

# Minnesota 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)

**DUE: JANUARY 31, 2003**  
**Updated: February 14, 2008**



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

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

Status	State Accountability System Element	
<b>Principle 1: All Schools</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> .
W	1.6	Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
<b>Principle 2: All Students</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>Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations</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>Principle 4: Annual Decisions</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

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### **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**

**Principle I:** A single statewide accountability system applied to all schools and LEAs.

### **1.1. How does the state accountability system include every public school and LEA in the state?**

Minnesota is in a period of transition with respect to the adoption of a new and more rigorous set of standards and accountability system. The processes outlined in this document reflect such a transition; components will be phased out as the new system is implemented. Even during this transition period, Minnesota will have a single statewide accountability system that will meet the intent of both state and federal statutes. This system will report the performance of all public schools and districts based on test scores from assessments aligned to state standards.

#### **All Schools and Districts**

Minnesota statute defines public schools as any school with building, equipment, courses of study, class schedules, enrollment of pupils ordinarily in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 or any portion thereof, and staff meeting the standards established by the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Education.

Elementary school enrollment of pupils ordinarily is in pre-kindergarten through grade 6 or any portion thereof. Middle school enrollment is defined as any school other than a secondary school giving an approved course of study in a minimum of three consecutive grades above 4<sup>th</sup> but below 10<sup>th</sup>. Secondary school is any school with enrollment of pupils ordinarily in grades 7 through 12 or any portion thereof.

Minnesota has numerous school configurations to accommodate the needs and choices of students and their parents. Schools are classified according to type of program delivered and the specific student population served. Test results are reported for all students enrolled during the testing window. In the case where students come from a variety of resident districts because of a specialized program, the results for those students are included in the host school also in the district that hosts the program.

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

All public schools are included in the accountability system. This includes:

- Schools in independent districts
- Special districts and schools
- Charter schools
- Secondary facilities coops
- State schools for the blind and deaf/hard hearing, school for the arts
- Secondary vocational schools
- Area learning centers

Schools with grade configurations not including grade levels that are tested with the state assessment system will be included by assigning AYP status to and from feeder schools. In the case of schools with only grades K-2, AYP determinations made for the grades three and above buildings will also apply to the feeder school building.

When such assignment is not possible, schools' AYP status will be "Pending" until the school has or has not proven its adequate yearly progress by means of curriculum alignment and standardized test results

For Accountability purposes, School District (or LEA) is under the authority of the commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Education per 127A.05, Subd. 3 and as defined in Minnesota Statute 120A.05 (Subdivision 8, 10, 14): District. "District" means a school district.

Independent district. "Independent district" means any school district validly created and existing as an independent, consolidated, joint independent, county or a ten or more township district as of July 1, 1957, or pursuant to the Education Code.

Special district. "Special district" means a district established by a charter granted by the legislature or by a home rule charter including any district designated a special independent school district by the legislature.

AYP results are based on all students enrolled in all of the schools served by a district.

The district types are listed below:

- 01 - Independent
- 03 - Special (Minneapolis #1 and South St. Paul #6)
- 06 - Intermediate (Hennepin Technical #287, Northeast Metropolitan #916 and Dakota County #917)
- 07 - Charter/Outcome-Based School
- 34 - Tribal Contract/Grant
- 35 - Private Alternative District
- 50 - Miscellaneous Cooperative
- 51 - Secondary Vocational Cooperative

## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

- 52 - Special Education Cooperative
- 53 - Vocational and Special Education Cooperative
- 61 - Education District
- 62 - Cooperative Secondary Facilities District, Deseg School Districts
- 70 - State Academies for the Deaf/Blind, School for the Arts

### **Documentation**

- 12. Definition of a Public School and District for Accountability Purposes
- 15. MARSS Minnesota Automatic Reporting System
- 19. Minnesota Statute 120B.30 Statewide Testing and Reporting System
- 33. C4- State Evidence and State Activities for Meeting Requirements

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making AYP Determinations?

Minnesota will adopt a single statewide accountability system for all public schools and districts based on results from the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments-Series II (MCA-II). The MCA-II are state developed criterion referenced assessments aligned to the new state academic content standards. These tests replace the MCAs which were aligned to the previous set of standards. Results on the MCA-II are reported in four different achievement levels:

- Level 1- Does Not Meet the Standards
- Level 2- Partially Meets the Standards
- Level 3- Meets the Standards
- Level 4- Exceeds the Standards

The goal of the AYP system is to have all students scoring at or above Level 3 by 2013-14. Level 3 represents solid grade level work on all assessments.

Performance baselines will be set for grades 3-8 and high school using data from the 2005-06 assessments.

AYP progress determinations will be made on the basis of performance index scores and annual measurable objectives for student achievement as defined in federal statute. All schools are expected to show improvement at a rate that will result in 100 percent of the students meeting state expectations in reading and mathematics by 2013-14.

The performance index will be used to determine whether schools, districts and the state are meeting annual measurable objectives. Schools are awarded one full index point for each student who scores at or above Level 3. One-half index point is awarded for students who score within level 2. No index points are awarded for students who score within Level 1. Annual measurable objectives are expressed as index targets. Students took the MCA-II for the first time in school year 2005-2006. Therefore, new index targets will be generated in 2006 and then held constant for the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years. Index targets will be increased annually in equal increments beginning in 2007-08. All schools must reach the goal of 100 index points by the year 2013-14.

Minnesota will incorporate an additional growth calculation, subject to approval by the USDOE, once grades three through eight reading and mathematics assessments have been implemented for at least two years.

#### **Documentation**

- 6. AYP Performance Index Overview
- 10. AYP Technical Paper Number 4: Index Basis for Measuring AYP Goals
- 16. Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment Achievement Level Descriptors
- 33. C4- State Evidence and State Activities for Meeting Requirements

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 1.3 Does the state have at a minimum a definition of basic, proficient and advanced student achievement levels in reading and mathematics?

Prior to the 2005-2006 school year, Minnesota's statewide assessments were aligned to the previous reading and mathematics standards. In 2003, the State Legislature approved new academic content standards in reading and mathematics. The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA-II) given for the first time in 2005-2006, are aligned to these new set of standards. At the present time, the Minnesota assessment system includes the following: The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA-II) in reading and mathematics, the Test of Emerging Academic English (TEAE) for LEP students and the Alternate Assessment for students with disabilities.

#### **MCA Achievement Levels**

Results on the MCAs were reported in five achievement levels.

Results on the MCA-II are currently reported in four achievement levels: Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4 as described below. These are generic descriptions that define achievement relative to the appropriate grade level. Note: these descriptions may change as the assessment system is enhanced to reflect new more rigorous grade specific standards.

- Level 1 scores indicate that the student has significant gaps in the knowledge and skills necessary for satisfactory grade level work. This level corresponds to "below basic" level work for NCLB requirements.
- Scores in Level 2 represent partial knowledge and skills required for successful grade level achievement. This level corresponds to a "basic" level of achievement for NCLB.
- A score at or above Level 3 (scale score 1420-1499) represents state expectations for achievement of all students. Students who score at Level 3 are working successfully on grade-level material. This level corresponds to a "proficient" level of achievement for NCLB.
- Scores in Level 4 represent successful work with challenging, above grade level material. This level corresponds to an "advanced" level of achievement for NCLB.

\* New level descriptions will be available July 25, 2006.

#### **TEAE Achievement Levels**

For state accountability purposes, all LEP students currently take the MCA-II with language accommodations. Results from the reading section of the Test of Emerging Academic English (TEAE) will be used in the state accountability system. This alignment



## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

study is fully described in appendix 34. (See sections 2.1 and 5.4 for a further discussion of the TEAE)

The TEAE is a standards-based assessment aligned to the Minnesota's grade level expectations in reading that provides information about LEP students' progress towards those grade level expectations. This test is given annually to LEP students in grades three through twelve. Scores are reported in five achievement levels.

The state is conducted a formal alignment study to validate the relationship between the TEAE and the new English/reading standards. The goal of this study was to determine the feasibility of relying on the TEAE so LEP students do not have to take the reading MCA-II in addition to the reading TEAE since both measure the same grade specific expectations.

Minnesota uses the reading TEAE to measure the reading achievement of LEP students for school accountability purposes. These scores will generate index points and be included in the AYP calculations.

### Alternate Assessment Achievement Levels

The Minnesota Alternate Assessments are provided for special education students who are severely cognitively impaired. IEP teams may direct schools to administer an alternate academic assessment or an alternate functional assessment based on the overlap of student's daily curriculum with the assessment tool. The academic assessment evaluates academic skills for students who have goals in the content area but are not able to participate in the MCA-II. The functional assessment evaluates daily living skills. Both forms of the alternate assessment are observational checklists completed by the student's teacher.

A standard setting process using Modified Angof methodology will be used this spring to set four achievement levels corresponding to the achievement levels on the MCA-II. These scores will generate index points and be included in the AYP calculations.

Alternate assessments are scored on a seven-point scale. The chart below illustrates the proposal for how alternate assessment scores will be used to generate index points. Minnesota will limit the percentage of students who are allowed to generate index points counting as proficient in the state accountability system based on results from the alternate assessment to one percent of the total test taking population at the district or state level as outlined in the December 9, 2003 final regulations.

	Awareness		Understanding			Application	
Alternate Assessment Scores	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
MCA-II Achievement Levels	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4

This proposal will be evaluated this spring during the standard setting process. Minnesota is planning to develop student centered alternate assessments to provide more reliable information regarding student performance.

## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

### **Documentation**

16. Minnesota Comprehensive Achievement Level Descriptors
20. Minnesota Test of Emerging Academic English Test Specifications
21. Minnesota Test of Emerging Academic English Alignment Study
32. The 2003 Alternate Assessment Process
34. Proposed Alignment Study of Minnesota's Grade Specific Expectations for Reading with the TEAE and the MCA-II

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?

#### **Timing of Accountability and Assessment Reporting**

Minnesota recognizes the need to release AYP results in time for LEAs to implement required provisions before the beginning of the next academic school year. As such, testing dates will be scheduled in early May. Minnesota assessment contracts require that results be ready no later than 42 days following the administration of assessments.

#### **Review of Results**

Minnesota has a system for districts to review and correct student information prior to the release of final AYP status. This system includes two key components.

First, schools and districts are allowed to review the demographics and test participation information 20 days after the close of the test administration window. Corrections to student identification information, demographic information or test participation information are permitted within this first review window. Superintendents are required to signoff on the accuracy of this data. Once this signoff is received the state proceeds to preliminary AYP calculations. This preliminary review does not include student scores.

The second key review component occurs at the same time as the release of the test scores. Preliminary, confidential AYP results are scheduled for annual release on June 30. This review includes student test scores and preliminary AYP calculations. Schools have thirty days to appeal their preliminary status based on statistical error or substantive reasons such as a one-time significant change in the student population, a natural disaster or other circumstances that render the assessments invalid.

#### **Annual School and District Identification**

Final AYP results are scheduled for annual release on July 30 following the thirty-day appeal window. July 30 results are final for all schools unless there is a pending appeal. Schools and districts then have thirty days to notify parents about their options for school choice and supplemental services before the start of school on September 1.

Due to the creation of new academic standards and assessments the annual school and district identification for the 2006 AYP determination will be slightly different. On August 15, 2006 a preliminary release of AYP and assessment data will be made to schools and districts; at this time schools and districts will have the ability to verify data. On September 1, 2006 preliminary AYP and report card data will be released to the public. Schools and districts will have an additional 15 days to verify data and file appeals. Final AYP data will be released to the public on November 15, 2006.

Schools and districts that are currently in any of the AYP consequence stages must continue being in that stage until the final publication of data on November 15, 2006. Schools and districts that move into or further along the AYP consequences must act on preliminary data and begin the improvement process including: parent notification,

## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

mandated set-asides, and the appropriate consequence. Please refer to document 32 for specific details on the levels of consequence that schools and districts will need to implement using preliminary data.

### **Capacity to Implement the AYP System**

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) is responsible for the creation of the review process for verification of student demographics and test participation results. MDE has created a secure web application, which is updated annually, to allow schools and districts to review preliminary results and develop a process to post final AYP information.

### **School Choice and Supplemental Services**

During school year 2002-2003, Minnesota did not have any low performing schools in Year 2 consequences. All low performing schools offered school choice during this current school year and based on the results from the 2002-03 MCA-II some will be required to offer supplemental services in the 2003-04 school. An application packet for supplemental service providers is being developed for release to potential vendors. Interested vendors may apply for inclusion on a state list of approved providers. Based on state developed criteria, Minnesota will approve a list of providers for supplemental services. The state will update this list annually and may open additional windows for submissions based upon the needs of students and districts.

The state approved list of supplemental service providers will be available by June 1 each year. This will allow schools to begin making arrangements for supplemental services during the thirty-day appeal window if based on preliminary results they suspect that they may be required to provide these options for students.

Minnesota has championed parental choice through the Postsecondary Enrollment Options Act enacted in 1985 and the Open Enrollment Act enacted in 1986. Open enrollment enables students and their parents the choice to enroll in any district throughout the state with approval from the resident and non-resident districts. In addition, the State's two largest districts, Minneapolis and St. Paul, have a history of providing parents of resident students with numerous choices through magnet schools. Each spring, both districts host fairs for the purpose of enabling schools in the districts, as well as charter schools within the district boundaries, the opportunity to share information with parents and students about the numerous choices available to them. Choice is not a new concept to Minnesota. Therefore, the provisions under NCLB allowing parents the choice of transferring to a school that made AYP have not had the impact in Minnesota that it has in other states.

Because Minnesota has had a long standing practice of offering choice to parents and students, MDE encourages schools identified for School Improvement after not making AYP for two consecutive years to not only offer choice but to also offer supplemental services.

## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

### **Documentation**

2. Appeals Process
3. Application Form for Supplemental Services
23. No Child Left Behind Process Model
31. Testing Schedules
32. Timelines for Reporting Decision for 2005-2006 Only

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 1.5 Does the state accountability system produce an annual state report card?

#### **Public Information**

Currently, Minnesota has a school improvement web site that provides sophisticated data analysis options for all schools and districts in the state. A report card component has been added to this site that includes all of the required data elements in a single section.

#### **Information in the Aggregate**

The report card will contain two-year trend scores in each grade and subject for all of the required elements that are currently supported by state collection systems at the school, district and state levels including: the five categories of race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, status as economically disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged versus non-disadvantaged and disability status versus non-disability status. Aggregate results are based on all students at the school, district and state level.

#### **Achievement Comparisons**

Scores for all groups will be reported to provide a comparison between the actual achievement level and the state's annual measurable objectives.

#### **Test Participation**

Participation will be reported for all groups, and the numbers of students who are not tested will be reported in disaggregated categories.

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### Additional Indicators

Additionally, aggregate information will be included on the graduation rate and attendance. Both attendance and graduation rates will be disaggregated for use in the safe harbor calculations as well as for reporting on the state report card.

### Professional Qualifications of Teachers

Professional qualifications of teachers, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency credentials, and the percentage of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate, and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools.

### Report Card

During the past two years, Minnesota has issued its report card in conjunction with the State Fair. Parents and the public have the opportunity to visit the Education Building and access the report card for the school their child attends. Staff from the Department is available during the entire time to answer questions. On opening day, the Governor and Commissioner hold a press conference to announce the availability of the report card.

### 1.6 How does the state accountability system include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?

#### Statewide Accountability System

Minnesota is currently developing a statewide accountability system that is consistent with state and federal legislative requirements to identify both high and low performing schools and districts. This system will apply to all public schools and districts in the state regardless of their Title I status.

All schools in the state will be rated in five different areas using a four star system.

- **Academic Achievement**  
Schools will be rated on academic achievement in the following areas:  
The percent of students who are proficient at each grade level in reading and mathematics as compared to the state averages; academic growth based on improvements in state test scores and the NCLB definition of adequate yearly progress. Results will be shown for disaggregated groups. To be awarded the top rating schools must show progress over time with all groups of students.
- **Academic Opportunity**  
Schools will be evaluated based on the depth and breadth of academic opportunity offered to students including the number of advanced courses offered such as AP and IB and gifted and talented opportunities.
- **School Safety**  
The four-star system will be used to rate all schools in the state on safety. This

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

rating will be based on the number and type of disciplinary incidents reported each year, the persistently dangerous school rating defined in Title IV and the number of suspensions and expulsions.

- **Student Participation**

Student participation will be evaluated based on the attendance and graduation rates as well as the number of dropouts. All components will be evaluated over time.

- **Teacher Quality**

The quality of the teaching staff will be reported based on the number of teachers, the years of experience, level of preparation and advanced degrees earned and the number of paraprofessionals and their level of preparation

- **Tax Payers Report**

School financial situations will be reported based on the sources of district general operating revenues, the district use of general operating funds, amount of long term debt the current year's revenues and expenditures, and, the tax rates and amounts paid.

### **Rewards and Sanctions**

This five star rating system will be incorporated into the information displayed on the State report card that outlines the performance of all schools and districts in the state. Schools with high ratings will be rewarded with public commendations.

The federally required sanctions will apply only to Title I schools. The state process will require schools to create a school improvement plan that addresses eight key areas: curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, financial resources, leadership, and, governance. School improvement plans will include strengths and weaknesses in each of the eight areas, and an outline of how the school will address specific issues critical to the improvement of student achievement.

### **Documentation**

19. Minnesota Statute 120B.30 Statewide Testing and Reporting System



## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Principle 2: All students are included in the state accountability system.

### 2.1 How does the state accountability system include all students in the state?

#### Definition of Public Schools and Districts

Schools are defined as any school with a building, equipment, courses of study, class schedules, enrollment of pupils ordinarily in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 or any portion thereof, and staff meeting the standards established by the Commissioner of the Department of Education.

Elementary school enrollment of pupils ordinarily is in kindergarten through grade 6 or any portion thereof. Middle school enrollment is defined as any school other than a secondary school giving an approved course of study in a minimum of three consecutive grades above 4<sup>th</sup> but below 10<sup>th</sup>. Secondary school is any school with enrollment of pupils ordinarily in grades 7 through 12 or any portion thereof.

For Accountability purposes, School District (or LEA) is under the authority of the commissioner of children, families and learning per 127A.05, Subd. 3 and as defined in Minnesota Statute 120A.05 (Subdivision 8, 10, 14): District. "District" means a school district. Further information on this definition is provided in section 1.1.

#### Inclusion of All Students

All students enrolled on the day of the test must participate in the testing and count toward the ninety-five percent participation requirements. Schools are required to return an answer document for all students enrolled.

Students are considered absent and not counted towards meeting the ninety-five percent tested requirement if they are unable to make up the test during the testing window or if they have been withdrawn based on parental request.

Students are identified and their enrollment and attendance is verified through the Minnesota Automated Reporting System for Students (MARSS). MARSS is a state level student identification system that assigns each student a unique identification number. This number associates each student with his/her full demographic information including ethnicity, LEP status, SES status, disability status, migrant status, gender, age and date of birth. Districts receive state aid based on the number of students enrolled with a MARSS number. This student identification number is used in an edit check to verify that all students enrolled are also included in the testing.

#### Inclusion of Student with Disabilities

Approximately twelve percent of the student population receives special education services. The majority of special education students participate in the MCA-II appropriate for their grade level and may have accommodations as determined by their IEP team. Minnesota does not allow out of level testing.

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Approximately two percent of the special education population, severely cognitively disabled students, takes an alternate assessment. These numbers are included in the participation rates for schools, districts and the state.

Alternate achievement levels have been set that align to the achievement levels on the MCA-II. Students who take the alternate assessments earn index points used in the school, district and state AYP performance index ratings. (See sections 1.3 and 5.3 for further information about the alternate assessments for severely cognitively disabled students.) Minnesota will limit the number of students that can contribute index scores indicating proficiency based on the proposed federal limits of one percent at the district and state level.

Minnesota will adopt the flexibility for defining membership in the special education subgroup outlined in the December, 15 2005 proposed regulations. The special education subgroup in 2006 will include all current special education students as well as any former special education students who were reclassified as non- special education students in one of the previous two years.

Minnesota adopted the 2% special education proxy that ED proposed in May 2005 for use in AYP 2007. We request authority to use the proxy in our 2008 calculations. This new flexibility addresses the 2% of the nation's students are neither appropriately assessed with a general education assessment nor appropriately assessed with the alternative assessment for the most significantly cognitively disabled (students discussed previously under the 1% cap).

### **Inclusion of Students with Limited English Proficiency**

During the 2002-04 school years, LEP students were required to take the MCAs appropriate to their grade level. In its January 31, 2003 submission, MDE indicated that it was undertaking an alignment study of the reading section of the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and the reading section of the Test of Emerging Academic English (TEAE). MDE has finished its work on this alignment study.

The alignment study MDE conducted show that the two assessments are aligned, MDE will submitted to USED proper documentation so that the department may determine whether or not Minnesota can use the TEAE Reading for LEP students in lieu of the MCA Reading.

In 2004-2005 and beyond, following USED policy decisions as outlined in the February 20, 2004 "Dear Colleague" letter, LEP students in their first year in school will be included in the accountability system with either the TEAE Reading or the MCA Reading.

*Implementing the federal flexibility for the LEP group when calculating AYP proficiency and participation*

## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

Minnesota had already amended the June 2003 workbook submission to include English Language Learners (ELL) and Transitional Language Learners (TLL) in the LEP subgroup for AYP purposes. TLL are former ELL who have not yet scored in the proficient category on the MCA.

Minnesota will adopt the flexibility for defining membership in the LEP subgroup outlined in the February 20, 2004 Dear Colleague letter. The LEP subgroup in 2004 will include all current LEP as well as any former LEP who were reclassified as non-LEP in one of the previous two years. This federal flexibility will co-exist with the Minnesota plan to include ELL and TLL in the LEP subgroup.

Minnesota will also make use of the flexibility provision for immigrants new to the country. LEP students who have been in the U.S. less than one year (defined per the joint CCSSO/ Title I/ Title III conference call on March 5, 2004 as LEP students who were not enrolled in school 1 or more days during the previous academic year) will not be included in AYP proficiency calculations at the school, district, or state level. These students will be included in the participation calculation in 2004 on the MCA and in 2005 and beyond on either the MCA-II or Minnesota's measure of English language proficiency in reading, the TEAE. LEP students however, will continue to take the MCA-II in math with appropriate accommodations.

### **Documentation**

1. Accommodations and Modifications for Students with Special Needs on Minnesota Statewide Assessments
25. Participation Calculation Rules

### **2.2 How does the state define "full academic year" for identifying students in AYP decisions?**

#### **Definition of a Full Academic Year**

The current testing window is March-April depending on the grade and subject being tested. By school year 2005-06 all testing will occur in a single window in early May. Students are considered enrolled for a full academic year if they are enrolled on October 1 of the current school year and also enrolled at the time of testing. This definition of full academic year is applied to students for the MCA-II, the Alternate Assessments and the Test of Emerging Academic English.

This definition of full academic year is also applied consistently to all students in all schools and districts in the state (see section 1.1).

### **Documentation**

15. MARSS: Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System 2002-03

## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

### **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?**

#### **Accurate Student Information**

The Minnesota Automated Reporting Student Systems (MARSS) is a statewide student identification system that is used to track students to ensure that they are not left out of the accountability system. Each student is assigned a unique identification number. Test documents are returned with the student's name, MARSS identification number and date of birth. The early roster AYP verification system, combined with data edits, is used to verify student identify based on name, date of birth and MARSS number. The MARSS system includes enrollment and withdrawal information about students for each school and district of attendance within the academic year.

An edit is done through the MARSS system to verify enrollment on test day based on state funding received for students during that same time period. The October 1 status is also verified through the MARSS system which links student identification information to both dates.

#### **Include All Students in School, District and/or State Results**

Results for students who are not in attendance at a single site for a full academic year are not excluded from the accountability system. Students who transfer between buildings within districts are included in district and state calculations even though their scores are not assigned to a particular building. Students who transfer among districts in the state are included in the state calculations.

#### **Documentation**

15. MARSS: Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System 2002-03

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Principle 3: State definition of AYP is based on an expectation 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 2013-14.

### **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 years?**

#### **Separate Measurements for Reading and Mathematics**

AYP determinations will be made separately for each subject tested. Starting points, intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives will be determined separately for reading and mathematics.

#### **AYP Performance Index**

School and district performance is assessed by determining the proportion of students scoring at or above grade level expectations in reading and mathematics.

Minnesota has chosen to use a performance index to calculate AYP to increase the reliability and validity to the accountability system. The proportion of students scoring in achievement levels is used to assign index points. Points are awarded for students at two decision points:

- One half point for each student in Level 2
- One full point for each student in Level 3

The performance index increases the number of data points used to make decisions about schools thereby increasing the stability and consistency of the decision. The performance index also increases the validity of the system since it gives schools credit for moving students from the lowest achievement level into higher levels. Schools receive credit for growth but are also held to achievement status requirements.

As some schools are very far away from reaching state expectations for student achievement, the performance index will allow schools to demonstrate success in the beginning of the new system while still allowing them to retain a focus on the ultimate state expectation of having 100% of all students score at or above Level 3 by school year 2013-14.

#### **Combining Data Across Grades**

Minnesota will use a uniform averaging procedure to identify the annual measurable objective required of all groups within each school and district to determine AYP status. Annual measurable objectives or the number of required index points will be based on the total number of students in each grade for each school and district. For example, annual measurable objectives for K-5 schools will be calculated on the basis of the grades three,

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

four, and five assessments. Annual objectives for K-12 schools will be calculated using data from all tests administered in the school.

This methodology ensures that information about schools and districts is based on precise information about their students.

### **Documentation**

- 8. AYP Technical Paper Number 2: Statewide Accountability System-Technical Features
- 10. AYP Technical Paper Number 4: Index Basis for Measuring AYP Codes
- 22. NCLB Data Base Component: AYP 2001-02 Starting Points

### **3.2 How does the state accountability system determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?**

In determining whether each subgroup, each school and each district, as well as the state as a whole, meets the annual measurable objectives, Minnesota will use three categories of indicators: participation, AYP performance index and attendance or graduation rate.

#### **Participation Requirements**

To ensure high levels of reliability and consistency of decisions any group with at least forty students across tested grades will be included in the participation rate calculations. This cell size ensures that even with the smallest groups in the state no more than two students may be absent on test day. A participation rate of at least ninety-five percent is required to make AYP. Any group that has fewer than forty students will not be included in these calculations (see section 10.2 for further details).

Based on recent flexibility from USED which allowed states flexibility in the participation calculation, Minnesota amended its accountability system to allow for uniform averaging of participation across three years. In addition, students who are medically unable to test during the testing window may be excluded from the test participation calculation if the district has appropriate documentation.

If any group that meets the minimum group size of 40 does not meet the 95% requirement on the current year's data, the data for that group will be combined and averaged across two years to determine if the 95% participation rate can be met. If the group still does not meet the 95% requirement, data will be combined across three years and averaged.

#### **AYP Performance Index**

Student achievement will be evaluated on the basis of performance index scores and annual measurable objectives as defined in federal statute. All schools are expected to improve achievement at a rate that will result in 100 percent of the students meeting state expectations in reading and mathematics by 2013-14.

## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

The performance index will be used to determine whether schools, districts and the state are meeting annual measurable objectives. Performance index scores are calculated at the school and district level if there is a minimum of twenty students across tested grades.

Schools are awarded one full index point for each student who scores at or above Level 3. One-half index point is awarded for students who score within level 2. No index points are awarded for students who score within Level 1. Annual measurable objectives are expressed as index targets. New index targets will be generated in 2006 and then held constant for the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years. Index targets will be increased annually in equal increments beginning in 2007-08

### **Additional Indicators**

Minnesota has identified attendance and graduation rate as the two additional indicators to be used for AYP determinations for schools, districts and the state. Minnesota will require grade K-8 schools to have a ninety percent attendance rate and high schools to have an eighty percent graduation rate to be considered making adequate yearly progress. In the case of K-12 schools attendance rate will be used as the additional indicator.

### **AYP Determinations**

Schools and districts will not make AYP if they do not meet annual measurable objectives in any area including test participation, the AYP proficiency index rating, attendance and/or graduation.

Title I schools will be subject to federal consequences if they fail to meet AYP requirements within any cell in the academic category (participation and proficiency index) for two consecutive years or if they fail to meet AYP requirements for the other academic indicator (attendance for elementary and middle schools or graduation for high schools) for two consecutive years.

Title I districts will be subject to federal consequences if they fail to meet AYP requirements within any cell in the academic category (participation and proficiency index) for two consecutive years or if they fail to meet AYP requirements for attendance and/or graduation for two consecutive years.

### **Safe Harbor**

Any group that does not meet the annual measurable objectives by generating the required number of index points may still make AYP if the number of non-proficient students is reduced by ten percent compared to the previous year. The number of additional index points the school or district needs to reach the goal of one-hundred (all students proficient) represents the non-proficient students.

Schools and districts must reduce the number additional number of index points needed to make the goal of one-hundred index points by ten percent. This number is added to the index rate earned the previous year. If the current year's index rate meets or exceeds this figure (last year's rate plus 10% of the number needed to meet the goal of one hundred index points) the school or district can make AYP if the group is also making AYP in

## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

attendance and/or graduation. Attendance and graduation rates are disaggregated for use with the safe harbor calculation.

### **Documentation**

- 14. Index Calculation Rules
- 23. NCLB Data Base Component: Confidence Interval Tables
- 25. Participation Calculation Rules
- 30. Steering Committee Recommendations
- 35. AYP Framework – Relationship Between the Performance Index and the Percentage Proficient



## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 3.2a What is the state’s starting point for calculating adequate yearly progress?

#### Same Starting Point for All- Based on the 20<sup>th</sup> Percentile of Enrollment

Minnesota has established separate starting points for each grade and subject tested. Starting points are the same for all subgroups and schools. Starting points are based on data from MCA-II, 2006. The starting points were generated using NCLB methodology that requires all schools in the state to be ranked from lowest to highest performing based on their test scores. Index points were calculated for the school at the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of enrollment as identified for each grade and subject. Based on the AYP performance index, schools at the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile were higher performing in both reading and mathematics than the lowest performing subgroup in all cases.

#### Starting Points 2006

The table below shows starting points expressed in AYP proficiency rating index points. Minnesota re-established its starting points based on new academic standards. Starting points are based on data from the MCA-II the 2005-06 school year.

Reading Starting Point Grade	Starting Points Expressed in Index Ratings 2006
3	0.7222
4	0.6948
5	0.7193
6	0.7027
7	0.6563
8	0.6404
10	0.6477

  

Math Starting Point Grade	Starting Points Expressed in Index Ratings 2006
3	0.7895
4	0.6964
5	0.5979
6	0.5989
7	0.5880
8	0.5839
11	0.2813

#### Documentation

- 8. AYP Technical Paper Number 2: Statewide Accountability System-Technical Features
- 22. NCLB Data Base Component: Starting Points
- 26. Preliminary 3-Year Average of Percent Proficient Starting Points with Index

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 3.2 b What are the state's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?

#### Annual AYP Decisions

In Minnesota annual measurable objectives are expressed as target index points. (See section 3.2c for projected annual target index point requirements.) Annual measurable objectives will remain the same for the first two years and then be increased in equal increments beginning in 2007-08 to ensure that all students are proficient as required in the federal timelines. As additional assessments are developed and used to make AYP decisions pursuant to the federal timelines, annual measurable objectives will be established based on requirements outlined in federal statute.

#### Proficiency by 2013-14

Each year AYP decisions are made for schools, districts and the state. To have all students proficient by school year 2013-14 100 percent of students must score at or above achievement Level 3; thus the final index target is 100. This target index requirement will apply to all reading and mathematics assessments grades 3-8 and high school.

Minnesota has received approval to exercise its authority under NCLB, section 1111 (2) Accountability (J)(i). Therefore, beginning with school year 2004-2005 schools and districts that do not make adequate yearly progress towards their index target nor qualify under the safe harbor provision, will have their student's test scores averaged for up to three years. An example of how this works is provided below:

Lake Woobegone School does not make AYP for school year 2004-2005.

Lake Woobegone School does not make AYP using the safe harbor provisions

Scores from the 2004-2005 school year will be averaged with the scores from the 2003-2004 school year to determine AYP. If the school still does not make AYP, scores from the 2002-2003 school year will be added.

Using this provision will eliminate the anomalies created by having small cell sizes and will ensure that those schools that are truly in need of improvement are identified.

#### Documentation

8. AYP Technical Paper Number 2: Statewide Accountability System-Technical Features

22. NCLB Data Base Component: Starting Points

26. Preliminary 3-Year Average of Percent Proficient Starting Points with Index

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 3.2.c What are the state’s intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?

During the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO’s) will be held constant. Beginning in school year 2007-08 the target index points will increase annually in equal increments until school year 2013-14 when the target index is 100. A performance index of 100 can only be generated if all students meet or exceed the statewide expectations for AYP by scoring at or above Level 3 on the MCA-II. The table below shows the annual measurable objectives for the assessments in grades three thru eight, ten and eleven.

<b>Math</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>Grade</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
3	0.7895	0.7895	0.8196	0.8496	0.8797	0.9098	0.9399	0.9699	1.0000
4	0.6964	0.6964	0.7398	0.7831	0.8265	0.8699	0.9133	0.9566	1.0000
5	0.5979	0.5979	0.6553	0.7128	0.7702	0.8277	0.8851	0.9426	1.0000
6	0.5989	0.5989	0.6562	0.7135	0.7708	0.8281	0.8854	0.9427	1.0000
7	0.5880	0.5880	0.6469	0.7057	0.7646	0.8234	0.8823	0.9411	1.0000
8	0.5839	0.5839	0.6433	0.7028	0.7622	0.8217	0.8811	0.9406	1.0000
11	0.2813	0.2813	0.3840	0.4866	0.5893	0.6920	0.7947	0.8973	1.0000

<b>Reading</b>									
<b>Grade</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
3	0.7222	0.7222	0.7619	0.8016	0.8413	0.8809	0.9206	0.9603	1.0000
4	0.6948	0.6948	0.7384	0.7820	0.8256	0.8692	0.9128	0.9564	1.0000
5	0.7193	0.7193	0.7594	0.7995	0.8396	0.8797	0.9198	0.9599	1.0000
6	0.7027	0.7027	0.7452	0.7876	0.8301	0.8726	0.9151	0.9575	1.0000
7	0.6563	0.6563	0.7054	0.7545	0.8036	0.8527	0.9018	0.9509	1.0000
8	0.6404	0.6404	0.6918	0.7431	0.7945	0.8459	0.8973	0.9486	1.0000
10	0.6477	0.6477	0.6980	0.7484	0.7987	0.8490	0.8993	0.9497	1.0000

AYP determinations will be made annually for all subgroups, schools and districts based on the starting points and annual measurable objectives outlined above.

#### **Documentation**

- 8. AYP Technical Paper Number 2: Statewide Accountability System-Technical Features
- 22. NCLB Data Base Component: Starting Points
- 27. Preliminary 3-Year Average of Percent Proficient Starting Points with Index

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

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

### **4.1 How does the state accountability system make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the state made AYP?**

Annual AYP decisions will be based on whether or not each school and district is on track to meet the goal of 100 percent of the students meeting state expectations for high academic achievement by 2013-14 by scoring at or above Level 3 on the MCA-II.

Schools and districts will not make AYP if any group does not meet the annual measurable objective within the academic category or the other indicator category. Federal consequences will apply to Title I schools and districts in which any group does not make AYP for two consecutive years within a subject area or other academic indicator. This approach is consistent with NCLB's goal of targeting remediation to specific performance deficiencies.

#### **Documentation**

- 6. AYP Performance Index Overview
- 10. AYP Technical Paper Number 4: Index Basis for Measuring AYP Goals
- 14. Index Calculation Rules
- 29. Recommendations from Stakeholder Committee
- 30. Steering Committee Recommendations

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Principle 5: All schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

### 5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all of the required subgroups?

#### Definitions of Subgroups Included in AYP Calculations

The state definition of AYP requires students in the following groups to meet annual state achievement objectives: LEP, Special Ed, low income, African American, American Indian, White, Hispanic, Asian, all students combined.

Student demographic characteristics and ethnic designations are tracked via the MARSS identification system. Student characteristics are flagged and attached to the student identification number. Characteristics used to define each of the subgroups are defined and collected in the following manner:

- Student ethnicity is collected from parents or guardians at the time the student enrolls in school and is based on the five categories currently required by the National Center on Educational Statistics.
- Eligibility for free and reduced price lunch is determined through the completion of an eligibility form indicating family household income level and subsequently reported for each school and district in the state. While this indicator is problematic at the high school, it is the only measure of low-income data available that is consistent and reliable.
- LEP designation is determined by schools reporting that the student speaks a language other than English at home and the student is below the cut on any of the four areas in the Test of Emerging Academic English: reading, writing, listening and speaking. The cut scores on these assessments indicate that the student has a sufficient skill level to no longer require language support in a classroom where English is the language of instruction. Students whose scores on the TEAE exceed the cut scores in all four areas are no longer identified as LEP - but may be included in the expanded LEP category for up to two years after testing proficient on the TEAE for AYP purposes.
- Special education status is reported by districts based on requirements outlined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

#### Documentation

15. MARSS: Minnesota Automated Student Reporting System 2002-03

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### **5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of Adequate Yearly Progress?**

Beginning school year 2002-03, Minnesota will transition into the new NCLB system and begin identifying schools as not making AYP if any subgroup does not meet annual measurable objectives within a subject or other indicator category. Federally mandated consequences will apply to Title I schools and districts that do not make AYP for two consecutive years within a subject or other indicator category.

#### **Subgroup Inclusion at the School Level**

About half of the schools and districts in Minnesota are located outside the boundaries of the seven-county metro-area. Since most of greater Minnesota schools are relatively small, the minimum cell size for required for AYP performance index calculations is set at twenty with a .95 confidence interval. A cell size of twenty used in combination with a confidence interval permits the inclusion of a maximum number of students across cells while maintaining a high level of statistical reliability and validity. If a higher minimum cell were used many of the schools in the state would not be held accountable for subgroup performance.

#### **Participation Calculations**

Subgroups at both the school and district level must meet a minimum cell size of forty to be included in the participation calculation. Since the participation rate is essentially a "head count" no confidence interval will be used.

#### **Documentation**

9. AYP Technical Paper Number 3: Notes on Multiple Comparisons

### **5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the state's definition of adequate yearly progress?**

#### **Students with disabilities**

Students with disabilities as defined in section 5.1 are included in the special education subgroup based on MARSS identification. Results for special education students who take the regular MCA-II with or without accommodations are included in school, district and state totals.

Special education students may take the MCA-II with or without test accommodations. Severely cognitively disabled students may take an Alternate Assessment. Currently approximately two percent of the students in the special education population take alternate assessments each year. Students who take an alternate assessment are counted in the ninety-five percent participation requirement and are able to earn index points using the alternate achievement levels described in section 2.1. Minnesota will allow districts and the state to evaluate the performance of one percent of the tested students

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

with alternate achievement standards based on their performance on the alternate assessment.

Minnesota will adopt the flexibility for defining membership in the special education subgroup outlined in the December, 15 2005 proposed regulations. The special education subgroup in 2006 will include all current special education students as well as any former special education students who were reclassified as non- special education students in one of the previous two years.

Minnesota adopted the 2% special education proxy that ED proposed in May 2005 for use in AYP 2007. We request authority to use the proxy in our 2008 calculations. This new flexibility addresses the 2% of the nation's students are neither appropriately assessed with a general education assessment nor appropriately assessed with the alternative assessment for the most significantly cognitively disabled (students discussed previously under the 1% cap).

### **Documentation**

1. Accommodations and Modifications for Students with Special Needs on Minnesota Statewide Assessments

#### **5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the state's definition of adequate yearly progress?**

All LEP students, as defined in section 5.1, are included in the accountability system. Their scores are included in the AYP performance index calculations in the all group and in disaggregated subgroups.

Minnesota adopted the flexibility for defining membership in the LEP subgroup outlined in the February 20, 2004 Dear Colleague letter. The LEP subgroup in 2004 included all current LEP as well as any former LEP who were reclassified as non-LEP in one of the previous two years. This federal flexibility will co-exist with the Minnesota plan to include ELL and TLL in the LEP subgroup. For the mathematics assessments, students must take the MCA-II but may have translations or other language accommodations

#### **Test of Emerging Academic English**

Minnesota state statute requires students to be assessed in reading in English. Thus translations of reading tests are not permitted. In order to better assess the reading skills of students with minimal skill in English, the state has developed the Minnesota Test of Emerging Academic English (TEAE), a contextually based standards-based reading assessment designed for English language learners. The test begins with pre-reading items and presents passages that become progressively more difficult as they reach grade level. The TEAE is aligned to grade level expectations in reading. See section 1.3 for further discussion of the achievement levels.

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### Documentation

1. Accommodations and Modifications for Students with Special Needs on Minnesota Statewide Assessments

#### **5.5 What is the state's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes?**

##### **Privacy Filters**

All data in Minnesota is suppressed on the public web site when there are less than ten students in any cell or all students in a single cell. In the case of AYP, unfiltered information will be provided to schools and districts in confidential reports. When any reportable cell contains information based on less than ten students, the designation NA appears with an explanation at the bottom of the page. If more than ninety-five percent of the students appear in any single cell an indication of greater than ninety-five percent will be used to indicate the number of students.

##### **Rational for Cell Sizes - Participation**

To achieve reliability and validity in accountability decisions, the minimum sample size for calculating the participation rate of students is forty across tested grades. The minimum subgroup size of forty provides schools with a cushion against failing the participation requirement for students due to reasons beyond their control. With a cell size of forty no more than two students in any group may be absent.

Since the participation rate is essentially a head count measurement error is not an issue. Data are presumed to be accurate since schools and districts will have had several chances to "cleanse" these data. Since a confidence interval is not used with this calculation the decision stands to keep this cell size higher than the cell size used to calculate academic performance.

##### **Rational for Cell Sizes - AYP at the School Level**

Minnesota will require a minimum cell size of twenty across tested grades in the school or district in order to calculate an AYP performance index. This minimum cell size will be applied to all subgroup categories.

Minnesota has many small schools outside of the seven-county metro-area. If the cell size is larger than twenty, many students will not be included in the subgroups. A small cell size combined with a confidence interval allows for maximum with a high level of measurement accuracy in AYP decisions.

In order to ensure that AYP status is published for all schools and districts regardless of size, data will be combined across years if schools or districts do not have at least twenty students across tested grades in the all category. If schools or districts still do not have enough students to meet the minimum cell size requirement, the calculation will still be completed but will be marked with an asterisk indicating that the AYP rating is not statistically reliable due to the small cell size. Schools may use the small cell size as the basis for an appeal.



## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### **Statistical Reliability**

A confidence interval is needed to ensure statistical reliability of the index system. AYP decisions should be based on student achievement rather than size or diversity. The high stakes nature of these decisions requires that decisions have a very small likelihood of misclassification in terms of false positives or false negatives. This requires a very stringent confidence level to be sure that the schools are failing because students did not meet the required target because of lack of achievement and not due to measurement error.

Minnesota's proposal to use confidence intervals on a sliding scale from .95 to .99 depending on the total number of decisions to be made for a school or district was approved by the USDOE. There are potentially eighteen decision points per subject area and a total of thirty-seven decisions for the school and thirty-eight decisions at district this level. The proposal of this proposal will help in avoiding high rates of misclassification for schools or districts with many groups.

The base confidence interval of .95 was chosen because it minimizes the false negatives. Minimizing the false negatives is especially important in this conjunctive model that includes as many as eighteen decision points per subject in the annual AYP calculation. The misclassification rate for decisions is .5 percent. A bootstrap methodology has been used to select a z-value corresponding to the desired confidence level. See AYP Technical Paper 4 for a complete discussion of this process.

### **Documentation**

9. AYP Technical Paper Number 3: Notes on Multiple Comparisons
10. AYP Technical Paper Number 4: Index Basis for Measuring AYP

### **5.6 How does the state accountability system protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?**

Minnesota has a public reporting policy requiring that data in cells of nine or less to be suppressed and cells with greater than ninety-five percent of the total population be indicated as including greater than ninety-five percent rather than the exact number. This policy will continue to be applied to NCLB public reporting requirements.

### **Documentation**

11. Data Display Privacy Filter Policy

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Principle 6: State definition of AYP is based primarily on the state's academic assessments.

### **6.1 How is the state's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?**

#### **Minnesota's New Academic Standards and Adjustments to Existing Statewide Assessments**

Minnesota schools are in a state of transition with respect to academic standards. During the 2003 Legislative session, the Profile of Learning, which constituted the State's academic standards in 11 learning areas, was repealed. In its place, the Legislature passed grade level standards in reading/language arts and mathematics. During the 2004 Legislative session, the legislature passed grade level standards in the areas of science and social studies.

In developing the new academic standards, the Commissioner established a committee of teachers, parents, community members and representatives of high education to develop a draft of the standards in each content area. These standards were then reviewed and feedback provided by a national expert in the respective field. A total of 16 hearings were also held throughout the state for the purpose of obtaining feedback on the draft. The feedback from the national experts and the hearings was used to create a final draft that went to the Minnesota Legislature.

To assist teachers in transitioning towards new standards, staff from the Division of Standards and Professional Development has been conducting regional training to help teachers understand the differences between the new standards and those under the Profile of Learning, as well as the benchmarks contained in the standards. The Profile of Learning was very broad and not grade level specific. The new academic standards are grade level specific and also contain benchmarks.

Educators have been given the following timelines with respect to the implementation of the new academic standards and the transition to the new math and reading statewide assessments:

- All Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA-II) will remain aligned to the Profile of Learning until 2005-2006 as schools and districts transition to the new Academic Standards.
- New test specifications for all MCA-II aligned to the new Academic Standards for math and language arts/reading will be released in the summer of 2004.
- All tests will shift to the new specifications beginning in the 2005-2006 school year with the implementation of the MCAII.
- Summary timeline:

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

2003	Math and Language Arts/Reading Standards approved by the Legislature
2003-2004	Transition to new standards
2004-2005	Transition to new standards
2005-2006	Full implementation of new standards and statewide assessments

### Modified Timeline for New Assessments Required by NCLB for 2005-2006

The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA-II) are state developed criterion-referenced tests aligned to state standards. MCA tests have been implemented at all grade level clusters in reading and mathematics as required by NCLB. With the implementation of new academic standards and the addition of Grades 4,6, and 8 reading and math assessments to the system, Minnesota will implement the MCAII in 2005-2006.

The timeline for the development of additional assessments is shown below in Table 6. Alterations in the assessment timeline from the June 2002 workbook submission are shown in italics.

TABLE 6:

<b>Assessment Timeline</b>		
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Proposed Date</b>	<b>Federal Timeline Requirement for Evidence</b>
Develop grade level benchmarks for reading and math standards	June 2002 – March 2003	May 2003
Disseminate grade level benchmarks	April 2003	
Identify core science requirements for high school	Summer 2002 – Spring 2003	
Develop test specifications for new reading and math tests in Grades 4, 6, and 8	<i>September 2003 – June 2004 (Draft specifications currently posted for public comment.)</i>	Milestones - June 2002 Detailed Timeline - May 2003
Issue RFP for test contractor to develop new reading and math tests in Grades 4, 6, 8	April 2003	Milestones - June 2002 Detailed Timeline - May 2003
Award RFP through competitive bid process for development of new reading and math assessments	August 2003	Milestones - June 2002 Detailed Timeline - May 2003
Develop items for new reading and math tests in Grades 4, 6, and 8	June 2003 – December 2003	Milestones - June 2002 Detailed Timeline - May 2003

**Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

<b>Assessment Timeline</b>		
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Proposed Date</b>	<b>Federal Timeline Requirement for Evidence</b>
Develop test specifications for science assessments based upon identified core requirements	June 2004 – Spring 2005	
Field test items for new reading and math tests in grades 4, 6, and 8	April 2004	Evidence January 2006
Issue RFP for test contractor to develop science assessments in required grade spans of 3-5, 6-9, 10-12	<i>October 2004</i>	
Award RFP through competitive bid process for development of science assessments	<i>January 2005</i>	
Develop items for new science assessments	<i>January 2005 – December 2005</i>	
Pilot test new test forms in reading and math for grades 4, 6, and 8	Spring 2005	Evidence January 2006
First operational administration of new reading and math tests in grades 4, 6, and 8	<i>Spring 2006</i>	Evidence January 2006
Field test items for new science assessments in required grade spans	<i>Spring 2006</i>	
Pilot test new test forms in science for required grade spans	<i>Spring 2007</i>	
First operational administration of science assessments in required grade spans	School Year 2007-2008	December 2008

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

---

### **Documentation**

17. Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments Mathematics Test Specifications
18. Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments Reading Test Specifications

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Principle 7: State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public high schools and an additional factor selected by the state for middle and public elementary schools (such as attendance rate).

### 7.1 What is the state definition for the public high school graduation rate?

#### High School Indicator

Minnesota will use the definition of graduation rate recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics. It is a cohort emulation formula that uses a four-year standard for graduation. In the few cases where the high school only contains three grades, a three-year graduation rate will be used. K-12 schools will also use graduation rate as the additional indicator since they give students diplomas. Data are collected for student subgroups and disaggregated for use when applying the 'safe harbor clause' to make AYP. The graduation rate will be calculated in the aggregate in order to make AYP "status decisions".

#### Calculation Formula

This calculation **does not include** students who graduate with GEDs or any other diploma not aligned to the states academic standards. Minnesota is not currently able to collect GED data.

Students are counted as dropped if they are reported as a drop and do not re-enroll in another school during the four year period. Minnesota is not currently able to control for students who finish high school within four years from their start date.

This methodology allows for a consistent computation for all schools and districts in the state, and includes students who change schools part way through their high school career. This computation is based on students who receive diplomas in year four of the emulated cohort.

---

# of graduates year 4

Dropouts (Grade 9 Year 1 + Grade 10 Year 2+ Grade 11 Year 3 + Grade 12 Year 4) + Completers Year 4

Based on this calculation the state expectations will be an eighty percent graduation rate or growth towards eighty percent.

Minnesota will work towards a system that is able to identify the number of years that students have been in high school and adjust the graduation rate accordingly.

#### Documentation

- 5. AYP 2001-2002 Graduation Rate Computation
- 13. Graduation Rates Working Group – Recap of December 3, 2002 Meeting Discussion
- 30. Steering Committee Recommendations

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 7.2 What is the state's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For middle schools?

#### **Elementary and Middle Schools**

Minnesota will use attendance as the additional indicator for elementary and middle schools. The attendance rate for the total school or district will be used to determine AYP "status decisions". Data are collected for student subgroups and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the 'safe harbor clause' to make AYP.

Schools will be required to have a ninety percent attendance rate or show growth towards 90 percent.

#### **Calculation Formula**

The formula for attendance rate is the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) divided by the Average Daily Membership (ADM). The ADA and ADM for each grade, school, or district, are added together and the resulting figures are used for each grade, school, or district summary.  $(\text{Grade level ADA} / \text{Grade Level ADM}) \times 100 = \text{Attendance Rate for that grade}$ . This will be used to calculate an average attendance rate for the school or district.

ADA is normally computed by taking the number of days a student was marked in attendance and dividing by the number of instructional days reported for that grade and school. ADM is normally computed by taking the number of days the student was reported as enrolled and dividing by the number of instructional days reported for that grade and school. Slight variations in the ADA and ADM computations are made for students whose membership and attendance is reported in terms of hours.

When the assessment system is fully operational, the state will include a growth factor as a secondary indicator for AYP calculations pending the approval of the USDOE.

#### **Documentation**

4. AYP 2001-2002 Attendance Rate Computation
30. Steering Committee Recommendations

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 7.3 Are the States academic indicators valid and reliable?

Minnesota's graduation rate and attendance rate calculations comply with national standards and the data used to calculate both graduation and attendance rates are subject to audit and verification at the state level. The calculation of graduation rate is consistent with the methodology recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics and used in the Common Core of Data.

#### **Documentation**

26. Public High School Dropouts and Completers from the Common Core of Data  
The Condition of Education 2002



## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

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

### **8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?**

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculations will be done separately for reading and mathematics at all grades tested. To determine whether schools, districts and the state as a whole meet AYP requirements, Minnesota will calculate annual measurable objectives in reading and mathematics using the AYP performance index. Schools and districts are identified as not making AYP if any group fails to meet annual measurable objectives as in either reading or mathematics. Title I schools and districts are subject to federal consequences if any group fails to make AYP for two consecutive years within a subject area.

#### **Documentation**

- 6. AYP Performance Index Overview
- 10. AYP Technical Paper Number 4: Index Basis for Measuring AYP Goals
- 14. Index Calculation Rules

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Principle 9: State accountability system is statistically valid and reliable.

### **9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the state's standard for acceptable reliability?**

Minnesota has done much research in the various options for ensuring maximum validity and reliability of the AYP system. This research is outlined in the technical papers included in the appendices including: "Notes on validity and reliability for a definition on AYP", "Notes on Multiple Comparisons Under AYP" and "Index Basis for Measuring AYP Goals".

This extensive research has resulted in the decision to use an AYP performance index as the basis for the decisions regarding student achievement as described in section 1.2, the cell sizes for schools and districts as noted in sections 5.2 and 5.4.

#### **Timeline for Evaluating Validity of the Accountably System**

Minnesota will release an RFP to solicit proposals from outside evaluators to propose a study to evaluate the validity of the accountability system. While the state is very confident that the selected statistical methodologies will yield accurate determinations with high levels of psychometric validity and reliability, it is important to determine if this highly sophisticated system meets the criteria required for face validity and consequential validity as well. Does the community at large concur with the results? Are schools identified through the Federal AYP system and the information provided by the additional state indicators accurate in describing the quality of education being provide to students in Minnesota schools?

An RFP will be issued in September 2003 with the award scheduled for late fall. The RFP will require the successful respondent to propose an evaluation study that triangulates data from both qualitative and quantitative sources to determine the validity of the state accountability system.

#### **Appeals Process**

Minnesota has a three-step appeals process that includes the verification of student demographic data, test participation and final AYP calculations. Schools and districts have an opportunity to review and correct the student level data, including demographics, prior to preliminary calculations of AYP status being sent to the schools. Preliminary calculations are sent to schools along with the release of the test results. Schools have thirty days to file an appeal from the time they receive the calculation.

Appeals may be made on the basis of federal requirement including: statistical or other substantive reason such as a one-time significant change in the student population, a natural disaster or other circumstances which render the assessment invalid. Schools must first submit their appeals to the district, which has the responsibility to determine the validity of the appeals based on the above criteria. The commissioner will establish an appeal process to review decisions made by districts. The commissioner reserves the right to make final decisions regarding appeals.

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### **Documentation**

2. Appeals Process
7. AYP Technical Paper Number 1: Notes on Validity and Reliability for a Definition of AYP

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 9.2 What is the state's process for making valid AYP determinations?

#### **Rationale for Decision Consistency**

Minnesota has a unique distribution of minority students. Although more than sixty percent of districts report minority and LEP students, disproportionate numbers are concentrated in a relatively few districts and schools. As a result high minimum cell requirements will only include students in urban districts and a small number of out-state districts with high concentrations of these students. In order to focus on the achievement of all minority students Minnesota must have a cell sizes small enough to be inclusive across all districts.

In light of this demographic distribution, and the number of conjunctive decisions required by NCLB, Minnesota has proposed a model for making AYP decisions that are based primarily on student achievement and not an artifact of sampling error associated with small sample sizes or the sampling error associated with the number of decisions made for each school or district. This model includes relatively small cell sizes at the school, increased cell sizes at the district level with a high confidence level applied to all calculations.

The minimum cell size for AYP calculations is twenty for all groups. This allows Minnesota to incorporate information as many groups of students as possible. Higher cell sizes result in significant drops in the number of groups of minority students included in the AYP calculation.

Based on approval from the USDOE Minnesota will apply confidence interval on a sliding scale from .95 to .99 depending on the total number of AYP decisions to be made at the school or district. This confidence interval provides a high degree of certainty regarding the potentially 37 AYP decisions to be made and provides an acceptable level of consistency.

#### **Stability of data**

Minnesota has conducted extensive analysis of the reliability of AYP decisions and incorporated the following statistical corrections into the AYP model. First, to ensure maximum stability of initial starting points and minimize the effect of random score fluctuations that can occur from year to year across groups within a school, three years of data have been used to calculate baseline scores in reading and mathematics for AYP for the existing assessments. This allows the state to include as much information as possible about past performance into the new NCLB system.

#### **Documentation**

9. AYP Technical Paper Number 3: Notes on Multiple Comparisons Under AYP

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

### 9.3 How has the state planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?

#### Plan for Incorporating Changes

Minnesota's accountability system has an overall goal of improving education for all students. Decisions about the components of the system are based on the specific principles below:

1. Academic proficiency is the primary factor in identifying successful schools.
2. The achievement of all students must be included in the decision regarding school performance.
3. Decisions regarding school performance must be statistically valid and reliable.

#### Consistency of Decisions Across Time

The system has been designed to accommodate the addition of new tests by the following measures:

- Statewide starting points will be calculated for each subject and grade level. A unique starting point will be determined for each school and each subject based on the grade configuration.
- Annual measurable objectives will be adjusted to incorporate additional tests while maintaining the timeline for all students to reach proficiency by 2013-14.
- The process of identifying the baseline requirements will parallel the process used to establish the 2001-02 baseline data and will be based on the methodology outlined in federal statute. This methodology requires baselines to be set on either a level of performance equal to that of the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of enrollment or the lowest performing sub-group. The process that produces the highest starting point will be used to establish starting points for newly developed assessments.
- New cut scores will be established through a statistically valid and reliable standard setting process consistent with nationally accepted practices.

As noted earlier, new standards were developed in the spring of 2003 for reading and mathematics and science and social studies in the spring of 2004. All assessments will be realigned to the new standards. The new system will be fully operational by 2005-06 for reading and mathematics and by 2007-08 for science.

#### Documentation

14. Index Calculation Rules

22. NCLB Data Base Component: AYP 2001-2002 Starting Points

23. NCLB Data Base Component: Confidence Interval Tables

30. Steering Committee Recommendations

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

Principle 10: In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the state ensures that it assessed at least ninety-five percent of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

### **10.1 What is the state's method for calculating participation rates in the state assessments for use in the AYP determinations?**

All students enrolled on the date of the test must be included in the calculation for the participation rate. Schools are required to return an answer document for all students enrolled on the date of testing as verified by a MARSS identification number. An independent MARSS edit is used to ascertain per-pupil funding and will also be used to verify the enrollment count on the test day.

Students will be counted as tested if they have been provided with an opportunity to test. Students will be considered as not tested if they are:

- absent and have not made up the test during the official testing window
- withdrawn from the testing at the written request of a parent or guardian

Students who do not test will be reported in the aggregate and by subgroups on the state report card. Schools that do not test at least ninety-five percent of their students enrolled on test day will not be eligible for further AYP calculations and will be considered as not having met their annual achievement objective for that year. Only those student who have medical problems that prevent them from testing within the testing window will be exempted provided the district has documentation of the medical condition that prevented the student from taking the test.

For School Year 2002-2003, students who did not participate in the statewide assessments not only counted against a school's assessment participation calculation for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) but also counted as a zero in the proficiency calculation, which created a double penalty for schools. Minnesota requested and got approval to amend our policy. Students who do not participate in the assessment will only be included in the calculation for participation and will be excluded from the proficiency calculation.

For the 2003-2004 calculation of participation, Minnesota used the flexibility given to states in the March 29, 2004 dear Colleague letter from Secretary Rod Paige. In cases where the number of students was small and one student placed the school in AYP, Minnesota averaged the participation rate over a three-year period.

The state continues to be particularly concerned about parents who refuse to let their children participate in statewide testing. Schools have no control over this situation and this information is already being recorded in the AYP participation calculations. These

## Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

schools should be able to clearly identify the source of identification rather than having it exacerbated by phantom zeros lowering their proficiency calculation.

### **Documentation**

- 9. AYP Technical Paper Number 3: Notes on Multiple Comparisons
- 25. Participation Calculation Rules
- 29. Recommendations from ESEA Stakeholder Committee
- 30. Steering Committee Recommendations

### **10.2 What is the state’s policy for determining when the ninety-five percent assessed requirement should be applied?**

Only schools that meet the minimum cell size of 40 for the total group are eligible for AYP participation calculations. If a school does not meet the minimum cell size for participation their AYP will be based only on the achievement of their annual measurable objective and either attendance or graduation rate. Schools that do not have enough students in the “all” group for proficiency (20) will have data combined over two years. If schools still do not have enough students to meet the minimum cell size requirement, the calculation will still be completed but will be marked with an asterisk indicating that the AYP rating is not statistically reliable due to the small cell size. Schools may use the small cell size as the basis for an appeal.

### **Documentation**

- 9. AYP Technical Paper Number 3: Notes on Multiple Comparisons
- 25. Participation Calculation Rules
- 29. Recommendations from ESEA Stakeholder Committee
- 30. Steering Committee Recommendations