will be issued using the same reporting rules used to determine AYP for students in the aggregate at the LEA/SEA level. For each school and the LEA/SEA, the State will determine for each group of sufficient size whether the group achieved the annual measurable objective or satisfied the safe harbor provision of NCLB and met the 95% participation rate criteria.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	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. State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.	The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments. State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.3)
All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards for the grade in which the students are enrolled.

All special education students currently enrolled in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 must take the *Hawaii State Assessment* or the *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment*. Grade 31 ("out-of-grade level") special education students, who are chronologically in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, must take the designated assessment documented in each child's IEP: the age appropriate *Hawaii State Assessment* or the *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment*. If required by the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP), special education students may take the *Hawaii State Assessment* with accommodations. Twenty-three different accommodations are provided (for the spring 2008 administrations), e.g., accommodations in presentation format, response format, setting, use of assistive technology, and timing.

The *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* is a standards-based assessment that is administered to students who have IEPs and who, because of significant cognitive disabilities, are unable to participate in the *Hawaii State Assessment* even with necessary accommodations. The *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* consists of a comprehensive rating scale. In addition to rating all items on the assessment, it requires the collection of two independent pieces of evidence using two types of assessment,

e.g., observation, interview, record review, performance assessment, and student work sample for three reading standards and five mathematics strands. The *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* was designed to rate students' proficiency on the same Language Arts and Mathematics Content Standards that are assessed by the *Hawaii State Assessment.* The Grade-level Benchmarks for Language Arts and Mathematics have been expanded for the *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* to include performances and behaviors for students with significant cognitive disabilities, some of whom may require "prerequisite" or "enabling" skills that are part of a continuum of skills to attain the identified content standards at each grade level. For reporting and accountability purposes, students taking the *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* are included in school summary reports and in determinations of AYP. All *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* scores will be assigned to the "Well Below Proficiency" performance level until alternate achievement standards are adopted by the State Board of Education. Upon the adoption of these alternate achievement standards, all *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* scores will be assigned to one of four proficiency levels: "Well Below Proficiency", "Approaches Proficiency", "Meets Proficiency", and "Exceeds Proficiency".

Beginning in 2006, the Department will include the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with significant cognitive disabilities (based on alternate academic achievement standards approved by the State Board of Education) when calculating adequate yearly progress for schools and the LEA/SEA, provided:

1. The State Board of Education approves the alternate academic achievement standards before the HIDOE renders any preliminary AYP determinations based on the same; and
2. The number of students who score at the "meets" or "exceeds" level on the alternate achievement standards at the LEA/SEA level does not exceed 1.0% of all students in the grades assessed in reading and in mathematics. If the number of students who score at the "meets" or "exceeds" level on the alternate achievement standards at the LEA/SEA level exceeds 1.0%, then the Department will include the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with significant cognitive disabilities in the following order up to the 1.0% cap.

Priority for being included under the 1% cap	SPED?	SPED/IEP placement?	English language learner (ELL)?	Economically disadvantaged?	Proviso?
First, *all* students who are:	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	must be ≤ 1.0% cap
Second, *all* students who are:	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	must be ≤ 1.0% cap
Third, *all* students who are:	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	must be ≤ 1.0% cap
Fourth, *all* students who are:	Yes	Yes	No	No	must be ≤ 1.0% cap

Table continued on next page

Table continued from previous page

Priority for being included under the 1% cap	SPED?	SPED/IEP placement?	English language learner (ELL)?	Economically disadvantaged?	Proviso?
Fifth, *all* students who are:	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	must be ≤ 1.0% cap
Sixth, *all* students who are:	Yes	No	Yes	No	must be ≤ 1.0% cap
Seventh, *all* students who are:	Yes	No	No	Yes	must be ≤ 1.0% cap
Eighth, *all* students who are:	Yes	No	No	No	must be ≤ 1.0% cap

If only a portion (rather than all) of the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with second priority can be included, then only the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with first priority will be included. If only a portion (rather than all) of the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with third priority can be included, then only the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with second priority will be included. If only a portion (rather than all) of the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with fourth priority can be included, then only the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with third priority will be included. If only a portion (rather than all) of the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with fifth priority can be included, then only the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with fourth priority will be included. If only a portion (rather than all) of the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with sixth priority can be included, then only the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with fifth priority will be included. If only a portion (rather than all) of the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with seventh priority can be included, then only the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with sixth priority will be included. If only a portion (rather than all) of the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with eighth priority can be included, then only the "meets" and "exceeds" proficiency scores of students with seventh priority will be included.

In 2007, a total of 506 students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 were scheduled to participate in the state reading and mathematics assessments via the Alternate Assessment. That number represents 0.53% (506/95289) of all public school students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 who were scheduled to participate in the 2007 reading and mathematics assessments.

Former SPED Students (Beginning spring 2008)

Pooling the proficiency ratings of former and current SPED students. Pursuant to section 34 CFR 200.20(f)(ii) concerning the measurement of adequate yearly progress by students in the SPED subgroup, the HIDOE pools the reading/language arts and mathematics proficiency ratings of former SPED students with the proficiency ratings of current SPED students, for up to two school years (e.g., Friday, April 14, 2006 to Friday, April 18, 2008).

Calculating the proficiency and participation rates of SPED students. If the number of students in a school's SPED subgroup, excluding SPED students who were rescinded from the SPED program between the day after the close of the preceding test administration window (e.g., Saturday, April 21, 2007) and the close of the subsequent test administration window (e.g., Friday, April 18, 2008) is less than forty, then the SPED subgroup's proficiency rate is not calculated. If the number of students in a school's SPED subgroup, excluding SPED students who were rescinded from the SPED program between the day after the close of the preceding test administration window and the close of the subsequent test administration window is greater than or equal to forty, then the calculation of the SPED subgroup's proficiency rate will include these former SPED students.

If the number of students in a school's SPED subgroup, excluding SPED students who were rescinded from the SPED program between the day after the close of the preceding test administration window (e.g., Saturday, April 21, 2007) and the close of the subsequent test administration window (e.g., Friday, April 18, 2008) is less than forty, then the SPED subgroup's participation rate is not calculated. If the number of students in a school's SPED subgroup, excluding SPED students who were rescinded from the SPED program between the day after the close of the preceding test administration window and the close of the subsequent test administration window is greater than or equal to forty, then the calculation of the SPED subgroup's participation rate will include these former SPED students.

In accordance with the USDOE's (Tuesday, May 10, 2005) interim flexibility for determining the NCLB sanction status of LEAs and schools that did not make AYP based solely on the proficiency rate of the students with disabilities (i.e., SPED) subgroup, and ***for purposes of the 2006-2007 school year only***, the Department will increase the proficiency rate of that subgroup by a mathematical constant equal to 0.02 divided by the proportion of students with disabilities in grades 3 ,4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 at the time of testing. If the LEA/SEA's or a school's adjusted proficiency rate in reading or mathematics, or both, is equal to or greater than the annual measurable objectives for the same, then the students with disabilities subgroup will be deemed to have made AYP in reading or mathematics, or both. For purposes of this interim flexibility, the Department will display the *unadjusted* proficiency rate of the SPED subgroup in mathematics and reading, and will note that a school or the LEA/SEA made AYP in mathematics or reading, or both, because the proficiency rate of the SPED subgroup was increased by the constant described in this paragraph.

The proportion of students with disabilities will be determined by dividing the number of active SPED students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 at the time of testing, by the number of active students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 at the time of testing (see below).

Proportion of students with disabilities =

$$\frac{\textit{(number of active SPED students in grades 3-8 and 10 at the time of testing)}}{\textit{(number of active students in grades 3-8 and 10 at the time of testing)}}$$

The term "at the time of testing" refers to a school's participation rate count date (test start date), which is based on the week when the school administers the first reading or mathematics test session to the majority of its students.

Students with disabilities are students with an IDEA eligibility flag ("SPED") in the HIDOE's statewide Student Information System at the time of the state assessment administration in the spring.

See also Critical Element 1.1, *"How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?"*, and Critical Element 2.1, *"How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?"*

Reference:

State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Office of the Superintendent, Systems Accountability Office, Student Assessment Section. *Student Participation and Accommodations Handbook,* Reading and Mathematics, Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, Spring 2007. Honolulu: Hawaii, 55 pp.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	All LEP students participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards. State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.	LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.4)

All English for Second Language Learner (ESLL or LEP) students are required to participate in the state assessment. They are allowed to take one or more of the test segments with appropriate accommodations (e.g., extended time) that are based on the student's identified learning needs, if used during the student's classroom instruction, recommended by the student's ESLL teacher and regular classroom teacher, and among those accommodations currently approved by the HIDOE.

The HIDOE categorizes ESLL students in three language proficiency levels: Non-English Proficient (NEP), Limited English Proficient (LEP), and Fluent English Proficient (FEP). The HIDOE uses an off-the-shelf (i.e., noncustomized) version of CTB/McGraw-Hill's *LAS Links* assessment to evaluate the English proficiency of ESLL students. Being an off-the-shelf test, the *LAS Links* is not considered to be aligned to the *Hawaii English Language Proficiency Standards* (HELPS), which were approved by the State Board of Education in October 2007.

For the spring 2002 and 2003 administrations of the HCPS II State Assessment, assessment participation requirements for NEP students were, in summary, as follows:

> All NEP students were required to participate in the statewide assessment in mathematics. NEP students could be excused from the reading assessment. Upon attaining a LEP level of English proficiency, ESLL students were required to take both the reading and mathematics state assessments (with accommodations, if appropriate). NEP students who

did not take the HCPS II State Assessment's reading test were counted as non-participants in the denominator of the participation rate for the state reading assessment.

Upon the recommendation of the U.S. Department of Education's Peer Review of March 21, 2003, given its review of the HIDOE's draft Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook dated January 31, 2003, the HIDOE, effective with the 2004 statewide assessment administration, required all ESLL students, at each and every language proficiency level, to take the *Hawaii State Assessment* in both reading and mathematics. The HIDOE affirms the principle that all students in the Hawaii public school system should participate in the statewide assessment program.

ESLL students are students with a "SLEP" flag (Students of Limited English Proficiency or SLEP is the term the HIDOE formerly used to designate ESLL students and the term is still used in student records) in the statewide Student Information System at the time of the state assessment administration in the Spring. Only "SLEP" with a type "J" code, meaning "active SLEP", i.e., eligible and receiving ESLL instructional services, or potential ESLL awaiting assessment, are included in the definition of ESLL (SLEP, type "J") as used to define the "limited English proficient" subgroup for NCLB state assessment and AYP requirements. Except as provided below, former or "mainstreamed" ESLL students are not included in the "limited English proficient" subgroup for NCLB purposes, but rather are included in the general student population.

Former ESLL Students

Pooling the proficiency ratings of former and current ESLL students. In accordance with the USDOE's (Thursday, February 19, 2004) policy concerning the measurement of adequate yearly progress by students in the ESLL subgroup, the HIDOE pools the reading/language arts and mathematics proficiency ratings of former ESLL students with the proficiency ratings of current ESLL students, for up to two school years.

Calculating the proficiency and participation rates of ESLL students. If the number of students in a school's ESLL subgroup, excluding ESLL students who (having met all minimum Exit Criteria) were exited from the ESLL program between the day after the close of the preceding test administration window (e.g., Saturday, May 1, 2004) and the close of the subsequent test administration window (e.g., Friday, April 29, 2005) is less than forty, then the ESLL subgroup's proficiency rate is not calculated. If the number of students in a school's ESLL subgroup, excluding ESLL students who (having met all minimum Exit Criteria) were exited from the ESLL program between the day after the close of the preceding test administration window and the close of the subsequent test administration window is greater than or equal to forty, then the calculation of the ESLL subgroup's proficiency rate includes these

former ESLL students.

If the number of students in a school's ESLL subgroup, excluding ESLL students who (having met all minimum Exit Criteria) were exited from the ESLL program between the day after the close of the preceding test administration window (e.g., Saturday, May 1, 2004) and the close of the subsequent test administration window (e.g., Friday, April 29, 2005) is less than forty, then the ESLL subgroup's participation rate is not calculated. If the number of students in a school's ESLL subgroup, excluding ESLL students who (having met all minimum Exit Criteria) were exited from the ESLL program between the day after the close of the preceding test administration window and the close of the subsequent test administration window is greater than or equal to forty, then the calculation of the ESLL subgroup's participation rate will include these former ESLL students.

See also Critical Element 1.1, *"How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?"*, and Critical Element 2.1, *"How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?"*

Reference:

State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Office of the Superintendent, Systems Accountability Office, Student Assessment Section. *Student Participation and Accommodations Handbook,* Reading and Mathematics, Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, Spring 2007. Honolulu: Hawaii, pp. 17-19 and 29-30.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.[6] Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.	State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes. Definition is not applied consistently across the State. Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.5)

The minimum number of students (n-count) required in a subgroup for reporting is ten to protect student privacy. For accountability purposes (i.e., determining AYP), the minimum number of students is forty for making inferences about student proficiency and forty for making inferences about the assessment participation rate. These minimum n-count criteria are applied consistently across the State for reporting and accountability purposes. The identification of ten students per subgroup for reporting is based on the need to protect the privacy of students when reporting results. Please see the response to Critical Element 5.6, *"How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?"*, for additional details regarding the criteria of a minimum n of ten to protect student privacy.

The HIDOE has determined that the minimum number of students in a group required for statistical reliability is forty. This minimum applies to any calculation of a proportion, mean, or statistic that carries with it the implication of a group outcome characteristic (e.g., the percentage of a group demonstrating reading proficiency). This value maximizes statistical reliability in AYP determinations while holding schools accountable for the maximum number of students.

There are a number of complex, interacting issues impacting the accuracy and consistency of AYP

[6] The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

determinations. The major issues are sampling error (i.e., accuracy or alpha-level of a test of statistical significance, power, precision, and n-count), measurement error (psychometric quality of the assessment scores), the rigorous demands of the NCLB accountability design itself (e.g., its fully conjunctive use of thirty-seven indicators, the lack of independence between the required subgroups, the use of growth scores as embedded within the safe harbor provision), and basic data processing and reporting quality controls. While the element of n-count affects the reliability and validity of data and decisions, it is only one factor. See also Critical Element 9.1, *"How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?"*

For the purpose of determining assessment participation rates as an indicator of AYP, the HIDOE uses a minimum n-count of forty students for subgroups. The stringent 95% NCLB-required criterion implies that if subgroup sizes less than forty are used, no more than one student could miss the test. Even schools that are zealous about maximizing student participation in the state assessment encounter circumstances that prevent students from taking the test (e.g., extended illness, injury, family issues). Consequently, the HIDOE will use a minimum n-count of forty prior to applying the 95% participation rate standard for subgroups.

References:

State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Office of the Superintendent, Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation and Reporting Section. "Guidelines for Reporting and Interpreting Student Data." August 2000.

CCSSO (State Collaborative on Comprehensive Assessment Systems for Title I and Accountability Systems and Reporting). *Making Valid and Reliable Decisions in Determining Adequate Yearly Progress*. December, 2002.

Linn, R., Baker, E. and Herman, J. "Minimum Group Size for Measuring Adequate Yearly Progress" in *The CRESST Line*. National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. Fall 2002.

Hill, R. and DePascale, C.A. "Reliability of No Child Left Behind Accountability Designs." The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. February 7, 2003.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information.[7]	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.6)

The HIDOE has determined the minimum number of students in a cell required for protection of students' privacy as ten. A cell is the unit or subunit for which a count is reported, such as "economically disadvantaged students scoring below proficiency." This minimum applies to any count of information for which privacy is at issue, such as reading proficiency status, by student characteristics, such as ethnicity or special education status. Cells for which the privacy minimum is not met are blanked in reports of disaggregated data. The determination was made in an administrative directive from the State Superintendent of Education on guidelines for disaggregation of student data promulgated in 2000.

Additionally, the HIDOE applies a rule ("single-populated level rule") such that no reporting of a subgroup is made publicly if all students within the subgroup perform (or respond, in the case of questionnaire data) to a single value or level on a dependent outcome variable. For example, if all students in a given school, say, from the students with disabilities subgroup, scored in the non-proficient range in reading on the state assessment, then reporting subgroup results for that "single-populated level" would reveal personally identifiable information about each student with membership in that subgroup. Such practice is not allowed.

For the situation where the n-count is at least ten *and* all values for a subgroup occur in a single level, the technique of limitation of detail by using ranges will be used, for example, reporting "greater than 80%

[7] The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

proficient" for the subgroup. This method allows for the maximum amount of information to be reported while still protecting the privacy of individuals.

Reference:

State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Office of the Superintendent, Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation and Reporting Section. "Guidelines for Reporting and Interpreting Student Data." August 2000.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State's academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.[8] Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(6.1)

The State's AYP decisions are based primarily on the *Hawaii Content and Performance Standards III* (HCPS III) State Assessment in reading and mathematics currently administered in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10. Assessment data are pooled (combined) across grade levels within a school. Of the thirty-seven criteria used to determine AYP, all but one - the additional academic indicator (i.e., graduation rate for high schools, retention rate for elementary and intermediate or middle schools) - are based on the state assessment.

There are a total of eighteen measures for reading:

- Nine measures corresponding to the percent of students proficient (all students and eight required subgroups: economically disadvantaged; five major ethnic and racial groups; students with disabilities; limited English proficient students); and
- Nine additional measures for the percent of students participating in the reading assessment, with a minimum of 95% required, for all students and each of the eight required subgroups.

Similarly, a total of eighteen measures for mathematics is used in determining AYP.

The HCPS III State Assessment program includes science assessments in grades 5, 7, and 11. Beginning in fall 2007 (i.e., school year 2007-2008), all students in grades 5, 7, and 11 must take the

[8] State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

science component of either the *Hawaii State Assessment* or the alternate assessment. Because the science assessment is given in the fall, students will not have had the opportunity to learn the material from the current grade level. Therefore, the science assessment that is administered at a particular grade covers the standards from previous grades.

- The Level I science assessment is administered in grade 5 and covers grades 3 and 4 standards.
- The Level II assessment is administered in grade 7 and covers grades 5 and 6 standards.
- The Level III assessment is administered in grade 11 and covers high school biological and physical sciences standards and the grade 8 earth and space science standard.

The 95% test participation rate requirement for reading and mathematics will apply to science. The proficiency levels in science are the same as the proficiency levels in reading and mathematics: "Well Below Proficiency", "Approaches Proficiency", "Meets Proficiency", and "Exceeds Proficiency". Unlike reading and mathematics results, however, there is no proficiency rate objective for science and science results are not used to determine AYP. Participation rates and proficiency rates in science, for the "All students" subgroup and disaggregated subgroups (e.g., SPED and Asian/Pacific Islander), may eventually be used to recognize high performing schools or rapidly improving schools, or both.

Reference:

State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Office of the Superintendent, Systems Accountability Office, Student Assessment Section. *Student Participation and Accommodations Handbook,* Science, Grades 5, 7, 11, Fall 2007. Honolulu: Hawaii, 39 pp.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	State definition of graduation rate: • Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or • Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and • Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause[9] to make AYP.	State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS Critical Element 7.1, continued on next page		

[9] See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

Critical Element 7.1, continued from previous page
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(7.1)

Graduation Rate is defined as follows:

1. For the LEA/SEA:
   The percentage of first-time ninth grade students who graduate with a diploma within four years, excluding students who have transferred out of the Hawaii public school system.
2. For schools:
   The percentage of first-time ninth grade students who graduate with a diploma within four years, excluding students who have transferred out of the school. The denominator of the graduation rate is the number of first-time ninth grade students from the State's beginning-of-the-school-year official enrollment count, excluding students transferring out.* The numerator of the graduation rate is the number of students receiving a diploma** within four school years.

*The term "transfer" excludes "dropouts" as defined in the calculation of dropout rates under the Common Core of Data survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

**The term "diploma" is defined as completion of the State Board of Education approved educational program and receipt of a Board of Education or Department of Education diploma in recognition thereof. The term does not include a GED or any other degree that is not fully aligned with the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards. Special education students who are not working toward a diploma may receive a certificate if they complete the program specified in their IEP. Students who receive these IEP completion certificates are not counted as graduates.

For purposes of AYP (other than the safe harbor provision), the calculation of the graduation rate applies to the school and LEA/SEA levels, but not to the subgroup level. Schools and the LEA/SEA that meet or exceed the annual measurable objective (threshold) for the graduation rate are deemed to have met the other academic indicator for purposes of calculating AYP.

In addition to being part of the definition of AYP, schools and the LEA/SEA are required to meet the graduation rate threshold as a requirement for the safe harbor provision. Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for determining AYP, and disaggregated as necessary for use when applying the safe harbor provision.

A report of the rationale and proposed values for a long-term goal and annual measurable objectives for graduation rate was accepted by the State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and is

published on the web at http://arch.k12.hi.us. Those values are given in the following table.

Graduation Rate (%)													
Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Starting Point (Baseline)	70												
Long-term Goal													90
Annual Objective	70	70	70	75	75	75	80	80	80	85	85	85	90

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.[10] An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.	State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(7.2)

Retention Rate is defined as follows:

1. Elementary Schools:
   The percentage of students for the target school year in grades 1 through 5 (or 6) whose grade level is the same or lower in the subsequent school year.
2. Middle, Intermediate, or multi-level Elementary/Intermediate Schools:
   The percentage of students for the target school year in the school's highest grade whose grade level is the same or lower in the subsequent school year; provided that if the highest grade for the target school year is greater than 8, then the retention rate is based on the percentage of the school's 8th grade students whose grade level is 8 or lower in the subsequent school year.

For purposes of AYP (other than the safe harbor provision), the calculation of the retention rate applies to the school and LEA/SEA levels, but not to the subgroup level. Schools that achieve or exceed the annual measurable objective (threshold) for the retention rate are deemed to have met the other academic

[10] NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

indicator for purposes of calculating AYP. The same conditions apply to the LEA/SEA.

In addition to being part of the definition of AYP, schools and the LEA/SEA are required to meet the retention rate threshold as a requirement for the safe harbor provision. Retention rate is included (taken together) for determining AYP, and disaggregated as necessary for use when applying the safe harbor provision.

A report of the rationale and proposed values for a long-term goal and annual measurable objectives for retention rate was accepted by the State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and is published on the web at http://arch.k12.hi.us. Those values are given in the following tables.

Retention Rate (%), Elementary Schools

Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Starting Point (Baseline)	3												
Long-term Goal													2
Annual Objective	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Retention Rate (%), Middle/Intermediate Schools & Multi-Level (e.g., K-8) Schools

Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Starting Point (Baseline)	6												
Long-term Goal													5
Annual Objective	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable. State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.	State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(7.3)

Reliability and validity are terms properly used in reference to *indirect* measures, which require inference to connect the measure to an important construct (e.g., test score to reading comprehension), and which involve measurement error, such as students' scores on a test of thirty items sampled from a universe of 10,000 potential questions. Both the graduation rate (used for high schools, and multi-level high/intermediate schools and high/elementary schools) and the retention rate (used for elementary, middle, and intermediate schools) are calculated from counts of all relevant students by status and are, by that very fact, valid. They are direct calculations of the target rates and require no inference to underlying constructs. The status of students as members of the relevant base group (the denominator of the rate), as graduates, or as having been retained in grade is determined by clear, fixed criteria applied to all students and determined at a fixed date, and is not subject to measurement error. Since the rate is calculated from the universe of relevant students as of fixed dates, the rate for a given school in a given year does not vary with repeated calculation. There is question as to whether these rates are stable from year to year. That is not a question of reliability, however, but rather of the variability of performance between different cohorts of students. The graduation rate or retention rate in one year is not an estimate of an underlying rate for cohorts in all years. If it were, then, and only then, would reliability be at issue.

Our Student Information System captures student data on an individual basis statewide. A unique

student identifier provides for accurate association of data to individual students.

The State produces academic assessments consistent with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, NCME, APA, 1999). The State's contractor for the custom-developed standards-based segments of the HCPS III State Assessment is responsible for researching, documenting, and attesting to the reliability and validity of state assessment instruments.

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.[11] AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(8.1)

The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculation examines separately the proportion of students proficient in reading and mathematics, as well as the rates of participation in the reading and mathematics assessments. In determining whether each subgroup, school, and the LEA/SEA as a whole meets the annual measurable objectives, the HIDOE calculates - separately for reading and for mathematics - the percent of the tested students who achieve the proficient level, examines assessment participation rates, implements a uniform averaging procedure by pooling data across grade levels, and employs the safe harbor provision when applicable.

The HIDOE has established separate, statewide, annual measurable objectives in reading and mathematics that identify a minimum percentage of students who must meet the proficient level of academic achievement. The reading and mathematics annual measurable objectives are applied to each school, to the LEA/SEA, as well as to each subgroup at the school and LEA/SEA levels, to determine AYP status.

Consecutive years of failing AYP requirements are predicated on any subgroup of students failing the

[11] If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

same subject (reading or mathematics) for multiple years. For related details, please see responses to Critical Element 3.2, *"How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?"*, and Critical Element 4.1, *"How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?"*

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?	State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions. State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice. State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions. State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.	State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments. State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters. State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(9.1)

There is a probability of error associated with each subgroup decision (e.g., that a subgroup met or exceeded the target performance specified by an annual measurable objective or not) and that the probability of misidentification error in a conjunctively determined school-wide decision (e.g., that the school made AYP or not) increases as the number of subgroups for which the school is accountable increases. In addition, there is a tradeoff between increasing the reliability of decisions and including the maximum number of subgroups in the accountability system. Since only those students in the particular grade levels included in the state assessment program contribute academic achievement data, those students constitute a sample when making inferences about subgroups in the school (or the LEA/SEA) as well as when making inferences about the school as a whole (or the entire LEA/SEA). While increasing the minimum sample size or n-count increases the statistical reliability of inferences made about the subgroup, in the context of NCLB's accountability requirements, doing so results in a decrease in the

number of subgroups available for use in AYP determinations.

The HIDOE uses minimum n-counts of forty for making inferences about student proficiency and assessment participation rate. These minimum n-counts give the best balance between the reliability of decisions and the inclusion of the maximum number of subgroups in the accountability system. (See also Critical Element 5.5, *"What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?"*)

Additionally, the HIDOE has included several features that are designed to maximize decision consistency and the validity of inferences drawn from the accountability system. These include:

- pooling (combining or "averaging") data across grade levels;
- the use of uniform averaging and comparing the average to the most recent year's results (including the current year), or the current year's results alone, to the annual proficiency target;
- the use of the safe harbor provision, so that schools that miss an annual proficiency target but show a strong gain in the area missed are not identified; and
- predicating two consecutive years of failing AYP on students failing the same subject (reading or mathematics).

The HIDOE uses the standard error (SE) of the proportion to determine whether the proportion (p) of students who *are* "proficient" (i.e., who "meet" or "exceed" the State's academic achievement standards) in mathematics and reading is significantly lower than the proportion of students who *should be* "proficient" in mathematics and reading. (The State's annual measurable objectives - or AMOs - for reading and mathematics define the proportion - or percentage - of students who *should be* "proficient" in mathematics and reading, respectively.) The standard error of the proportion is applied to subgroups at the school and LEA/SEA level if a subgroup at the school or the LEA/SEA level is deemed to have not met the annual measurable objective for reading or mathematics.

$$\text{\% who are proficient} + \sqrt{\frac{(\text{[\% who are proficient]}) \times (1 - \text{[\% who are proficient]})}{\left[\text{Number of "full academic year" students who took the test}\right]}} \times 100$$

If the sum of "the proportion of students who *are* proficient" and "the standard error of the proportion" is greater than or equal to the annual measurable objective for reading or mathematics (i.e., p + SE ≥ AMO), then the subgroup is deemed to have met the annual measurable objective for reading or mathematics. If the sum of "the proportion of students who *are* proficient" and "the standard error of the proportion" is less than the annual measurable objective for reading or mathematics

(i.e., p + SE < AMO), then the subgroup is deemed to have not met the annual measurable objective for reading or mathematics. The standard error of the proportion is *not* applied to participation rate, graduation rate, retention rate, and safe harbor calculations. The standard error of the proportion is limited to not more than five percentage points.

The HIDOE continually examines annual data related to the consistency of the AYP inferences made about subgroups, schools, and the LEA/SEA. The HIDOE has formed a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of national experts in assessment and accountability and enlisted their help in addressing this issue. Technical assistance from national organizations such as CCSSO is available to assist states in the design and conduct of empirical research and evaluation studies of the decision accuracy and consistency of state accountability systems.

The HIDOE will publicly report the method for determining decision consistency, the estimate of decision consistency for the State's AYP determinations, and the acceptable range of decision consistency via the Department's ARCH website and in the State's annual accountability report. The HIDOE will use that information to refine the accountability system.

See also Critical Element 9.2, *"What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?"*

References:

State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Office of the Superintendent, Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation and Reporting Section. "Guidelines for Reporting and Interpreting Student Data." August 2000.

CCSSO (State Collaborative on Comprehensive Assessment Systems for Title I and Accountability Systems and Reporting). *Making Valid and Reliable Decisions in Determining Adequate Yearly Progress*. December 2002.

Linn, R., Baker, E. and Herman, J. "Minimum Group Size for Measuring Adequate Yearly Progress" in *The CRESST Line*. National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. Fall 2002.

Hill, R. and DePascale, C.A. "Reliability of No Child Left Behind Accountability Designs." The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. February 7, 2003.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(9.2)

Hawaii is a single LEA/SEA. Therefore, while Title 34, *Code of Federal Regulations*, section 200.31 (opportunity to review school-level data) charges the LEA with the responsibility to create an appeals process, in Hawaii, this responsibility would fall on the "state" office.

Before identifying a school for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the Superintendent will provide the school with an opportunity to review the school-level data on which the preliminary identification is based. All schools will be provided ten calendar days after the official notification of preliminary AYP results to submit an appeal. The general procedure for appealing a school's preliminary AYP results and NCLB status is enumerated below:

Step 1: If the principal believes that the proposed identification is erroneous for computational, statistical or other substantive reasons, then the principal must substantiate and document the perceived errors.

Step 2: The principal must submit the supporting evidence to the Superintendent not later than ten calendar days after the notification of preliminary AYP results is distributed to the schools.

Step 3: The Superintendent will consider the evidence submitted by the principal before making a final determination.

Step 4: The Superintendent will make public a final determination of the status of the school with respect to identification not later than thirty calendar days after the school is provided with the opportunity to review the data. In other words, a final determination of the status of a school will be made not later than forty calendar days after the notification of preliminary AYP results.

All decisions on identification after the appeal process has been completed will be final. As previously

discussed in Critical Element 1.4, *"How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?"*

> . . . Schools notify parents and make school choice available upon receipt of their *preliminary* accountability results, including AYP results (i.e., "met" or "not met") and NCLB status (e.g., "corrective action" and "restructuring"). Once *final* accountability results are issued, the HIDOE revises its list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to reflect any additions or deletions resulting from the school-level appeals process. In cases where a school that was preliminarily identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring does not appear on the final list of schools identified for the same, the school will be so informed and relieved of prospective requirements. Any school choice commitments (i.e., transportation costs) that were made based on *preliminary* accountability results are honored for the remainder of the school year.

All efforts to reduce error, including providing for the review and appeal of preliminary AYP results, contribute to enhancing the validity of AYP determinations. See also our response to Critical Element 9.1, *"How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable validity?"*

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.[12] State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System. State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.	State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP. State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(9.3)

The HCPS III State Assessment program includes reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, and science assessments in grades 5, 7, and 11. The HIDOE's working definition of Adequate Yearly Progress includes data from all the grade levels tested in reading and mathematics (i.e., 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10), and is based on Hawaii's original May 28, 2003 starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives for all students to reach proficiency by 2013-14.

As previously discussed in Critical Element 1.3, *"Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of basic, proficient and advanced student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?"*

In 2004, the HIDOE began revising its content standards by moving from grade band standards (e.g., K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12 for language arts and mathematics) to grade

[12] Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

specific standards (i.e., K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12). In 2005, the State Board of Education approved the third edition of the *Hawaii Content and Performance Standards* (HCPS III) and the HIDOE began the development of new tests based on the new content standards. The new tests in reading and mathematics were administered to students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 in spring 2007.

In spring 2007, a standard setting panel consisting of more than 100 teachers, school administrators, community members, parents, and university faculty was asked to set the numerical cut scores for the four proficiency levels in reading and mathematics (i.e., "Exceeds Proficiency", "Meets Proficiency", "Approaches Proficiency", and "Well Below Proficiency"). Using actual test items from the spring 2007 *Hawaii State Assessment*, the standard setting panel set the cut scores based on grade specific, performance level descriptions of how much students should know and be able to do in order to be rated as "Exceeds Proficiency", "Meets Proficiency", "Approaches Proficiency", and "Well Below Proficiency".

The standard setting panel's recommended cut scores for the spring 2007 *Hawaii State Assessment* were accepted by the State Board of Education without change in April 2007. All future reading and mathematics test results (i.e., proficiency ratings) will be based on the April 2007 cut scores until the content standards (i.e., HCPS III) are revised, there is a significant change in the design of the test, or the State Board of Education determines that new "cut scores" are needed.

Students who attend a "new" school are accounted for in the first year of the school's operation by including those students' scores in the AYP determination for the LEA/SEA. The goal of attaining 100% proficiency for all students by 2013-14 applies to both new schools and existing schools. Adequate yearly progress determinations for new schools begin in their second year of operation when the scores of students attending the school are included in AYP determinations for the schools.

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate). State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate). Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.	The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments. Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(10.1)

The HIDOE's statewide Student Information System and use of a unique student identifier allow for accurate student accounting and tracking. The HIDOE's System Evaluation and Reporting Section performs the calculation of participation rates on the state assessments. These calculations are done from a complete student roster file that identifies each student in the State who is enrolled at the time of testing. Additionally, each school is responsible for providing documentation to the HIDOE's Student Assessment Section for each student who was not tested. The HIDOE compares the number of test scores with official enrollment counts, and these comparisons must show that all students were tested or can be otherwise accounted for.

As previously noted in Critical Element 2.1, *"How does the State's Accountability System include all students in the State?"*

All students enrolled at the time of testing are expected to participate in the *Hawaii State Assessment*. A school's "participation rate count date" is the Monday of the week when the school administers the first reading or mathematics test session to the majority of its students. (If Monday is a state holiday, then the school's participation rate count date is Tuesday.) A school's participation rate count date operationally defines "enrolled at the

> time of testing" and comprises the denominator of the assessment participation rate measure used in determining AYP for the state, for the school, and for all required student subgroups. For purposes of systemwide accounting, the HIDOE uses March 1st or, if March 1st falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the first Monday in the month of March as a fixed census date. . . .

Participation rates are computed as the number of students tested divided by the number of students enrolled at the time of testing.

One modification to the preceding calculation rule is necessary in order to account for students who transfer from one Hawaii public school to another Hawaii public school. For participation purposes, the general rule is to attribute students to the school where the student took the first reading or mathematics test sessions. For proficiency purposes, the general rule is to attribute students to the school where the full academic year requirement is met. Students who took the first reading or mathematics test session at one school but met the full academic year requirement at another school, however, are attributed to the LEA/SEA (but not the school) for proficiency purposes. In other words, proficiency and participation are not attributed to different schools (i.e., "proficiency follows participation").

Students who exit the Hawaii public school system on or before the Monday of the week when the school begins testing are not part of the number of students "enrolled at the time of testing" for the purpose of calculated assessment participation rates. Conversely, students who enroll in the Hawaii public school system on the Monday of the week when the school begins testing are part of the number of students "enrolled at the time of testing" for the purpose of calculated assessment participation rates.

Participation rates are calculated for all schools and for the LEA/SEA and for all subgroups for which the number of students meets the state standard of forty for the statistical reliability of participation rates. The participation rate is not calculated if there is an insufficient number in the group for statistical reliability.

The failure of a school to test 95% of its students or the students in any target subgroup for which there is a number sufficient for statistical reliability results in the school being identified as failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress. If a school or subgroup, or both, does not meet the 95% requirement, then the HIDOE uses data from the previous year to average the participation rate data for the school or subgroup, or both, as needed. If this two-year average does not meet the 95% requirement, then the HIDOE uses data from the previous two years to average the participation rate data for a school or subgroup, or both, as needed. If this three-year average does not meet the 95% requirement, then the school is deemed to have not met this requirement.

Invalid test sessions do not count for participation or proficiency purposes, or both. Out-of-grade-level testing is not allowed under any circumstances. A student will be deemed to have not participated in the *Hawaii State Assessment* or the *Hawaii State Alternate Assessment* if a school administers an out-of-grade-level test to a student.

If the HIDOE determines that:

1. The integrity of a test session was compromised; and
2. The compromised test session must be retaken,

then the compromised test session will not be counted for participation or proficiency purposes, or both, until the compromised test session is retaken.

Medical Emergencies

Students who are unable to take the *Hawaii State Assessment* or the alternate assessment during the State's official test administration window because of a "unique, significant medical emergency" are not counted for participation purposes. A student's "physician" must state, in writing, that the student was medically unable to take part in the *Hawaii State Assessment* (with or without accommodations) or the alternate assessment (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities). The physician's signed report must include a description of the medical emergency that caused the student to be deemed medically unable to take part in the *Hawaii State Assessment* or the alternate assessment. The student's medical emergency may be temporary or persistent in nature; however, it must extend without interruption from the date the school started testing (e.g., Tuesday, April 1, 2008) to the last day of the State's official test administration window (e.g., Friday, April 18, 2008).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(10.2)

The procedure for calculating participation rates is explained in Critical Element 10.1, *"What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?"* The participation rate is included as a requirement for AYP for any subgroup for which the number of students enrolled in the school meets or exceeds the minimum n-count for participation rate (see also Critical Element 5.5, *"What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes . . . [and] . . . accountability purposes?"*).

Appendix A
Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.

3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.

5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the Adequate Yearly Progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.

6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.

7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.

8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

***Hawaii Revised Statutes*, sec. 302A-1004(a)(6)(educational accountability system; annual reports)**

(a) The department shall implement a comprehensive system of educational accountability to motivate and support the improved performance of students and the education system. This accountability system shall:

* * *

(6) Involve an annual statewide assessment program that provides a report card containing trend data on school, school complex, and system performance at selected benchmark grade levels with performance indicators in areas relating to student achievement, safety and well-being, and civic responsibility. These performance indicators shall include but not be limited to:
(A) Student performance relative to statewide content and performance standards; and
(B) School attendance and dropout rates;

* * *