

# ALABAMA

## 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)

February 1, 2008



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

## **Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which 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.

### **Transmittal Instructions**

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, PDF file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to [conapp@ed.gov](mailto:conapp@ed.gov).

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Ave., SW  
Room 3W300  
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400  
(202) 401-0113

## **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**

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

**STATUS Legend:**

- F – Final state policy  
P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval  
W – Working to formulate policy



**Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability**

F	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups.</i>
F	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups.</i>
F	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities.</i>
F	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students.</i>
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 <i>primarily on academic assessments.</i>
---	-----	--

**Principle 7: Additional Indicators**

F	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools.</i>
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</i>
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 <i>reading/language arts and mathematics.</i>
---	-----	--

**Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability**

F	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions.</i>
F	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions.</i>
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population.</i>

**Principle 10: Participation Rate**

F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.</i>

**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
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY 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 “LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY” for ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State Accountability System produces ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS 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).</li> </ul>	<p>A public school or LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY 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>



## STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

State law 2000-753 was amended [§16-6B-1 and §16-6B-3, Ala. Code (1975), (Attachment A)] to give authority to the State Board of Education to develop and implement a statewide assessment and accountability system. On July 9, 2002, the State Board of Education adopted the "Resolution Regarding Assessment and Accountability" (Attachments B and B1) outlining principles for development of assessment and accountability systems and a statewide assessment program.

The Accountability Advisory Committee, consisting of a broad base of stakeholders, was appointed by the State Superintendent of Education and made recommendations for a single, comprehensive state accountability system. This state accountability system incorporates the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*, including adequate yearly progress determinations, and also includes additional indicators of the educational status of the schools and local education agencies (LEAs). The design of the state accountability system is consistent with the *No Child Left Behind* model in that the design includes starting points, annual measurable objectives, and intermediate goals for the state's criterion-referenced assessments. The Accountability Advisory Committee made its recommendation for a state accountability system to the State Board of Education in May 2003. On June 26, 2003, the State Board of Education adopted a resolution regarding accountability for schools and LEAs (Attachment C) establishing a state accountability system to become effective with the 2003-2004 school year. This accountability system is consistent with the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education (Attachment D, Action Plan of Compliance Agreement; effective dates April 8, 2002, through April 8, 2005) that incorporates the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*.

The accountability system requires a single statewide accountability system that includes all public schools and LEAs in the State and requires every public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress. "Public school," for purposes of accountability, shall be defined as any school consisting of any grade or combination of Grades K through 12 that is either under the control and management of a county or city board of education supported by public funds, any school under the control and management of the State Board of Education supported by public funds, or as otherwise recognized by the legislature. (Note: This definition of "public school" is for purposes of accountability, but has not been codified.) Home schools in Alabama are considered private schools and, therefore, are not subject to the *No Child Left Behind* requirements. There currently are no charter schools in Alabama. The Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind is not under the control of the State Department of Education and, therefore, not included in the state accountability system.

The state accountability system will produce adequate yearly progress decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12, K-2) and public schools that serve special populations. For accountability purposes, schools with no tested grades (e.g., K-2 schools) will be linked with the school into which the students feed. If students from a school feed into more than one school, the sending school will be assigned the status of the receiving school where the highest percent of students attend. Determinations will be made ahead of time as to which schools are linked.

Until implementation of the final state accountability system in 2004, the Alabama State Department of Education continued implementation of its interim accountability program (Attachment E, memorandum dated January 22, 2003) that includes all public schools and LEAs in the State as agreed to in the April 8, 2002, Compliance Agreement (Attachment D).

Under the state's previous accountability system, schools identified for improvement under Title I were identified as "School Improvement-Year *n*" to indicate the status and the number of years in that category. Schools identified for improvement by the "state" accountability system were categorized as Alert *n*, Caution, or Clear. At the onset of the transition of the state's accountability system to that which is agreed upon in our Compliance Agreement, beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, these terms were replaced with Academic Priority and Academic Watch. In 2005, the state was released from its Compliance Agreement by the U.S. Department of Education. A single set of terms has been applied to all schools and all local education agencies that are in the same academic status category. While the determinations for failure to make adequate yearly progress will be the same for all schools and local education agencies, there may be different consequences. For example, a Title I-funded school that fails to make adequate yearly progress will be subject to the public school choice and supplemental education services provisions of Section 1116. A non-Title I school that fails to make adequate yearly progress will not be required to implement those provisions, but may choose to do so if other supplemental funds are available.



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 ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS determination?</p>	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS 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 ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS determination.</p>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>		
<p>The same criteria will be applied to all public schools and LEAs when making determinations for adequate yearly progress for <i>No Child Left Behind</i>. (See Principles 1.3, 3, 4, and 5.)</p> <p>The Accountability Advisory Committee made its recommendation for a state accountability system to the State Board of Education in May 2003. On June 26, 2003, the State Board of Education adopted a resolution regarding accountability for schools and LEAs (Attachment C) establishing a state accountability system to become effective with the 2003-2004 school year. This accountability program is consistent with the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education (Attachment D; effective dates April 8, 2002, through April 8, 2005) that incorporates the requirements of <i>No Child Left Behind</i>.</p>		

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>.<sup>[1]</sup></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>

<sup>[1]</sup> 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 ANNUAL YEARLY PROGRESS.

## STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State Board of Education has adopted four levels of student achievement. Student achievement levels define how well students are mastering the State's academic content standards at grade level. Level III is defined as "Meets Academic Content Standards" at grade level and Level IV is defined as "Exceeds Academic Content Standards" at grade level. Level II (Partially Meets Academic Content Standards) and Level I (Does Not Meet Academic Content Standards) provide descriptions about the progress of lower achieving students toward mastery of the State's academic content standards at grade level. These academic achievement levels are used for reporting achievement results for all criterion-referenced assessments with the exception of the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam* which will be reported in three levels [Levels I-II (Does Not or Partially Meets Academic Content Standards/Fail), Level III (Meets Academic Content Standards/Pass), and Level IV (Exceeds Academic Content Standards/Advanced)].

The cut scores and exemplars for the academic achievement levels will be developed according to the April 8, 2002, Compliance Agreement. Results for Grade 4 reading and mathematics, Grade 6 reading and mathematics, Grade 8 reading, and Grade 11 reading and mathematics will be ready for reporting beginning with the spring 2004 testing. Results for Grade 3 reading and mathematics, Grade 5 reading and mathematics, Grade 7 reading and mathematics, and Grade 8 mathematics will be ready for reporting beginning with the spring 2005 testing. An advanced level for the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam* was added to the existing levels for reading and for mathematics for spring of 2004. These academic achievement levels also will be used for reporting achievement results for all criterion-referenced assessments developed in the future (e.g., science).

The *Alabama Alternate Assessment* assesses students with the most significant cognitive disabilities by measuring their mastery of individualized academic goals based upon the state content extended standards in reading and mathematics. Scores for students taking the *Alabama Alternate Assessment* also are reported in four levels of academic achievement. Level I - Does Not Meet Standards, Level II - Partially Meets Standards, Level III - Meets Standards, and Level IV - Exceeds Standards. (There is no out-of-level testing.)

See Attachments B and B1 for a copy of State Board of Education resolution dated July 9, 2002.

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>



## STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Starting dates for schools are determined by the LEAs. Schools have historically started anywhere from the middle of July to the end of August. A committee was formed to study the feasibility of a uniform window for starting dates for schools that will greatly assist in timely reporting of results. (See the resulting Board resolution, Attachment J.)

Attachment F is a timeline including the test administration dates, the dates for return of results to the State Department of Education, the dates for LEA reviews and responses, and the dates for the State Department of Education's final determination.

The accountability system will include an appeals process that will include the following:

1. Before identifying a school or LEA for improvement, the LEA, through an appeals process, will be given an opportunity to review the data on which the State Department of Education based the proposed identification. A school or LEA has ten (10) business days after notification of its proposed identification to submit written evidence through the local superintendent indicating good and just cause for review. An appeal may be based upon circumstances such as epidemics, natural disasters, or extreme changes in demographics. Evidence supporting the re-classification must detail a convincing case for the circumstance(s) beyond the school's or LEA's control. Circumstances within the school's or LEA's control (such as inaccurate reporting of attendance data) will not serve as sufficient cause for review. Appeals based on circumstances not outlined above will be handled on a case-by-case basis by the State Department of Education.
2. Two copies of the written evidence signed by the LEA superintendent must be presented to the State Superintendent of Education in Montgomery.
3. The State Department of Education will review the school's or LEA's written evidence and will make a judgment about re-classification within ten (10) business days of receipt of evidence or as soon as possible. The State Department of Education will submit its finding to the local superintendent after the review process. Final determinations of status will be made public immediately following the final determination of status (approximately the middle of August).

This schedule should allow LEAs time to implement the required provisions of *No Child Left Behind*. (The State has an approved list of providers for supplemental educational services which can be found on the State Department of Education's website at [www.alsde.edu](http://www.alsde.edu).)

Based on the requirement for making adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years, Alabama identified 19 school systems that had one or more schools identified for improvement during the 2003-2004 school year. In June 2003, these school systems were notified of such identification by the State Department of Education, so the school systems could begin implementation of school choice and supplemental services at the beginning of the 2003-2004 school year. The same procedure will be implemented in subsequent years.

It should be noted that additional time will be needed in 2004 and 2005 because of the necessity of setting standards on the new assessments in Grades 3 through 8. This is consistent with the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education on April 8, 2002 (Attachment D). After the final standard-setting in spring 2005, the data will be available as described above.



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>

**STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

Information is reported to the public in two phases. Phase I is in the form of a press release. Adequate yearly progress determinations required by *No Child Left Behind*, including disaggregated data by subgroups, and instructional personnel qualifications are included. (See Principle 1.4.) Concurrently, assessment data are posted on the State Department of Education's website at [www.alsde.edu](http://www.alsde.edu). A user is able to select the school, test, subtest, grade, and subgroup for which information is desired.

Phase II of the reporting system is an annual State report card that is reported to the public in February each year and includes assessment results and other academic indicators by student subgroups. School and LEA reports cards also are disseminated and contain similar data to the State report card. The current State, LEA, and school report cards can be viewed on the State Department of Education's website at [www.alsde.edu](http://www.alsde.edu).

The State Department of Education has produced report cards for schools, LEAs, and the State since 1996. For the February 2003 report card, major changes were made to the content and release schedule in order to fully comply with *No Child Left Behind*. Report cards will be produced in the five most prevalent languages in the state through a contract with Transact. The SDE will inform the LEAs of the five languages in which the report cards are available. The LEAs will inform parents of the availability through websites, parent meetings, and school bulletins. (See Attachment G for details concerning the current State report card and further changes to be implemented in 2003-2004.)

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?<sup>[2]</sup></p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set by the State;</li> <li>• Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and,</li> </ul> <p>Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs.</p>	<p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>		
<p>The state accountability system incorporates the requirements of <i>No Child Left Behind</i>, including adequate yearly progress determinations, and also will include additional indicators of the educational status of the schools and LEAs. The state accountability system includes descriptions of state support, rewards, and sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on academic status. (See Attachments K1 [Board resolution dated November 13, 2003], K2 [Report to the State Accountability Committee from the Rewards and Sanctions Subcommittee], and K3 [Alabama Standards for Effective Professional Development.]) The state accountability system and the accompanying support, rewards, and sanctions were set by the State Board of Education; include adequate yearly progress determinations; and are applied uniformly across all public schools and LEAs. All schools and LEAs, without regard to Title I status, are subject to the state's accountability requirements. All schools and LEAs are identified for state support, recognition, and sanctions on the same basis, without regard to Title I status. However, schools and LEAs <b>not</b> receiving Title I funds will not be held to the requirements of section 1116 of <i>No Child Left Behind</i>.</p> <p>The Accountability Advisory Committee made its recommendation for a state accountability system to the State Board of Education in May 2003. On June 26, 2003, the State Board of Education adopted a resolution regarding accountability for schools and LEAs (Attachment C) establishing a state accountability system to become effective with the 2003-2004 school year. This accountability program is consistent with the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education (Attachment D) that incorporates the requirements of <i>No Child Left Behind</i>.</p> <p>Until the implementation of the final state accountability system in 2004, the Alabama State Department of Education continued implementation of its interim accountability program that includes all public schools and LEAs in the State as agreed to in the April 8, 2002, Compliance Agreement (Attachment D).</p>		

<sup>[2]</sup> 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.**

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<p>2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?</p>	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>		
<p>The accountability system includes all public school students in the state. Students attending alternative schools at the time of testing will be counted at their home school for accountability. Although students with disabilities and limited English proficient students may receive certain testing accommodations, no students are exempted from the assessment or accountability system based on demographics, instructional program, or type of school. Foreign exchange students pursuing an Alabama high school diploma will be included in the assessment program and the accountability system for the schools and LEAs where enrolled.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p>	<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>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>		
<p>Assessment results are reported for all students tested, regardless of the length of time the student has been in the school or LEA. However, for purposes of accountability, a student will be included only if he/she has been enrolled in the school or LEA for a full academic year. LEAs within the state do not operate on a uniform school calendar; however, all LEAs have a beginning date from first of August through mid-August. (See Attachment L for school opening dates for all Alabama LEAs.) All schools in the State will be in session at least two (2) weeks prior to September 1. Therefore, a student is considered to be enrolled in a school or LEA for a full academic year if he/she is enrolled as of September 1 of any school year and remains enrolled as of the first day of the testing. (Note: A student who is suspended is considered to remain enrolled.) The definition will be consistently applied statewide for determining adequate yearly progress and for state accountability purposes. A student that has not been enrolled in a school or LEA for a full academic year will be included at the state level for accountability purposes.</p> <p>An Invitation to Bid (ITB) for collection of student data was issued and awarded. This new data management system will greatly enhance the collection of more reliable data for these purposes.</p>		

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><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>		
<p>The new student data management system (STI), provides current and reliable data that allows the State to determine which students have not attended the school or LEA for a full academic year (see definition of “full academic year” in 2.2). A student attending the same school for a full academic year will be included in determinations for adequate yearly progress for the school. A student attending the same LEA for a full academic year will be included in determinations for adequate yearly progress for the LEA. A student that has not been enrolled in a school or LEA for a full academic year will be included at the state level for accountability purposes.</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.**

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<p>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?</p>	<p>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<sup>[3]</sup> and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>

---

<sup>[3]</sup> 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.

## STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Separate starting points for percent proficient by subject (reading and mathematics) will be established for each grade in Grades 3-8 and Grade 11. Intermediate goals will be established that are equal in magnitude for each grade separately for reading and mathematics. The baseline will be established in 2003-2004 for Grade 4 reading and mathematics, Grade 6 reading and mathematics, Grade 8 reading, and Grade 11 reading and mathematics. The baseline will be established in 2004-2005 for Grade 3 reading and mathematics, Grade 5 reading and mathematics, Grade 7 reading and mathematics, and Grade 8 mathematics. Intermediate goals will be established requiring increases in the percent proficient in 2005-06, 2007-08, 2009-2010, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 for assessments with baselines established in 2003-04. Intermediate goals will be established requiring increases in the percent proficient in 2006-07, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-1014 for assessments with baselines established in 2004-05. This will yield seven equal growth interval requirements. According to this timeline, all students must be proficient (scoring Level III or Level IV) by 2013-2014. This timeline is consistent with the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education on April 8, 2002 (Attachment D). (See Attachment H for growth trajectory model.)

For the proficiency index calculations, students scoring in Levels III (Meets Academic Content Standards) and IV (Exceeds Academic Content Standards) will count as proficient. Students scoring in Level II (Partially Meets Academic Content Standards) will count as .5 toward proficiency. (See Attachment M for November 21, 2005, Memorandum to Chief State School Officers from Secretary Margaret Spellings encouraging states to consider incorporating an index.)

Grades 3-8 and 11 within a school will be combined for adequate yearly progress determinations using the proficiency index. (This proficiency index provides the fairest method of establishing starting points across schools since the schools in Alabama have a wide variety of grade configurations. For example, a middle school, where scores are lowest, would be disadvantaged if required to meet the same starting point as an elementary school.) An example of the reading proficiency index for a hypothetical school with Grades 4 and 5 is shown below:

- Grade 4 annual measurable objective for 2004 = 49% proficient  
Actual percentage of Grade 4 Hispanic students (N=20) proficient = 54%  
Difference = +5%
- Grade 5 annual measurable objective for 2004 = 35% proficient  
Actual percentage of Grade 5 Hispanic students (N=30) proficient = 20%  
Difference = -15%
- Weighting constants (Grade n/Total n): Grade 4 =  $(20/50)=.4$ ; Grade 5 =  $(30/50)=.6$
- Hispanic reading proficiency index =  $.4(+5\%) + .6(-15\%) = (+2\%) + (-9\%) = -7\%$

A proficiency index of zero or higher indicates that the annual measurable objective has been met by the subgroup. The proficiency index in this example shows that the Hispanic subgroup is below the annual measurable objective by 7 percentage points. The 99% confidence interval for  $n=50$  is then applied to determine if the subgroup meets AYP. If a difference of 7% is not significant, then the Hispanic subgroup will be considered to have made AYP.

For an LEA, a proficiency index will be determined separately for elementary (Grades 3-5), middle (Grades 6-8), and high school (Grade 11) using the procedure described above.

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<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

The state accountability system requires that for a public school or LEA to make adequate yearly progress, students in the aggregate and each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State's annual measurable objectives, students in the aggregate and each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in reading and in mathematics, and students in the aggregate must meet the State's requirements for other academic indicators. Students must have an Alabama reading test score to be included for adequate yearly progress in reading and an Alabama mathematics test score to be included for adequate yearly progress in mathematics. A 99% confidence interval will be applied around the proficiency index. A group will be considered to have met the annual measurable objective if the score falls within the confidence interval.

The accountability system will incorporate a uniform averaging procedure. Alabama will determine the proficiency index across all grades within a school and for elementary, middle, and high school grade spans within an LEA to determine adequate yearly progress for the current year. (The percent of students scoring proficient or higher will be based on the number of tested students that were enrolled for a "full academic year.") This will be calculated separately for reading and mathematics. If the annual measurable objective is not met, the proficiency indexes for the most recent three years of test scores, including the current year's scores, will be averaged. The results of this average across years will be used to determine if the annual measurable objective is met. (In 2004, there will be no previous year's data to compare to, and in 2005 there will be only one previous year's data to compare to. In subsequent years, the uniform averaging procedure will include three years of data.) This will increase the reliability of the decisions made for accountability.

If in any particular year, a student subgroup does not meet the annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made adequate yearly progress if the percentage of students in that subgroup who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments decreases by 10% of that percentage from the preceding school year's score; that subgroup shows progress toward or meets one or more of the other academic indicator(s); and that subgroup has at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessments. (Since 2004 will be the baseline year, safe harbor will be phased in as data are available.) This will increase the reliability of the decisions made for accountability.

Adequate yearly progress criteria will be applied to the same subject irrespective of the subgroup. As stated above, a school or LEA must meet all of the following in order to make AYP: annual measurable objectives in reading and mathematics, participation rates in reading and mathematics, and additional academic indicators. However, to be identified for school improvement, a school must miss AYP in the same component for two consecutive years. (Components for AYP are reading [annual measurable objectives and participation rates], mathematics [annual measurable objectives and participation rates], and additional academic indicator.) A school system will be identified in school improvement when it does not make AYP in the same component (reading, mathematics, or additional academic indicators) across all three grade spans (elementary, middle, and high school) for two consecutive years.

This element of the accountability program will be implemented in August 2004, as reflected in the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education on April 8, 2002 (Attachment D). The requirements for the state accountability program will incorporate the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*.

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 20<sup>th</sup> 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

In accordance with the terms of the April 8, 2002, Compliance Agreement between the Alabama State Department of Education and United States Department of Education (Attachment D), the starting points will be established using data from the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years. The State will establish separate statewide starting points in reading and mathematics for each of Grades 3-8 and Grade 11 for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement (Level III and Level IV). The same starting point will apply to all schools and the same starting point will apply to all subgroups. Starting points for Grade 4 reading and mathematics, Grade 6 reading and mathematics, Grade 8 reading, and Grade 11 reading and mathematics will be determined using the spring 2004 testing. Starting points for Grade 3 reading and mathematics, Grade 5 reading and mathematics, Grade 7 reading and mathematics, and Grade 8 mathematics will be determined using the spring 2005 testing.

Each starting point will 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 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level. The exact starting points will be sent to the United States Department of Education in July 2004.

The proficiency index requires the following: (1) separate starting points and growth trajectories for each grade and subject; (2) a comparison of percent proficient for each grade/subject to the annual measurable objective and calculation of a difference score for each grade/subject; (3) a procedure to weight the difference scores based on the number of students in each grade (i.e., a weighted constant); and (4) determination of a proficiency index in each subject by summing across grades the products of the difference scores and the weighted constants. For the proficiency index calculations, students scoring in Levels III (Meets Academic Content Standards) and IV (Exceeds Academic Content Standards) will count as proficient. Students scoring in Level II (Partially Meets Academic Content Standards) will count as .5 toward proficiency.

(The State Board of Education requires that any student receiving an Alabama high school diploma pass the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam* and fulfill requirements regarding required course credits. Passing the test is a requirement to exit high school with a diploma at the end of Grade 12, and students have multiple opportunities to take the test. A pretest is administered at Grade 10 in order to identify potential deficiencies and help students in preparing to take the assessments. However, if a student passes in Grade 10, that student's score is banked for graduation requirements. The assessment is officially administered at the end of Grade 11. Therefore, Grade 11 will be used for making adequate yearly progress decisions for reading and mathematics at the high school level. There are multiple forms of the tests so students do not see the same questions in subsequent administrations.)

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>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>		
<p>The State's annual measurable objectives will be the same percent proficient requirement as the most recent intermediate goal and will 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 at each grade level. The State's annual measurable objectives will ensure that all students meet (or exceed) the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline. The State's annual measurable objectives will be the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The exact annual measurable objectives will be sent to the United States Department of Education in July 2004 and July 2005.</p>		



CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<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"> <li>• The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year.</li> <li>• Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.</li> </ul>	<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>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>		
<p>Separate starting points by subject (reading and mathematics) will be established for each of Grade 3-8 and Grade 11. Intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress will be established that are equal in magnitude. Starting points for Grade 4 reading and mathematics, Grade 6 reading and mathematics, Grade 8 reading, and Grade 11 reading and mathematics will be determined using the spring 2004 testing. Starting points for Grade 3 reading and mathematics, Grade 5 reading and mathematics, Grade 7 reading and mathematics, and Grade 8 mathematics will be determined using the spring 2005 testing. Intermediate goals will be established requiring increases in 2005-06, 2007-08, 2009-2010, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 for assessments with baselines established in 2003-04. Intermediate goals will be established requiring increases in the percent proficient in 2006-07, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-1014 for assessments with baselines established in 2004-05. This will yield seven equal growth interval requirements. According to this timeline, all students must be proficient (scoring Level III or Level IV) by 2013-2014. This timeline is consistent with the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education on April 8, 2002 (Attachment D).</p> <p>The exact intermediate goals will be sent to the United States Department of Education in July 2004 and July 2005.</p>		



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

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
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. <sup>[4]</sup>	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>		
The State accountability system requires annual decisions for each public school and LEA. The state accountability system will include annual adequate yearly progress determinations. These determinations should be made annually prior to the beginning of the school year.		

<sup>[4]</sup> 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.**

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

**STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

The state accountability system requires that adequate yearly progress be made by all the required subgroups provided the subgroup meets the minimum group size requirements. The subgroups include the following:

1. Economically disadvantaged.
2. Major racial/ethnic groups (White not Hispanic, Black not Hispanic, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan native).
3. Students with disabilities.
4. Students with limited English proficiency.

An additional subgroup will be added for the 2005-2006 accountability reporting system as a result of the influx of displaced students from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. These students will be reflected only in the displaced students' subgroup. This subgroup will be reported and counted for participation at the school, system, and State levels. The achievement for this subgroup will be reported, but not included, in determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). (See impact data, Attachment P).

An ITB for collection of student data was issued and awarded. This new data management system will greatly enhance the collection of more reliable data. It is expected that the new system will simplify the collection of the data elements needed for disaggregation by subgroups.

This element will be implemented in August 2004, as reflected in the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education on April 8, 2002 (Attachment D). However, the State Department of Education disaggregated by the required subgroups and required subgroups to meet the interim accountability requirements during the prior two academic school years.

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
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.
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>		
<p>The accountability system will require that all public schools and LEAs be held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress. The State Department of Education will calculate, for all students and for each subgroup, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the percent of students tested who achieve proficient or higher (Level III and Level IV) (See Principle 3.2),</li> <li>2. the participation rate (See Principle 10), and</li> <li>3. the safe harbor provision, where applicable (See Principle 3.2).</li> </ol> <p>In the first two academic years of reporting AYP, the State Department of Education applied the interim accountability criteria to the schools and LEAs in the aggregate and for the following subgroups: economically disadvantaged, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency. (See Attachment E for January 22, 2003, memorandum to City and County Superintendents of Education.)</p>		



CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<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>

**STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

Although students with disabilities identified and receiving special education services may receive certain testing accommodations, no students are exempted from the assessment or accountability system based on demographics, instructional program, or type of school. All special education students are required to participate in statewide assessments by taking either the regular assessments (with or without accommodations) or the *Alabama Alternate Assessment*. Scores for students taking the *Alabama Alternate Assessment* are reported in four levels of academic achievement as are the scores for other assessments (three levels for the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam*).

The scores for special education students who take the *Alabama Alternate Assessment* will be included in the accountability system. However, the State has established a cap that will allow the scores of no more than one percent of all students in the grades being assessed to be counted as proficient and advanced using the *Alabama Alternate Assessment* for accountability purposes for the LEA and the State. Level I will be assigned as the score for any students over the allowed one percent in an LEA or the State. The State Department of Education will implement this in accordance with the final regulations dated December 9, 2003 (34 CFR Part 200). The State Department of Education reserves the right to seek an exception from the Secretary of Education in order to exceed the 1.0 percent cap.

The U.S. Department of Education is offering interim flexibility options for an additional 2%. ~~until the final regulations are released.~~ The State will continue to **is requesting to continue to utilize Interim Option I for the 2007/2008 school year per the November 19, 2007 letter to Chief State School Officers from Kerri L. Briggs.** This option will allow the State to adjust the proficiency index for this group. School and LEA reports will reflect that this interim option was used in AYP calculations. (See Attachment N dated December 14, 2005, Memorandum to States from Margaret Spellings.) The State will use the following steps, which were outlined by Secretary Spellings in her December 14, 2005 memo, when utilizing this option:

1. Calculate what 2.0 percent of the total number of students assessed within the state equates to solely within the SWD subgroup by dividing 2.0 by the percentage of students who have disabilities. This number, which will be a constant for every school, will be the basis for flexibility in school AYP determinations.
2. Identify all schools that did not make AYP solely on the basis of the SWD subgroup and the proficiency rate of those students in each school.
3. Calculate the adjusted percent proficient for each school's SWD subgroup. This adjustment is equal to the sum of the actual percent of proficient scores of this subgroup plus the proxy percent calculated in step 1 above.
4. Compare this adjusted percent proficient for each school identified in step 2 to the state's annual measurable objective (AMO). This comparison must be conducted without the use of confidence intervals or other statistical treatments.
  - a. If the adjusted proficiency rate for the school's SWD subgroup meets or exceeds the state's AMO, the school may be considered to have made AYP for the 2005-06 school year.
  - b. If the adjusted proficiency rate for the school's SWD subgroup does not meet or exceed the state's AMO, the school did not make AYP for the 2005-06 school year.
5. This process should be followed for reading and mathematics separately and also repeated at the district level, as needed.
6. The actual percent proficient must be reported to parents and the public; the state may also report the adjusted percent proficient.

Alabama recently was awarded funding for the Alabama General Supervision Enhancement Grant (AL-GSEG), CFDA Number 84.373X by the U.S. Department of Education to:

- o Investigate the characteristics of students with disabilities in order to identify students who may qualify for an Alternate Assessment based on Modified Achievement Standards.
- o Strengthen links among content standards, instruction, and assessment to help all students progress toward grade-level achievement.
- o Develop recommendations for developing a new assessment or modifying an existing assessment appropriate for students with persistent academic difficulties identified in Goal 1, so that all students are provided opportunities to demonstrate what they know and are able to do related to state grade-level content standards.
- o Build capacity through ongoing technical assistance, monitoring activities, and opportunities for feedback.

(See Attachment R for copy of grant award notification and grant timeline.)

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<p>5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>



## STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The accountability system includes students with limited English proficiency. All students with limited English proficiency, with the exception listed below, are required to participate in statewide assessments, with or without accommodations, regardless of their level of English language proficiency or the length of time the student has been in school. (See Attachment E for January 22, 2003, memorandum to City and County Superintendents of Education.) Limited English proficient students are included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress.

LEP students, during their first ~~academic year of enrollment~~ **twelve months** in U. S. schools will not be required to participate in the reading assessment. However, if these students participate, their scores will not be included in accountability determinations for reading. For purposes of participation in the assessment program, LEP students, during their first ~~academic year of enrollment~~ **twelve months** in U. S. schools, will use the English language proficiency assessment if they do not participate in the reading assessment. LEP students, during their first ~~academic year of enrollment~~ **twelve months** in U. S. schools, must take the mathematics assessment, but their scores will not be included in accountability determinations for mathematics. These students taking the mathematics assessment will be counted in participation for mathematics.

For purposes of making AYP determinations, the scores of former LEP students will count in the LEP subgroup for two years after these students are no longer considered to be LEP under the state's definition of LEP. However, these students will not be included when determining whether the LEP subgroups satisfy the minimum number for subgroup AYP accountability.

All students classified and receiving services as limited English proficient students will be included as such for accountability purposes. Alabama's definition of limited-English proficient students is provided in Attachment I.

Additionally, each LEP student must be assessed annually during April or May to ascertain his/her level of English language proficiency. During 2003-2004, either the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) or the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) was used for determining a student's level of English language proficiency. However, beginning in 2004-2005, LEAs will use the English language proficiency test, ACCESS for ELLs, ~~which is currently under development by the Wisconsin, Illinois, Delaware, and Arkansas Consortium (WIDA) project of which Alabama is a participant.~~

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING 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?	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.<sup>[5]</sup></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>

**STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

The accountability system defines 40 as the minimum number of students required for accountability purposes that will result in data that are statistically reliable. A minimum N of 40 is necessary in order to ensure reliability due to multiple sources of error (test-retest and differences in students included each year) in adequate yearly progress determinations.

These required numbers will apply to all schools and LEAs in the aggregate and by subgroup. If the number of students in a subgroup is below 40 the minimum N, that subgroup's score will not apply to the school's adequate yearly progress determination, but the LEA will be held accountable for that subgroup if the minimum N of 40 is reached at the LEA level. If each subgroup in a school or LEA is below the minimum N of 40, the aggregate (all students) indicator for the school or LEA will be applied in determining AYP for the school or LEA.

If a school is so small that it does not meet the minimum requirement of 40 in the **aggregate** and, thus, would not be held accountable according to the established criteria in Principle 3, the school will be given the adequate yearly progress determination based on the N-count they do have, but the designated status will include a notation indicating that the school did not meet the minimum N requirement of 40. (Approximately 70 schools currently do not meet the minimum requirement of 40.)

As indicated in Principle 5.6, scores will not be reported for groups less than 10. In addition, the scores for groups less than 10 will not apply to adequate yearly progress determinations. Scores, however, will be reported for groups with N-sizes of 10 through 40 but the scores will not apply to adequate yearly progress determinations, except as indicated above for small schools that do not meet the minimum requirement of 40 in the aggregate. A footnote for the score will indicate that the school or LEA did not meet the minimum 40-student requirement for state accountability purposes.

<sup>[5]</sup> The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.



<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
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. <sup>[6]</sup>	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>		
<p>The accountability system defines 10 as the minimum number of students required in a subgroup for reporting purposes that will not reveal personally identifiable information. This required number will apply to all schools and LEAs in the aggregate and by subgroup. If the number of students in a subgroup in a school or LEA is below 10, that subgroup score will not be reported.</p>		

<sup>[6]</sup> 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.**

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
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.<sup>[7]</sup></p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	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**

The accountability system is based primarily on academic assessments. Reading and mathematics, based on the state's content standards, will be assessed in Grades 3 through 8 and in Grade 11 as reflected in the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education (Attachment D). The State Department of Education will calculate for subgroups, schools, and LEAs the percent of tested students who achieve the proficient level or higher, the participation rates, and invoke the safe harbor provision, where applicable, for determining if the school or LEA meets the annual measurable objectives.

Attendance rate will be used in the elementary and middle schools and graduation rate will be used in the high schools as the additional academic indicator. Schools and LEAs will be considered to have made adequate yearly progress on the additional indicators if they make improvement toward the goal or meet the goal.

On June 26, 2003, the State Board of Education adopted a resolution regarding accountability for schools and school systems establishing a state accountability program to become effective with the 2003-2004 school year. (See Attachment C.) This accountability program is consistent with the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education (Attachment D). The requirements for the state accountability program will incorporate the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*.

*In compliance with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), Alabama will administer science assessments in Grades 5, 7, and 11 beginning in spring 2008. These assessments are based on state-approved and NCLB peer review-approved content standards.*

<sup>[7]</sup> 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 definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p>	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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,</li> <li>• Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and</li> <li>• Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer.</li> </ul> <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause<sup>[8]</sup> to make AYP.</p>	<p>State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.</p>

<sup>[8]</sup> See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)



## STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The accountability system includes a definition of “graduation rate” and graduation rate is included in the adequate yearly progress definition for public high schools. A graduate is defined as a student who completes state-developed graduation requirements for a diploma (Alabama High School Diploma, Alabama Occupational Diploma, and Alternate Adult High School Diploma). (Note: In order to receive an Alternate Adult High School Diploma, a student must earn the same required credits as for the Alabama High School Diploma and must pass the GED. These students must have continued to prepare for and attempt to pass the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam* that is required for the Alabama High School Diploma. The required coursework for the Alabama Occupational Diploma is aligned with the state courses of study and includes work components through Career/Technical Education. However, some students take the regular coursework for meeting graduation requirements. The reading content standards for this diploma are the same as for the regular diploma. The State Department of Education submitted further evidence of the alignment of the mathematics course for this diploma with the regular mathematics course requirements. Beginning in 2004, students will be required to take the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam*, but passing the exam is not a requirement for the Alabama Occupational Diploma.) Students receiving non standards-based certificates or GED will not be included as graduates when calculating graduation rates. Graduation rate will be included (in the aggregate) for adequate yearly progress, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the safe harbor clause to make adequate yearly progress determinations. (Note that the projected 4-year dropout rate will be used for the additional academic indicator and safe harbor in lieu of graduation rate until the data are available allowing disaggregation using the algorithm described below.)

The goal for graduation rate is 90% as recommended by the National Education Goals Panel. Schools and LEAs will be considered to have made adequate yearly progress on the graduation rate if they make improvement toward the goal or meet the goal. Graduation rate will be an estimated cohort graduation rate and will be calculated according to the following algorithm:

$$GR_i = \frac{G_i + G_s}{G_i + G_s + E_i + D_i + D_{(i-1)} + D_{(i-2)} + D_{(i-3)}} \times 100$$

Where:  $GR_i$  is the graduation rate for a given year ( $i$ ) between 2003 and 2014.  
 $G_i$  is the number of students achieving a high school diploma for year  $i$ .  
 $G_s$  is the number of students achieving a high school diploma during the summer of year  $i$ .  
 $E_i$  is the number of students receiving exit document other than high school diploma for year  $i$ .  
 $D_i$  is the number of dropouts in grade 12 for year  $i$ .  
 $D_{(i-1)}$  is the number of dropouts in grade 11 for the first previous year ( $i - 1$ ).  
 $D_{(i-2)}$  is the number of dropouts in grade 10 for the second previous year ( $i - 2$ ).  
 $D_{(i-3)}$  is the number of dropouts in grade 9 for the third previous year ( $i - 3$ ).



As an example, graduation rate will be reported in spring 2005 and calculated as follows:

{[number of FY2004 graduates plus summer 2004 graduates (reported in FY2005)] **divided by** [number of FY2004 graduates plus summer 2004 graduates (reported in FY2005) plus number of Grade 12 students receiving exit document other than high school diploma in FY2004 (e.g., graduation certificates) plus number of Grade 12 dropouts in FY2004 plus number of Grade 11 dropouts in FY2003 plus number of Grade 10 dropouts in FY2002 plus number of Grade 9 dropouts in FY2001]} **times** 100.

Alabama will report graduation rate as the additional academic indicator for high school beginning in the 2005-2006 school year. Since graduation rate could not be calculated or reported previously, progress toward the goal can not be shown. Therefore, for this transitional year (2005-2006), schools or LEAs which do not meet the graduation rate goal will be considered to have met AYP for the additional academic indicator if they meet the drop-out goal or make improvement toward it. The drop-out rate will also be used during this transitional year for safe harbor.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>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?</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.<sup>[9]</sup></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>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>		
<p>Attendance rate will be the additional academic indicator for both the elementary and middle schools. Attendance rate will be calculated based on the same funding schedule and timelines established by the Alabama legislature. Attendance rate will be calculated as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">( the number of days present / number of days enrolled ) X 100.</p> <p>The goal for attendance is 95% which is consistent with the 95% participation rate required by <i>No Child Left Behind</i>.</p> <p>Schools and LEAs will be considered to have made adequate yearly progress on the additional indicator if they make improvement toward the goal or meet the goal. The additional academic indicator will be included (for the aggregate) for adequate yearly progress, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the safe harbor clause to make adequate yearly progress.</p>		

<sup>[9]</sup> NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	<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>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>		
<p>Attendance data are currently collected at the State level from the LEAs at the individual student level through required reports to the State Department of Education. These data are edited and tested against historical trends where data are questionable in order to ensure that results are accurate.</p> <p>An ITB for collection of student data has been issued and awarded. This new data management system will enhance the collection of more reliable data for calculating both student attendance rate and graduation rate.</p>		



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

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<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.<sup>[10]</sup></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><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>		
<p>The accountability system requires adequate yearly progress determinations separately for reading and mathematics for each school, LEA, and student subgroup.</p>		

---

<sup>[10]</sup> 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.**

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<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>

## STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

An accountability program must begin with valid and reliable assessments. The State Department of Education implements quality control measures during every aspect of the assessment program. It begins with development of the assessments (blueprints, bias and content reviews, field testing, statistical analyses, and validity and reliability studies), includes extensive training for all personnel involved in test administration, continues with the administration (random on-site monitoring of the assessment in selected schools, checks of answer keys, item analyses and rater reliability checks during scoring), and ends with reporting the results (hand scoring of individual reports, checking reports for pilot system and its schools) prior to release of results. Because students may take the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam* at varying grade levels and adequate yearly progress determinations are based on Grade 11, a process is in place to report cumulative results at the end of Grade 11. This process includes verification by the LEAs that students' scores, regardless of when the assessment is taken, match the students' enrollment data in Grade 11.

The reliability of the accountability system will be enhanced by the following:

1. use of the same criteria for all schools and LEAs,
2. requiring 95% participation rate for students in the aggregate and for subgroups,
3. use of valid and reliable assessments and other academic indicators,
4. use of uniform averaging across years (comparing the average to the most recent year's test results),
5. use of proficiency index across grades,
6. use of confidence intervals,
7. use of the safe harbor provision,
8. use of minimum "N" requirements, and
9. requiring adequate yearly progress for the same subject.

The State Department of Education's Technical Advisory Committee, in existence since 1983, will assist the State Department of Education in monitoring the reliability of adequate yearly progress decisions as data are available for the new system. Specifically, the Technical Advisory Committee will assist the Department of Education to determine if the classification decisions made are consistent with the state accountability system.

The criteria for such decisions should meet professional standards and practices. The criteria will be reviewed periodically by the Technical Advisory Committee to ensure that the criteria are still appropriate. [Please note that the newly developed assessments will not be ready for administration until the spring of 2004 and spring of 2005 as reflected in the Compliance Agreement entered into by the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education on April 8, 2002 (Attachment D).]



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 accountability system will include an appeals process for schools and LEAs that includes the following:

1. Before identifying a school or LEA for improvement, the LEA, through an appeals process, will be given an opportunity to review the data on which the State Department of Education based the proposed identification. A school or LEA has ten (10) business days after notification of its proposed identification to submit written evidence through the local superintendent indicating good and just cause for review. An appeal may be based upon circumstances such as epidemics or natural disasters. Evidence supporting the re-identification must detail a convincing case for the circumstance(s) beyond the school's or LEA's control. Circumstances within the school's or LEA's control (such as inaccurate attendance data) will not serve as sufficient cause for review. Appeals based on circumstances not outlined above will be handled on a case-by-case basis by the State Department of Education.
2. Two copies of the written evidence signed by the LEA superintendent must be presented to the State Superintendent of Education in Montgomery.
3. The State Department of Education will review the school's or LEA's written evidence and will make a judgment about re-classification within ten (10) business days of receipt of evidence or as soon as possible. The State Department of Education will submit its finding to the local superintendent after the review process. Final determinations of status will be made public immediately following the final determination of status (approximately the middle of August).

The State's Technical Advisory Committee will periodically review the accountability program in order to ensure its validity. The Technical Advisory Committee will ask the following questions:

1. Are the components of the system still aligned to the goals and purposes of the accountability system?
2. Are they working in harmony to help the system accomplish these goals and purposes?
3. Is the system accomplishing what was intended (and not accomplishing what was not intended)?

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.<sup>[11]</sup></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>

<sup>[11]</sup> 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.



## STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The newly-developed assessments for reading and mathematics for Grades 4, 6, and 8 will be administered in spring 2004. The spring 2004 data will be used to establish the baseline for reading and mathematics for Grades 4, 6, and 11 and for reading in Grade 8 as reflected in the Compliance Agreement entered into between the Alabama State Department of Education and the United States Department of Education (Attachment D). The reading and mathematics assessments for Grades 3, 5, and 7 and mathematics for Grade 8 will be administered in the spring of 2005 and will be included in the calculations for adequate yearly progress.

The procedure for determining the proficiency index makes it easy to add assessments into the AYP model while maintaining the required reliability and validity. The procedure is as follows:

- Calculation of separate starting points and growth trajectories for each grade and subject;
- Comparison of percent proficient on each assessment to the annual measurable objective and the calculation of a difference score for each;
- A procedure to weight the difference scores based on the number of students in each grade (i.e., a weighted constant); and,
- Computation of a proficiency index for each subject that allows data from different assessments to be weighted, ensuring that each student counts equally within the subgroup's proficiency index.

In the future, if standards for any existing assessments are changed, a new baseline and growth trajectory will be established using the new cut scores. [The scores required for passing the *Alabama High School Graduation Exam* will be reviewed every three years by the State Board of Education to determine if they should be raised as directed in a June 27, 2001, State Board of Education resolution. (See [www.alsde.edu/html/boe\\_resolutions2.asp](http://www.alsde.edu/html/boe_resolutions2.asp).) Consideration should be given to the implications for *No Child Left Behind* when making the determination to raise passing scores. Annual yearly progress requirements of *No Child Left Behind* will increase the rigor of the requirements. An increase in the required passing scores would result in the requirement of 100% proficiency with the higher requirements in a shorter period of time.]

The requirements for adequate yearly progress will apply to any new public schools and LEAs. For new schools, the first full year in existence will be their first year of accountability determination. The new school will be considered to have made adequate yearly progress if they meet the annual measurable objective for that first year of accountability. In subsequent years, uniform averaging and safe harbor will be phased in to include data as available.

The Technical Advisory Committee will be convened as needed to consider unforeseen issues and challenges regarding the state accountability system.



**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 NOT 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><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>		
<p>The accountability system requires that schools and LEAs have at least 95 percent participation in the assessments if the group size is 40 or more. The 95 percent requirement allows very little consideration for extenuating circumstances when small groups of students are involved. No more than one student can miss the assessment if the group size requirement is less than 40.</p> <p>Participation rates will be calculated as follows: Number of students with test results divided by number of students enrolled on the first day of the state testing window. This procedure will apply to subgroups and in the aggregate for all public schools and LEAs. Students participating in the <i>Alabama Alternate Assessment</i> will be included in the state accountability system in accordance with the final parameters defined by federal statute and regulations. (See Principle 5.3.) Limited English Proficient students will be included in the state accountability system in accordance with Principle 5.4. Students with tests that have been invalidated will be considered as not testing for the purposes of calculating the participation rate.</p> <p>If the participation rates are not met, the accountability system will incorporate a uniform averaging procedure for participation rates. The participation rates for the most recent three years of testing, including the current year's testing, will be averaged. The results of this average across years will be used to determine if the participation rates are met. (In 2005, there will be only one previous year's data to compare to. In subsequent years, the uniform averaging procedure will include three years of data.)</p> <p>An ITB for collection of student data has been issued and awarded. This new data management system will greatly enhance the collection of more reliable data for calculation of participation rates.</p>		

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.
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>		
<p>Schools, LEAs, and subgroups must have at least a 95 percent participation rate in order to meet the adequate yearly progress requirement for participation. The minimum group size for such calculations is 40. A group size smaller than 40 students would only allow for one student to be absent and still meet the 95 percent requirement. (This minimum N is consistent with the minimum requirement of 40 established for adequate yearly progress determinations.) Schools, LEAs, and subgroups that do not meet the 95 percent participation rate do not meet the adequate yearly progress requirement. (Students must have an Alabama reading test score to be included for participation in reading and an Alabama mathematics test score to be included for participation in mathematics.)</p> <p>If a school is so small that it does not meet the minimum requirement of 40 in the <b>aggregate</b> and, thus, would not be held accountable according to the established criteria in Principle 10.1, the school will be required to test at least two less than the enrollment (N-2) in order to meet the participation rate.</p>		