

Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook The State of New Hampshire



Submitted on: JANUARY 31, 2003

Revised June 3, 2003

Amended July 22, 2003

Amended March 30, 2004

Amended August 24, 2005

Amended, March 30, 2006

Revised, June 2, 2006

Revised, July 21, 2006

Amended December 29, 2006

Revised May 8, 2007

Revised May 11, 2007

Revised December 17, 2007

Amended March 30, 2008

Revised April 22, 2008

by

Lyonel B. Tracy

Commissioner of Education

New Hampshire Department of Education

101 Pleasant Street

Concord, NH 03301

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Overview:

New Hampshire has finally made the transition from the original New Hampshire Assessment to using the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) tests in grades 3-8 and 11. In October 2007, all 7 grade levels were assessed and will be held accountable using the NECAP test. Enclosed is New Hampshire's revised accountability workbook reflecting the addition of grade 11, dated December 17, 2007.

- The USED offered us the option of continuing to use the same index model previously approved for use in school year 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. We have chosen this option.
- New Hampshire was previously approved to use the equi-percentile method used for determining safe harbor in the transition from NHEIAP to NECAP for grades 3-8. We will use the same method to determine safe harbor for grade 11 this year.
- Starting points for Grade 11, together with AMOs through 2013-2014, will be forwarded to USED as Appendix B in mid February after grade 11 results are released. New Hampshire will use the same federal guidelines for starting points as we did for grades 3-8. (See sections 3.2 a, b, and c)
- New Hampshire also intends to take advantage of the 2% flexibility. (See section 5.3)

Grade 11 changes are in bold and any non-substantive changes, i.e. grammatical edits, are shown in italics.)

*Submitted by
Deb Wiswell, Administrator for Accountability
December 17, 2007*

Updated March 30, 2008

On March 30, New Hampshire submitted Appendix B that explains the changes to 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2b, and 5.3 because of the addition of high school starting points, AMOs, and Safe Harbor calculations along with the removal of the 2% flexibility option no longer allowed.

This complete version contains the new sections that can be found on pages 15, 17, 20, and 25.

*Submitted by
Deb Wiswell, Administrator for Accountability
March 30, 2008*

Updated April 22, 2008

In response to additional questions from USED, we have added language to sections 5.4, 6.1, and 7.3. All additions are in italics.

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
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

1.1

New Hampshire will produce AYP reports for all public schools (including public schools, charter schools, public academies), and their corresponding public districts. Students in these public educational agencies will be called public school students.

In 1993, the New Hampshire Legislature enacted state law RSA 193-C. “There is established within the department of education a statewide education improvement and assessment program (New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program – NHEIAP). The State requires that all public school students enrolled in grades 3-8 **and 11** participate in the state-wide assessment for their grade of enrollment.

New Hampshire will hold all public schools accountable for adequate yearly progress. New Hampshire has surveyed its public schools to make sure that all public alternative programs are connected to the existing public school structure. There are no public alternative schools within the state.

Several New Hampshire schools have no grade level tested within the grade spans included in the school. Currently, these schools fall into two categories: schools with grades 1-2 and schools with just grade 1. In the first case, schools will be held accountable for the performance of the third grade students in the state that were second graders in their school last year. In the second case, schools with only first grade will be evaluated using the results of the school into which the students flow for grades 2-3.

In addition, New Hampshire has many small schools. Several schools are small enough so that their grade level aggregate assessment data is confidential, even with a cell size of 11. Once AYP reports have been run, schools with fewer than the minimum number of students needed to run performance calculations will be evaluated by aggregating multiple years of assessment data. The AYP status would become public as well as a stated rationale for the decision. Schools receiving the SSR designation (small school report) will keep that designation until aggregation of sufficient students to reach the required cell size of 11.

Not all public school students attend public schools in the state. A student is identified as a public school student when public funds are used to pay for his or her education. These students fall into three categories.

1. Public school students who attend public schools out of state: these students are included in the assessment and accountability system of the state in which they are schooled. State law RSA 193-C:6 details the participation of students involved in interstate agreements.
2. Public school students who attend private in-state schools (usually these students are special education students and/or court ordered placements): these students are assessed and included in state level aggregate and disaggregate data. There is no provision under state or federal law to include private schools in the accountability system. Furthermore, these students do not fall within the “enrolled for a full academic year” clause for either the sending public school district or appropriate school.
3. Public school students who attend private out-of-state schools (also usually special education students and/or court ordered placements): these students participate in the assessment and accountability system for either New Hampshire or the receiving state.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?</p>	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>All public elementary and middle schools and their LEAs will be judged on a single AYP definition. AYP will be based on student performance on the statewide assessment, 95% participation rate, attendance rate at the elementary/middle school level, and graduation rate at the high school level.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The New Hampshire accountability system is based on the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP). The NECAP has four clearly defined achievement levels: Substantially Below Proficient (level 1), Partially Proficient (level 2), Proficient (level 3), and Proficient with Distinction (level 4).</p> <p>NH achievement levels are linked to the rigorous grade level content standards and describe how well students have mastered the material in reading and mathematics.</p> <p>New Hampshire reports assessment data in two forms: achievement level (indicated above), and scaled score (X00-X80, where X indicates the grade level of the test; i.e. 320, 420, 520). The two statistics are connected as follows: Proficient includes scores greater than or equal to X40 at each grade level. Levels 1 and 2 represent unacceptable performance.</p> <p>Achievement levels for each subject area at each grade level assessed are defined in the annual statewide assessment reports: parent letters, and school and district reports. Parent reports include information on overall achievement in each content area (reading and mathematics), and more detailed information about achievement within defined sub-score categories in each subject.</p>		

¹ 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.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?</p>	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>It is the Department's intent to provide accountability reports to all schools in a timely manner. With fall testing for grades 3-8 and 11, accountability reports will be released prior to the end of the school year. This allows enough time for schools to understand results, discuss school or district improvement issues if necessary, inform parents about their legal options as defined by Title I and state rules, and take advantage of the summer months in addressing curriculum and school improvement issues.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>New Hampshire currently produces, through enacted legislation (RSA 193-E:3), an annual report card for the State, LEAs and all public schools through the <i>NH School District Profiles</i> link on the NH Department of Education’s website: www.ed.state.nh.us. It provides easy to understand information about schools and communities to the public. New Hampshire law requires the Department to provide attendance and drop-out rates; school environmental indicators and safety data; proportion of graduating students going on to post-secondary education and military service; and performance on the state assessment. All data and information used to determine AYP will be added to the <i>NH School District Profiles</i> including disaggregated data about school performance which is currently sent to the LEAs. The additional data elements, regarding teacher information, are currently being collected so that they can also be added to the <i>NH School District Profiles</i>. The NH accountability legislation has amended the reporting requirements to include NCLB data elements.</p> <p>New Hampshire continues to work to include additional data connected to NECAP testing in all grades 3-8 and 11.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?²</p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	<p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Rewards and sanctions for all public schools, including Title I and Non-Title I schools, have been included in legislation presented to the 2003 New Hampshire Legislature: Public Education Accountability System. This bill includes language that authorizes the Department to set up a consistent system of rewards and sanctions. The bill provides for a system of annual recognition and responses to school performance as set forth in rules: to assist local school staff with the analysis and use of school performance data, to assist in the implementation of local educational improvement and assessment plans, and to provide grants to school districts for local school improvement. This bill does not compromise any of the rewards and sanctions described in NCLB for Title I schools, however it does limit the option of State takeover (RSA 194-H:5). RSA 193-H:4 outlines requirements for school improvement plans for every school identified as being in need of improvement.</p> <p>All Title I schools will be held to the requirements of section 1116 of <i>No Child Left Behind</i>.</p>		

² 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)].

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.
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The accountability system includes all students in the grades that are currently assessed under our statewide assessment system. The following is taken from page 6 of the 2005 NECAP <i>Principal/Test Coordinator Manual</i>. (procedure remains the same in the 2007-2008 school year)</p> <p>“All students enrolled in the school as of October 1, 2005 are required to participate in NECAP with the following exceptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students who completed the Alternate Assessment for the 2004–2005 school year. 2. Students who are new to the U.S. after October 1, 2004 and are LEP and take the ACCESS test of English language proficiency as scheduled in their states are not required to take the NECAP reading and writing tests. However, these students must take the NECAP mathematics test. 3. Students who have state-approved special considerations. Each state department of education has a process for documenting and approving circumstances that make it impossible or not advisable for a student to participate in state testing. <p>Contact the following staff or visit the state’s department of education website for additional information. <i>New Hampshire — Tim Kurtz, at 603-271-3846</i> <i>Rhode Island — Mary Ann Snider, at 401-222-8492</i> <i>Vermont — Mary-Ann Minardo, at 802-828-5410</i></p> <p>Students who enroll in the school after October 1, 2005 should participate, to the extent possible, in NECAP testing. The test coordinator should determine which sessions of NECAP, if any, have been completed in the student’s prior school. The remaining sessions should be administered. Be sure to complete the appropriate box on page 2 of the Student Answer Booklet if the student was unable to participate in all testing sessions.”</p> <p>For the spring NECAP Science test, the effective date for participation will be May 12, 2008.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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?	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

For the purpose of accountability reporting (reading and math), a full academic year is defined for students as students who are continuously enrolled in the school /district since the first business day in October of the previous school year. (With a fall test, the delivery of instruction that affects performance on the beginning-of-year assessment happened in the previous grade.) The suspension of a student does not affect his or her enrollment status. New Hampshire now collects student demographic and program participation information electronically.

The definition of full academic year is consistently applied to all schools and districts statewide.

This definition may be revisited if the assessment timeframe changes.

If science is required to be part of AYP reporting, full academic year will be defined as continuously enrolled in the school/district from the first business day of October through the first day of science testing in May.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>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?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>LEAs have submitted End-of-Year files that include <i>dates of enrollment and dates of withdrawal</i>. Together, these dates are used to determine which students were enrolled in a school or district of a full academic year.</p> <p>The accountability system properly includes mobile students.</p> <p>Students that are enrolled for a full academic year in the school will be included in the school accountability reporting.</p> <p>Students that are enrolled for a full academic year in the district will be included in the district accountability reporting.</p> <p>All students will be included in the state accountability reporting. This includes all students enrolled in the state on the first day of testing.</p> <p>The NH i.4.see data system <i>based on unique student identifiers</i> has built in several steps for cleaning up demographic and other student data at multiple times throughout the year, producing much more accurate and current reports.</p>		

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 REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> 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 ³ 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

RSA 193-H:2 states “On or before the 2013-2014 school year, schools shall ensure that all pupils are performing at the basic level or above on the statewide assessment as established in RSA 193-C.” This law, though not yet updated to reflect proficiency definitions consistent with NECAP, indicates that schools have until 2013-2014 school year to ensure that all students are proficient (Basic or above was consistent with our previous assessment system. Levels 3 and 4 on NECAP indicate proficiency.) This law will be updated to reflect the new assessment system.

Starting points and yearly expectations are figured separately for ELA and Math at the elementary/middle and *high school levels*, and require all students to be proficient by the 2013-2014 academic year.

Proficient (Level 3) was defined in the following manner. At the time of the first full implementation of the NECAP test (October 2005), teachers were asked to judge the extent to which their new students were ready to succeed at grade level (as defined by newly adopted grade-level expectations). The teacher judgment data were reviewed for any anomalies, and then after finding none, applied NECAP test items to establish tentative bookmarks in the Bookmark Standard Setting method. In January, 2006, approximately 100 teachers for each content area were asked to review proposed bookmarks and make recommendations of changes. What resulted now defines the level of achievement necessary for students to be ready to achieve at grade level.

A similar process was used with the advent of the Fall NECAP tests at the high school level in October 2007. At the high school level, teacher judgments were collected at the end of grade 10 in June of 2007.

³ 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.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

3.2 AYP Determinations:

As with New Hampshire's former system, AYP decisions proceed as follows:

1. Check participation rate
2. Check if school index meets target (AMO)
 - a. If no, check to see is school's index within the confidence interval
 - i. If no, check to see if school makes safe harbor and other indicator
3. Check other indicator.

Publicly released AYP reports consist of 3 pages.

- Page 1: Decision page (yes/no)
- Page 2: Participation and Performance Index data page
- Page 3: Index computation page

Cell Size: Consistent with the agreement between USED and NHDOE, New Hampshire will continue to use a cell size of 11 for performance. New Hampshire intends to continue to use a cell size of 40 for calculation of participation rates. This permits some variation in context for small schools in the state. New Hampshire intends to continue to use a cell size of 40 for the other indicator: attendance rate (for grades 3-8) and graduation rate for HS.

Participation Rate: All schools, subgroups, LEAs, and the state must attain at least a 95% participation rate to make AYP.

Confidence Intervals: Based on Task Force recommendations, New Hampshire will implement an AYP definition utilizing a 99% confidence interval, calculated by using the average within school variance for schools around the AMO. Assessment scores vary each year for at least two reasons unrelated to what students know and are able to do: cohort variation (sampling error), and measurement error. Both affect school performance independently from the quality of teaching and learning. New Hampshire intends to make AYP decisions in a valid and reliable manner.

Safe harbor:

For elementary/middle schools and districts:

If any group of students in a school or district does not meet the annual measurable objectives, the school (or district) makes AYP if:

- (1) The group has a 95% participation rate,
- (2) the percentage of proficient students increased and the not-proficient index (100 – proficient index) decreased by at least 10 percent from the preceding year, and
- (3) That group made progress on the other academic indicator.

For high schools:

NH proposed to use the equi-percentile method that was approved by USED in 2005 to transition from our spring NHIEAP assessment in May 2004 to our fall NECAP assessment in October 2005.

The standards for proficiency on the two tests are different. We know that 82% of the high school students demonstrated proficiency (240 or above) on the May 2006 NHEIAP test in Reading language arts. Similarly, for mathematics, 76% of the students demonstrated proficiency (240 or above) on the May 2006 NEHEIAP test. NH will determine corresponding equi-percentile NECAP scores for reading and mathematics (called X and Y respectively). For this year only, NH proposes to compare at the school, district, and state level, the percent of students scoring below 240 on the May 2006 NHEIAP test to the percent of students scoring below 1153 (for reading) and 1140 (for mathematics) on the 2007 NECAP test.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Index System: As stated earlier, the goal is to get all students to proficiency by school year 2013-2014. An index system supports that goal by keeping the end in sight while acknowledging the hard work of teachers and rewarding schools for the steady progress by students.

Achievement Level		Index Points
Level 1: Substantially below proficient	X00	0
	1a	20
	1b	40
Level 2: Partially Proficient	2a	60
	2b	80
Level 3: Proficient		100
Level 4: Proficient with Distinction		

Publicly released AYP reports will consist of 3 pages.

Page 1: Decision page

Page 2: Participation and Index page

Page 3: Index computation page

The Index computation will be provided for the whole school and every subgroup that meets the cell size criteria list above.

As with New Hampshire's past system, AYP decisions proceed as follows:

3. Check participation rate
4. Check if school index meets starting point
 - a. If no, check to see if school's index within the confidence interval
 - i. If no, check to see if school makes safe harbor and other indicator
3. Check other indicator.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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...).</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS																
<p>To determine the method and conditions for defining the Starting Points for AYP:</p> <p>Federal guidelines are followed for both reading and mathematics (computing 20% enrollment method). Files are available upon request. Starting points for HS were computed on student level from the grade 11 October 2007 NECAP tests.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="224 1367 1070 1497"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Starting Points (based on Oct 2005 NECAP results) for grades 3-8</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Index</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Reading</i></td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mathematics</td> <td>76</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="224 1528 1070 1656"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Starting Points (based on Oct 2007 NECAP results) for grade 11</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Index</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Reading</i></td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mathematics</td> <td>58</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Starting Points (based on Oct 2005 NECAP results) for grades 3-8			Index	<i>Reading</i>	82	Mathematics	76	Starting Points (based on Oct 2007 NECAP results) for grade 11			Index	<i>Reading</i>	84	Mathematics	58
Starting Points (based on Oct 2005 NECAP results) for grades 3-8																
	Index															
<i>Reading</i>	82															
Mathematics	76															
Starting Points (based on Oct 2007 NECAP results) for grade 11																
	Index															
<i>Reading</i>	84															
Mathematics	58															

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The State will use a consistent method for establishing annual measurable objectives based on the starting point and an eight year timeline <i>starting with assessment data from the 2005-2006 school year (for grades 3-8)</i> that has all schools, subgroups, LEAs and the State meeting the 100% proficient target by 2014. At the high school level, the timeline will be 6 years long starting with assessment data from the 2007-2008 school year.</p> <p>(see 3.2c for a table that includes annual measurable objectives)</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. • Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

The index goals are set separately for reading and mathematics for grades three through eight. These intermediate goals are set based on starting points (using 05-06 data).

Grades 3-8	Index	
	Reading	Math
Starting point (2005-2006)	82	76
2006-2007	82	76
2007-2008	86	82
2008-2009	86	82
2009-2010	91	88
2010-2011	91	88
2011-2012	95	94
2012-2013	95	94
2013-2014	100	100

High School AMOs based on 2007-2008 assessment baseline data

Grade 11	Index	
	Reading	Math
Starting point (2007-2008)	84	58
2008-2009	84	58
2009-2010	89	72
2010-2011	89	72
2011-2012	94	86
2012-2013	94	86
2013-2014	100	100

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> 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. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>AYP decisions will be made annually for each public school and all school districts that operate schools in New Hampshire. (New Hampshire has approximately 12 school districts that do not operate schools but choose to tuition them to other school districts.) The State will produce an AYP report for each school and school district in the state. The State will publish the list of schools and districts that are in need of improvement on its web site.</p> <p>Several NH schools are small enough so that their grade level aggregate assessment data is confidential, even with a cell size of 11. Once AYP reports have been run, schools with fewer than the minimum number of students needed to run performance calculations will be evaluated by aggregating multiple years of assessment data. The AYP status would become public as well as a stated rationale for the decision. Schools receiving the SSR designation (small school report) will keep that designation until aggregation of sufficient students to reach the required cell size of 11.</p> <p>A few New Hampshire schools have no grade level tested within the grade spans included in the school. Currently, these schools fall into two categories: schools with grades 1-2 and schools with just grade 1. In the first case, schools will be held accountable for the performance of the third grade students in the state that were second graders in their school last year. In the second case, schools with only first grade will be evaluated using the results of the school into which the students flow for grades 2-3.</p>		

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING 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

All public schools and school districts will be accountable for the performance of student subgroups – including major racial/ethnic subgroups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and economically disadvantaged students – through AYP determination, provided the subgroup meets the minimum group size requirement.

Starting with the administration of the NH State Assessment for the 2001-2002 school year, New Hampshire collected and disaggregated the data on each required subgroup for AYP, enabling school districts to compare achievement levels and plan instructional interventions. School districts receive a report for each of its schools containing the required disaggregated data.

This will continue with the new assessment results.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>New Hampshire requires that schools and districts report student race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency and economic status along with student assessment results.</p> <p>New Hampshire will disaggregate and hold schools and LEAs accountable for the performance of the following student subgroups that meet the minimum cell size requirement for accountability purposes:</p> <p>All Students</p> <p>Major Racial/Ethnic Groups: Asian, Black, White, Hispanic, Native American</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged: Identified as eligible for Free and Reduced Priced Meal Program under the USDA National School Lunch Act.</p> <p>Limited English Proficient: Students who exhibit limited comprehension of English in one or more of the four domains of listening, speaking, reading or writing.</p> <p>Students with Disabilities: As defined under section 602(3) of <i>the Individuals with Disabilities Act</i>.</p> <p>For each school and LEA, the State will determine for each subgroup of sufficient size whether the subgroup achieved the annual measurable objective or met the “Safe Harbor” provision of NCLB and met the 95% participation rate criteria. For a school or LEA to make AYP, <u>every group for which a school or LEA is accountable must make AYP.</u></p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 Students With Disabilities</p> <p>All students with disabilities in New Hampshire participate in the regular assessment New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), or the New Hampshire Alternate Assessment (NH-Alt). Students with disabilities participating in these assessments, with or without accommodations, are included in the State’s definition of AYP in the same manner as students without disabilities.</p> <p>Each student’s Individualized Education Program (IEP) team determines how the student will participate in the state assessment program. The state has developed participation guidelines for IEP teams to use as they make participation decisions. These guidelines stress factors such as cognitive ability and adaptive behavior skill levels. The student’s IEP team meets prior to the state assessment to determine the nature of the student’s participation for each assessment used. Students with disabilities may take:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the assessment without accommodations, under conditions routinely used; ▪ the assessment with accommodations; or ▪ NH-Alt for students with disabilities who meet the criteria for alternate assessment. <p>NH-Alt is intended for a very small percentage of students who require significantly different instructional and technological supports to measure the progress in their learning. Alternate achievement standards were generated by convening a panel of school district personnel to identify the essential core of the content standards in English language arts and mathematics. Students are scored using the same performance labels as those in the general statewide assessment system: Proficient with Distinction (level 4), Proficient (level 3), Partially Proficient (level 2), Substantially Below Proficient (level 1). A student’s portfolio is judged as demonstrating acceptable performance if it earns a score of proficient or better. Scores from the portfolio assessment and regular assessment are reported separately and combined when reporting accountability results.</p> <p>Students participating in NH-Alt receive a score that reflects the student’s performance of skills. The score are converted to the achievement levels currently used in New Hampshire to determine AYP and incorporated into the AYP calculation.</p> <p>New Hampshire ensures that the use of the alternate assessments (NH-Alt) complies with the <u>1%</u> percent proficient limit allowable and the eligibility criteria deemed permissible, as a result of the final federal regulations for accountability and assessment.</p> <p><i>For AYP considerations based on 2007 test results, New Hampshire will no longer implement the flexibility described in Transition Option 1 of Education Secretary Margaret Spellings’ letter of May 10, 2005. Since New Hampshire’s assessment system is currently in Approval Pending status and is not eligible for this transition flexibility.</i></p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>New Hampshire expects all students enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11 to participate in the statewide assessment at those grade levels. This includes LEP students. New Hampshire has a very small, but growing population of LEP students. The LEP students represent approximately 2% of the total student population. With over 150 languages spoken by LEP students in our public schools, it is not practical for New Hampshire to offer native language assessments as part of the NH Assessment Program. LEP students who have been enrolled less than 10 months in US schools are exempt from the Reading test, but must participate in the mathematics test. These students are counted as participating in reading, but are counted as participating in mathematics only if they do so. <i>In neither case, do these students' assessment results count toward AYP performance calculations.</i> All LEP students are required to participate in <i>the WIDA ACCESS TEST for ELLs</i>, a test of English language proficiency, in addition to the state-wide assessment.</p> <p>Accommodations are provided to LEP students in order to facilitate their participation in the statewide assessment. New Hampshire requires schools and districts to identify LEP students when reporting student assessment results. A wide range of accommodations are available for all students (see <i>Accommodation: Guidelines and Procedures</i>). Standard procedures and guidelines for determining which accommodations are appropriate for LEP students have been developed and are being used by school districts. One particular accommodation for LEP students is available: C-12 Word-to-word translation dictionary, nonelectronic with no definitions (For ELL students in Mathematics and Writing only). Approved accommodations do not affect student scores.</p> <p><i>LEP students who are being monitored after exiting from LEP status are part of the LEP subgroup in both assessment and accountability reporting for two years after exiting.</i></p> <p><i>"Exit Status" for a NH Title III LEP program student is defined as follows: The student has earned: 1.) a <u>Composite Proficiency Score of 5.0</u> on the most recent ACCESS for ELLs® test, <u>and</u> 2.) scores <u>at or above 4.0</u> in <u>all</u> the proficiency sub-domains, to include listening, speaking, reading and writing .</i></p> <p>New Hampshire is studying new ways to assess LEP student's English proficiency that would allow us to judge their performance relative to our ELA curriculum standards. In addition, we are seeking help in assessing LEP student's proficiency in mathematics through our collaboration with the New England Compact. It is hope that in reauthorization of NCLB, the USED would review the research on the realistic length of time it takes for English Language Learners to become proficient, and then build an appropriate accountability system based on that research.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p>	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Minimum n for reporting and accountability at the school and district level, and to all subgroups within...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 – participation rate • 40 – attendance rate • 40 – graduation rate • 11 – for performance 		

⁵ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> 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. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>New Hampshire State Law (193-C:11) states “Individual names or codes contained in the statewide assessment results, scores, or other evaluative materials shall be deleted for the purposes of records maintenance and storage of such results or scores at the Department of Education, unless a parent or legal guardian provides written authorization, or as required under federal law.” Such student identifiers reside within the individual schools and the assessment contractor. School and district scores are not reported publicly when the scores are based on fewer than 11 students. In addition, the Department will not report summative performance for a group or subgroup at less than 10% nor greater than 90% if such reporting would compromise the confidentiality of students.</p>		

⁶ 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.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

In 1993, New Hampshire passed legislation that enacted the statewide education and improvement program. The aim of this program was to define what students should know and be able to do, develop and implement methods for assessing that learning and its application, report assessment results to all citizens of New Hampshire, help provide accountability at all levels, and to use the results, at both state and local levels, to improve instruction and advance student learning. This legislation produced the New Hampshire curriculum frameworks and an assessment system called New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP). An excerpt from the law reflects its intent: “At each grade level assessed, the standards and expectations shall be the same for every New Hampshire student.” It is this historical context that provides the basis as we move forward. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) will be based primarily on the reading and mathematics scores derived from the statewide assessments, *both the general assessment (NECAP) and the NH Alternate Assessment*, given at grades 3-8 and 11.

The 95% participation rate will be derived from assessment data. Currently our statewide participation rate is well over 95%. The 90% attendance rate will be derived from attendance records submitted to the state.

New Hampshire will be implementing a science assessment, NECAP-Science, in May 2008 at grades 4, 8, and 11. Participation guidelines for the science assessment are the same as for the federally approved October NECAP assessments in reading and mathematics. Assessment scores will be reported in early fall of 2008 after initial standard setting in August. Report structures will be the same as the fall NECAP assessments. No accountability report will be issued for the first year of science testing.

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

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 REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.1 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?</p>	<p>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.⁸</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

New Hampshire will use attendance rates as the other indicator for grades 3-8. Attendance rate has been defined as the Average Daily Membership (ADM) reported to the NH Department of Education. Any school with an attendance rate lower than 90% will not make AYP.

Attendance rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP [See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i) and 34 CFR 200.20(b)].

Attendance as the other indicator is reflected in New Hampshire's single state accountability legislation - now Chapter 314 of the Laws of 2003. Section 314:6 is the accountability portion of the bill. It creates a new chapter in our statutes, RSA 193-H. The legislation took effect on July 22, 2003.

⁸ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?</p>	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The NH DOE has contracted with the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) to coordinate an Assessment/Accountability Technical Advisory Committee. It is the responsibility of this group to review all academic indicators for validity and reliability. Currently, reliabilities for all mathematics assessment are .90 or greater, .88 or greater for reading.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 What is the State's definition for the public high school graduation rate?		
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>Currently New Hampshire reports drop-out rates. NH uses a modified NCES definition of graduation (does not include GED) rate until such time as a data collection system allows us to gather more accurate graduation rates (possibly as early as the 2009-2010 school year).</p> <p>New Hampshire's graduation rate is calculated as the percentage of students who complete high school and earn a regular diploma within the standard number of years. The standard numbers of years for students with IEP/504 plans are specified in those documents.</p> <p>NH Graduation Rate = Completer Rate X Regular Diploma Rate Where, Completer Rate = 100% - Cumulative Dropout Rate% and Regular Diploma Rate in the standard # of years = $\frac{\text{\# of completers with regular diplomas earned in the standard \# of years}}{\text{Number of completers with regular + nonstandard diplomas}}$</p> <p>The dropout definition is consistent with the NCES definition. Dropouts are defined as students who leave school prior to graduation for reasons other than transfer to another school or death of student.</p> <p>In New Hampshire, four is the standard number of years for students who do not have IEPs or 504 plans. An additional year may be considered for completion to accommodate variations across districts and schools including, but not limited to:</p> <p>(a) the number of credits required for graduation from public schools, New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules 306.23 establishes a minimum number of credits for high school graduation. Many high schools go beyond the minimum number of credits for graduation. For example, a student may transfer from a school requiring 20 credits to a school requiring 23 credits, a public school may not accept all credits from a private school, or variations in course offerings may make it necessary for a student to take a few courses during the fifth year.</p> <p>(b) the number of credits from private schools that are accepted when a student transfers to a public school, and</p> <p>(c) the needs of students who are enrolled in Dropout Recovery/Intervention Programs developed at the local level. Students attending public schools in New Hampshire districts that have an active drop-out recovery program may need a fifth year to complete high school graduation requirements. If this is not allowed there would be a disincentive to recover students before they permanently drop-out.</p> <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP [See USC 6311(b)(2)(l)(i) and 34 CFR 200.20(b)].</p> <p><i>For high school AYP determinations, the graduation rate target is 75% or an improvement over the previous year.</i></p> <p>Graduation rate has been incorporated into the AYP definition in the pending New Hampshire Legislature's Public Education Accountability System Bill. "The percentage of pupils who graduate with a regular diploma from an approved high school shall be an indicator of whether a school district has made satisfactory progress.</p>		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.⁹</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Currently the state assessment (NECAP) measures student performance in reading and mathematics separately at grades 3-8 and 11. Accountability measures will be reported for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs in reading and mathematics separately.</p>		

⁹ 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.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>AYP determinations will be based primarily on assessment results from the statewide assessment system, NECAP. Annually NECAP goes through a complete evaluation of reliability (Standard Errors of Measurement, Accuracy and Consistency). The results are published in the NECAP Technical Manual.</p> <p>The NH DOE contracts with the NCIEA (National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment) to coordinate an assessment/accountability Technical Advisory Committee. It is the responsibility of this group to review all the academic indicators for validity and reliability and to ensure the integrity of the process.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING 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

The process for making AYP determinations is widely publicized (NH DOE website, Superintendent's Key Messages monthly e-mail, New Hampshire NCLB list serve, the AYP Task Force).

In the past year, the NH i.4.see data system has developed numerous verification tools to enable school districts to be sure that the demographic data we have on students is correct. This "data cleanup" occurs at multiple times throughout the year, allowing us to be sure that we have accurate BOY (beginning of year) and EOY (end of year) data – both of which are used in AYP calculations.

In addition, prior to the public release of assessment data, the department checks for data anomalies and may go so far as making phone calls to districts for verification of data. A report of assessment data is then sent to all schools for verification prior to its public release. Data that will form the basis of our graduation rates and retention rates are reviewed and confirmed by the superintendents.

This year, our data team is working on a verification tool for districts to use again prior to the release of AYP reports. AYP determinations will be made based on their final information and reports will be sent to all schools. A school wishing to appeal its AYP designation will have 30 days to present an appeal to their district. A district wishing to appeal its AYP designation will have 30 days to present an appeal to the Commissioner of Education or his designee. Guidelines for the appeal process along with worksheets and directions that allow districts to do their own AYP calculations appear on the NH DOE website and are given to every school that has not made AYP.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p>	<p>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.¹⁰</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The NH DOE has contracted with the NCIEA to coordinate a Technical Advisory Committee. It is the responsibility of this group to develop policy for anticipated changes to AYP as changes are made to the assessment system. The changes contained within this submission result from two external panels: AYP Task Force and the TAC. The NCIEA helps to run the meetings of both groups.</p>		

¹⁰ 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.

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 REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>New Hampshire collects student demographic data on every student enrolled on the first day of the statewide assessment. Participation rates for every group and subgroup at the school, district, and state level is calculated based on the total enrollment on the first day of testing. Due to the large number of small schools and small districts in the state, a cell size for participation rate accountability will be 40. Subgroups that fall under the cell size at the school level may still show up at the district level and will show up at the state level. New Hampshire does not intend to use confidence intervals on the 95% participation requirement.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING 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		
See section 10.1		

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.

Appendix B

Material added to the December 2007 Accountability Workbook Submission
after the addition of Grade 11 data

The following pages have changes:

Page 15: 3.2 Safe Harbor Equi-percentile Scores

Page 17: 3.2a High School Starting Points based on 07-08 Testing

Page 20: 3.2b High School Annual Measurable Objectives, 2007-2014

Page 25: 5.3 Students with Disabilities: Option 1 Flexibility

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

3.2 AYP Determinations:

As with New Hampshire's former system, AYP decisions proceed as follows:

1. Check participation rate
2. Check if school index meets target (AMO)
 - a. If no, check to see if school's index within the confidence interval
 - i. If no, check to see if school makes safe harbor and other indicator
3. Check other indicator.

Publicly released AYP reports consist of 3 pages.

Page 1: Decision page (yes/no)

Page 2: Participation and Performance Index data page

Page 3: Index computation page

Cell Size: Consistent with the agreement between USED and NHDOE, New Hampshire will continue to use a cell size of 11 for performance. New Hampshire intends to continue to use a cell size of 40 for calculation of participation rates. This permits some variation in context for small schools in the state. New Hampshire intends to continue to use a cell size of 40 for the other indicator: attendance rate (for grades 3-8) and graduation rate for HS.

Participation Rate: All schools, subgroups, LEAs, and the state must attain at least a 95% participation rate to make AYP.

Confidence Intervals: Based on Task Force recommendations, New Hampshire will implement an AYP definition utilizing a 99% confidence interval, calculated by using the average within school variance for schools around the AMO. Assessment scores vary each year for at least two reasons unrelated to what students know and are able to do: cohort variation (sampling error), and measurement error. Both affect school performance independently from the quality of teaching and learning. New Hampshire intends to make AYP decisions in a valid and reliable manner.

Safe harbor:

For elementary/middle schools and districts:

If any group of students in a school or district does not meet the annual measurable objectives, the school (or district) makes AYP if:

- (1) The group has a 95% participation rate,
- (2) the percentage of proficient students increased and the not-proficient index (100 – proficient index) decreased by at least 10 percent from the preceding year, and
- (3) That group made progress on the other academic indicator.

For high schools:

NH proposed to use the equi-percentile method that was approved by USED in 2005 to transition from our spring NHEIAP assessment in May 2004 to our fall NECAP assessment in October 2005.

The standards for proficiency on the two tests are different. We know that 82% of the high school students demonstrated proficiency (240 or above) on the May 2006 NHEIAP test in Reading language arts. Similarly, for mathematics, 76% of the students demonstrated proficiency (240 or above) on the May 2006 NEHEIAP test. NH will determine corresponding equi-percentile NECAP scores for reading and mathematics (called X and Y respectively). For this year only, NH proposes to compare at the school, district, and state level, the percent of students scoring below 240 on the May 2006 NHEIAP test to the percent of students scoring below 1153 (for reading) and 1140 (for mathematics) on the 2007 NECAP test.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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...).</p>	The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS																
<p>To determine the method and conditions for defining the Starting Points for AYP:</p> <p>Federal guidelines are followed for both reading and mathematics (computing 20% enrollment method). Files are available upon request. Starting points for HS were computed on student level from the grade 11 October 2007 NECAP tests.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="289 1121 943 1220"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Starting Points (based on Oct 2005 NECAP results) for grades 3-8</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Index</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Reading</i></td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mathematics</td> <td>76</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="289 1247 943 1346"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Starting Points (based on Oct 2007 NECAP results) for grade 11</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Index</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Reading</i></td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mathematics</td> <td>58</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Starting Points (based on Oct 2005 NECAP results) for grades 3-8			Index	<i>Reading</i>	82	Mathematics	76	Starting Points (based on Oct 2007 NECAP results) for grade 11			Index	<i>Reading</i>	84	Mathematics	58
Starting Points (based on Oct 2005 NECAP results) for grades 3-8																
	Index															
<i>Reading</i>	82															
Mathematics	76															
Starting Points (based on Oct 2007 NECAP results) for grade 11																
	Index															
<i>Reading</i>	84															
Mathematics	58															

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>The index goals are set separately for reading and mathematics for grades three through eight. These intermediate goals are set based on starting points (using 05-06 data).</p>		
Grades 3-8	Index	
	Reading	Math
Starting point (2005-2006)	82	76
2006-2007	82	76
2007-2008	86	82
2008-2009	86	82
2009-2010	91	88
2010-2011	91	88
2011-2012	95	94
2012-2013	95	94
2013-2014	100	100
<p>High School AMOs based on 2007-2008 assessment baseline data</p>		
Grade 11	Index	
	Reading	Math
Starting point (2007-2008)	84	58
2008-2009	84	58
2009-2010	89	72
2010-2011	89	72
2011-2012	94	86
2012-2013	94	86
2013-2014	100	100

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 Students With Disabilities</p> <p>All students with disabilities in New Hampshire participate in the regular assessment New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), or the New Hampshire Alternate Assessment (NH-Alt). Students with disabilities participating in these assessments, with or without accommodations, are included in the State's definition of AYP in the same manner as students without disabilities.</p> <p>Each student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) team determines how the student will participate in the state assessment program. The state has developed participation guidelines for IEP teams to use as they make participation decisions. These guidelines stress factors such as cognitive ability and adaptive behavior skill levels. The student's IEP team meets prior to the state assessment to determine the nature of the student's participation for each assessment used. Students with disabilities may take:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the assessment without accommodations, under conditions routinely used; ▪ the assessment with accommodations; or ▪ NH-Alt for students with disabilities who meet the criteria for alternate assessment. <p>NH-Alt is intended for a very small percentage of students who require significantly different instructional and technological supports to measure the progress in their learning. Alternate achievement standards were generated by convening a panel of school district personnel to identify the essential core of the content standards in English language arts and mathematics. Students are scored using the same performance labels as those in the general statewide assessment system: Proficient with Distinction (level 4), Proficient (level 3), Partially Proficient (level 2), Substantially Below Proficient (level 1). A student's portfolio is judged as demonstrating acceptable performance if it earns a score of proficient or better. Scores from the portfolio assessment and regular assessment are reported separately and combined when reporting accountability results.</p> <p>Students participating in NH-Alt receive a score that reflects the student's performance of skills. The score are converted to the achievement levels currently used in New Hampshire to determine AYP and incorporated into the AYP calculation.</p> <p>New Hampshire ensures that the use of the alternate assessments (NH-Alt) complies with the <u>1%</u> percent proficient limit allowable and the eligibility criteria deemed permissible, as a result of the final federal regulations for accountability and assessment.</p> <p><i>For AYP considerations based on 2007 test results, New Hampshire will no longer implement the flexibility described in Transition Option 1 of Education Secretary Margaret Spellings' letter of May 10, 2005. Since New Hampshire's assessment system is currently in Approval Pending status and is not eligible for this transition flexibility.</i></p>		