

District of Columbia Public Schools State Accountability Plan

Executive Summary

The State Accountability Plan submitted on May 1, 2003 and revised on June 3, 2003 details the proposed policies and procedures relating to the District of Columbia Public Schools State Education Agency (DCPS-SEA) Assessment and Accountability Policy. It includes the development, implementation and monitoring of a comprehensive accountability system for all public schools in the District of Columbia, including Public Charter Schools. All students are held to the same standards and will participate in a State assessment aligned to the State academic standards. Assessment data are made public to inform parents and community members about student achievement by school, Local Education Agency (LEA), and the SEA. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in academic achievement, as measured by the state assessment and additional academic indicators, is expected for all students at the school, district and state level. Where AYP is not made for two consecutive years, a school, district or state will be identified as “in need of improvement.” The DCPS-SEA Accountability System fulfills all municipal and federal requirements and regulations associated with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

Policy Format and Development

The *2003 State Accountability Plan and the proposed changes* follows the format of the workbook required by the Department of Education for the 2003 Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook and is organized around ten accountability “principles” as required by NCLB.

1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all schools and LEAs.
2. All public school students are included in the State Accountability System
3. The State definition of Adequate Yearly Progress is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and math by the 2013-2014 school year.
4. The State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.
5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.
6. The State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessment.
7. The State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public high schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public middle and elementary schools.
8. AYP is determined separately for reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.
9. The State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.
10. For a school to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Principle 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEA¹s.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
-------------------------	--

1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The DCPS Board of Education (BOE) is the State Board of Education for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) is the State Education Agency (SEA) for the District of Columbia. As such, the DCPS BOE develops policies and monitors all public schools in the District of Columbia (DC) and implements all NCLB regulations and related Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) decisions for all DC public schools.

All schools will be included in the State Accountability System. The working definition of a “school” incorporates two criteria. First, the school demonstrates a student membership verifiable in the official enrollment counts. Second, the school program is assigned a budget code and therefore is able to receive state and federal funds. Using these two criteria, there are currently 8 types of school programs in the DCPS-SEA. The grade-spans of schools (as defined by the two criteria) are outlined in the table below.

Number and Type of School/Program	Grades Served
1. Elementary Schools	Pre-K to 6
2. Middle Schools	5 to 8
3. Junior High Schools	7 to 9
4. Senior High Schools	9 to 12
5. Educational Centers	Pre-K to 9
6. Alternative Education Programs	6 to 12
7. Special Education Schools	Pre-K to 12
8. Special Education Centers	2 to 12

For accountability purposes, all schools are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have separate accountability targets (see Appendix A). All grade level performance percentages within a category (e.g., elementary) are compared to the same annual measurable objective (AMO). For schools that include both elementary and secondary grades, grade level performance will be compared to the appropriate annual measurable objective. For example, for a school that includes students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12, the performance for students in grades 3-5 will be compared to the elementary AMO while the performance of students in grades 6-10 will be compared to the secondary AMO for the purpose of determining AYP.

There are approximately 200 state tuition grants to non-public day or residential placement programs for special education students. Students placed in these special programs like all students enrolled in public schools are required to participate in the state assessment. Students in public charter schools are also included in the state assessment program. Charter schools in the District of Columbia are both schools and local education agencies (LEA) and, for the purposes of NCLB reporting, are considered to be schools.

¹ An LEA or local educational agency is a group of schools within the same school system. In the case of charter schools within the District of Columbia, schools are often synonymous with local educational agencies. These are, in other words, one-school districts or systems. In these cases, data will be reported only at the school level rather than repeating the same data for the one-school LEA.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>All school programs will be included in the State Accountability System. The grade-spans of schools are outlined in the table above (see Element 1.1).</p> <p>For accountability purposes, all schools are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have separate accountability targets (see Appendix A). All grade level performance percentages within a category (e.g., elementary) are compared to the same annual measurable objective (AMO). For schools that include both elementary and secondary grades, grade level performance will be compared to the appropriate annual measurable objective. For example, for a school that includes students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12, the performance for students in grades 3-5 will be compared to the elementary AMO while the performance of students in grades 6-10 will be compared to the secondary AMO for the purpose of determining AYP.</p> <p>There are approximately 200 state tuition grants to non-public day or residential placement programs for special education students. Students placed in these special programs like all students enrolled in public schools are required to participate in the state assessment. Students in public charter schools are also included in the state assessment program. Charter schools in the District of Columbia are both schools and local education agencies (LEA) and, for the purposes of NCLB reporting, are considered to be schools.</p> <p>For small schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, data are aggregated across years. School data are aggregating for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.</p>	

Revised August 2008

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i> , <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>From SY2002-2005, the state reported data for two performance levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proficient 2. Not proficient <p>Beginning in 2005-2006, DC will report four achievement levels for AYP determination:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advanced 2. Proficient 3. Basic 4. Below Basic <p>There are four performance levels reported for the regular reading and mathematics tests and the state alternative assessment.</p> <p>To make AYP, schools must meet the required percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced levels, the required participation rates, as well as the additional academic indicators.</p> <p>These levels are expected to stay the same through 2013-2014. For the new state test, DC CAS, the standard-setting and definition of each performance level, will take place by October 31, 2006 (see Critical Element 6.1 for DC CAS Timeline).</p> <p>The performance of all students is measured in relation to their grade levels, as out-of-grade testing is not permitted.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>DCPS SEA makes annual AYP determinations approximately 30 days prior to the beginning of the school year. Below is a short summary of the typical SEA activities in the accountability timeline.</p> <p>However, this timeline will not apply for SY2005-2006, the first year of implementation for the new state assessment, DC CAS. In November 2005, the District of Columbia requested flexibility in regard to the identification of schools as being in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on the new performance standards that will be finalized no later than October 31, 2006. This request was approved by the U.S. Department of Education on January 18, 2006 in a letter from Dr. Henry L. Johnson, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education (see attachment).</p> <p>As a result, at the conclusion of the first operational administration of the new state assessment, DC CAS, in May 2006 AYP reporting will be delayed until no later than October 31, 2006. At the time that the results will be available and no later than October 31, 2006, all NCLB reporting and notification requirements will be implemented. This delay will be made necessary so that new performance standards will be set based on the results from the first operational administration. Standard-setting is scheduled to be completed by July 28, 2006. In years following SY2006, the schedule of activities will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September: Begin school year and implementation of Statewide System of Support • October: Collect and verify enrollment • April: Collect and verify enrollment • April: Coordinate and supervise State Assessment, collect and verify attendance for testing, calculate participation rate, prepare and distribute RFP for new/renewing State Supplemental Service Providers • June: Receive results from testing company for State Assessment, analyze data, disaggregate data by subgroup, validate scores • July: Make AYP determinations, notify schools and districts of AYP determinations, approve final Supplemental Service Providers list • August: Respond to appeals by schools/LEA's, disseminate state/district report cards, monitor Choice option by LEA 	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>The Report Card is currently made available on the DCPS website. The report cards are also available in school offices and libraries.</p> <p>In 2001-2002, the District of Columbia Public Schools Academic Performance Database System serves as the draft format of the State Report Card. The current LEA and SEA report cards were first implemented in SY2002-2003 and have been published in August of each subsequent year.</p> <p>As a result of changes in the state test (see Critical Element 1.4), the state report cards and AYP reports will be modified by October 31, 2006 to accommodate the new (four) performance levels.</p>	

Revised August 2006

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>On April 16 2003 the DC Board of Education approved the DC State Accountability Plan to implement the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The plan includes recognitions and rewards for incentive schools, and interventions and sanctions for schools that fail to achieve AYP.</p> <p>Incentive Schools In SY2005 and SY2006, Incentive Schools were identified as schools that achieve Adequate Yearly Progress under NCLB and are recognized and rewarded with increased flexibility and autonomy. For example, of the available funds, some schools may be given unrestricted grants that give the schools maximum flexibility to support and maintain best practices; create Demonstration Models, modeling a best practice at each school that would become a resource to assist low performing schools; develop and maintain high performing teachers and administrators by supporting professional growth through professional development; and ensure teacher development and job-embedded professional development in the areas of English/language arts and/or mathematics.</p> <p>Interventions and sanctions include:</p> <p>In Need of Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Schools in Need of Improvement – Year One have not achieved AYP for two consecutive years and the LEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide parents the opportunity to transfer to a school not identified as in need of improvement. ○ Complete a written School Improvement Plan identifying issues hindering school improvement and addressing these issues with specific research-based improvement strategies. ▪ Schools in Need of Improvement – Year Two have not achieved AYP for three consecutive years and the LEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement the components outlined for Year One schools; and ○ Provide the opportunity for parents to select from a state approved list of Supplemental Educational Service providers.² 	
<p>Interventions and sanctions (continued):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Schools in Need of Corrective Action – have not achieved AYP for four consecutive years and the LEA must: 	

² A state approved list of Supplemental Educational Service (SES) providers is made available by June 30th of each year by the DC Office of Federal Grant Programs.

- Implement the components outlined for Year Two schools; and
- Implement at least one of the following strategies or actions:
 - Replace staff relevant to the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Change curriculum in the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Be permitted less local school management authority
 - Appoint an outside expert to advise the school
 - Extend the school day or school year
 - Restructure the internal organization of the school
- Schools in Need of Restructuring – Year One/Planning have not achieved AYP for five consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for corrective action schools; and
 - Plan for an alternative governance structure to take effect in the following school year that includes at least one of the following actions:
 - Replace staff relevant to the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Reopen the school as a Public Charter School
 - Enter into a private management contract for the school
 - Enter into an agreement to permit the SEA to operate the school
 - Other restructuring actions that significantly alter the governance.
- Schools in Need of Restructuring – Year Two have not achieved AYP for six consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for Restructuring – Year One schools; and
 - Reopen in accordance with the restructuring plan.

Exiting School Improvement:

School in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring that achieved AYP for two consecutive years will be removed from this designation.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>The definitions of a school program as detailed in section 1.1 of this workbook incorporate every student in the SEA.</p> <p>The State Accountability System includes students in general education, special education, special education centers, alternative education and non-public private day/residential placements.</p> <p>State guidelines are disseminated statewide to guide the assessment of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. An alternative assessment is available for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p> <p>Students with disabilities will be identified by their IEP and verified through automated special education data systems where available. 504 are included in calculations like all other students, but they are not included as students with disabilities.</p> <p>Service levels for NEP/LEP students are identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. LEP and NEP student (now referred to as English language learners) are those students who score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test.</p> <p>Accountability criteria related to the participation rate are detailed in Critical Elements 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, and 10.0.</p> <p>For small schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, data are aggregated across years. School data are aggregating for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>A ‘full academic year’ is defined as enrollment in a public school on the official state (fall) enrollment date in October of each year and the first day of testing (usually in April). The official enrollment from October will be compared to the enrollment in April. The comparison will identify students in the assessed grades who have not been enrolled for the full academic year in order to report their scores at the LEA level.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>If a student is enrolled in October and remains enrolled to the April enrollment date, he/she is determined to be enrolled for a full academic year. Therefore, the school is held accountable for their academic achievement. However, students do transfer and the following details how their scores will be applied for accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a student enrolls in more than one school within the same LEA, the student’s achievement scores will apply to the LEA and SEA. • If a student enrolls in more than one school in a different LEA, the student’s achievement will apply to the SEA. <p>For most students in the state, the dates of enrollment are identified using automated student data bases that are updated in real time by staff at the school level. In some public charter schools, these data are provided to the state using excel files that are created for this purpose in October and April.</p>	

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
3.1 How does the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>The charts for <i>Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives</i> are attached that present the progression from the 2001-2002 starting points to 2013-2014.</p> <p>To establish new intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, the state utilized the 2005-2006 DC CAS results and the same methodology used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003 as prescribed by NCLB and described in Critical Element 3.2a. Based on the operational administration of the new state assessment, DC CAS, the revised starting points, annual objectives, and intermediate goals are presented in Appendix A. As can be seen, while the starting points were recalculated, the annual objectives for 2005-2006 are still at the second step.</p> <p>100% of students in the DCPS-SEA are expected to achieve ‘proficient’ or better by SY2013-2014.</p> <p>For accountability purposes, all schools are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have separate accountability targets (see Appendix A). All grade level performance percentages within a category (e.g., elementary) are compared to the same annual measurable objective (AMO). For schools that include both elementary and secondary grades, grade level performance will be compared to the appropriate annual measurable objective. For example, for a school that includes students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12, the performance for students in grades 3-5 will be compared to the elementary AMO while the performance of students in grades 6-10 will be compared to the secondary AMO for the purpose of determining AYP.</p> <p>There are approximately 200 state tuition grants to non-public day or residential placement programs for special education students. Students placed in these special programs like all students enrolled in public schools are required to participate in the state assessment. Students in public charter schools are also included in the state assessment program. Charter schools in the District of Columbia are both schools and local education agencies (LEA) and, for the purposes of NCLB reporting, are considered to be schools.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>For a school, LEA, or the state to make AYP each subgroup (whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives (to include the applicable additional academic indicator) and have at least 95 % participation rate in state assessment.</p> <p>For each subgroup, to fail to make AYP, a school, LEA, or the state must fail to achieve AYP in the same component (i.e., reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) for two consecutive years.</p> <p>If any school, LEA, or state meet ALL of the following, they will make AYP under the ‘Safe Harbor Provision’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95% participation rate on state assessment; • % of students in each subgroup scoring below proficiency decreased by 10% compared to the prior year. For the transition year for the new state test, and for the purpose of calculating safe harbor, SY2005 proficiency data will be adjusted linearly based on the differences between the overall SY2005 and SY2006 state proficiency rates; estimated differences are presented in Appendix D; • In regard to the other academic indicators (i.e., attendance graduation rate), subgroups can achieve safe harbor by showing improvement on the additional academic indicators as specified in Elements 7.1 and 7.2. For the graduation rate, the state has the capacity to report this data at the subgroup level as a result of improved student level data collection. 	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
-------------------------	--

3.2a What is the State’s starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The SEA measures achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP. Data is combined across grades for determining AYP – i.e., a weighted proportion.

From SY2002-SY2005, the following details the general grade-spans included for determining AYP:

- Elementary: Grades 2-5
- Secondary (to include Middle and Junior High): Grades 6-12
- For schools that include both elementary and secondary grades, separate targets are applied level and a weighted proportion is then calculated.

For SY2002-SY2005, the chart below details the ‘starting points’ in terms of percent proficient or above for each of the grade-spans and content areas:

Grade Levels	ELA/Reading	Math
Elementary	30.3	38.4
Secondary	13.7	19.8

Commencing in SY2006 through SY2014, the following details the grade-spans included for the two levels of AYP:

- Elementary: Grades 2-5
- Secondary (to include Middle and Junior High): Grades 6-10
- For schools that include both elementary and secondary grades, separate targets are applied by level and a weighted proportion is then calculated.

For SY2002-SY2005, the starting points were calculated using the percent proficient in the school enrolling the 20th percentile of students of the State’s total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level. This method was applied to all schools in the Elementary and Secondary grade-spans. The starting points were calculated using data from the ’01-’02 school year. The starting points are the same for all schools in the Elementary Grade-span and in the Secondary Grade-span. Schools with un-graded or age-based groupings were identified according to the closest grade that would apply.

For SY2006-2014, the state has recalculated the starting points based on the results of the first administration of the new state tests, DC CAS. The starting points, annual objectives, and intermediate goals for the SAT-9 and the new assessment are presented in Appendix A.

To establish the new intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, the state utilized the 2005-2006 DC CAS results and the same methodology (outlined above) used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003. For SY2006, however, the AMO will reflect the second step of the newly established new intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>The charts for <i>Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives</i> are attached that present the progression from the 2001-2002 starting points to 2013-2014.</p> <p>The state will recalculate the starting points by October 31, 2006 based on the results of the first administration of the new state tests, DC CAS, and the new performance levels (see Critical Element 1.4). To establish the new intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, the state will utilize the 2005-2006 DC CAS results and the same methodology used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003 as prescribed by NCLB and described in Critical Element 3.2a. By October 31, 2006, new annual measurable academic objectives and intermediate goals will be determined using the SY2006 DC CAS results and will be forwarded to the U.S. Department of Education.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>For SY2002-2005, intermediate goals first increases for the SY2003-2004. Each subsequent increase occurs every two years and is equal incrementally.</p> <p>The state will recalculate the annual objectives and intermediate goals by October 31, 2006 based on the results of the first administration of the new state tests, DC CAS, and the new performance levels (see Critical Element 1.4). To establish the new intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, the state will utilize the 2005-2006 DC CAS results and the same methodology used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003 as prescribed by NCLB and described in Critical Element 3.2a. Intermediate goals will be determined for SY2006-2014 by October 31, 2006 based on the baseline 2005-2006 data for the new state assessment, DC CAS.</p>	

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>Except for SY2006, AYP decisions are made annually according to the timeline below. Decisions are made for each school.</p> <p>However, this timeline will not apply for SY2005-2006, the first year of implementation for the new state assessment, DC CAS. In November 2005, the District of Columbia requested flexibility in regard to the identification of schools as being in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on the new performance standards that will be finalized no later than October 31, 2006. This request was approved by the U.S. Department of Education on January 18, 2006 in a letter from Dr. Henry L. Johnson, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education (see Appendix D).</p> <p>As a result, at the conclusion of the first operational administration of the new state assessment, DC CAS, in May 2006 AYP reporting will be delayed until no later than October 31, 2006. At the time that the results will be available no later than October 31, 2006 and all NCLB reporting and notification requirements will be implemented no later than October 31, 2006. This delay will be made necessary so that new performance standards will be set based on the results from the first operational administration. In years following SY2006, the schedule of activities will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September: Begin school year and implementation of Statewide System of Support • October: Collect and verify enrollment • April: Collect and verify enrollment • April: Coordinate and supervise State Assessment, collect and verify attendance for testing, calculate participation rate, prepare and distribute RFP for new/renewing State Supplemental Service Providers • June: Receive results from testing company for State Assessment, analyze data, disaggregate data by subgroup, validate scores • July: Make AYP determinations, notify schools and districts of AYP determinations, approve final Supplemental Service Providers list • August: Respond to appeals by schools/LEA's, disseminate state/district report cards, monitor Choice option by LEA 	

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
	5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>For a school or LEA to make AYP, each subgroup (whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and from all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives (to include the applicable additional academic indicator) and have at least 95 % participation rate in state assessment.</p> <p>For each subgroup, to fail to make AYP, a school, LEA, or the state must fail to achieve AYP in the same component for two consecutive years.</p> <p>Students with disabilities will be identified by their IEP and verified through automated special education data systems where available. 504 are included in calculations like all other students, but they are not included as students with disabilities.</p> <p>Economically disadvantaged students will be identified through their application for free/reduced lunch.</p> <p>Major racial and ethnic groups, which include: African-American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, White and other will be identified through the official enrollment.</p> <p>Service levels for NEP/LEP students are identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. LEP and NEP student (now referred to as English language learners) are those students who score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>All LEAs will be held accountable for student subgroup achievement. In order to make AYP, each subgroup must meet or exceed the annual measurable objectives, intermediate goals, and/or participation rate and/or the other indicators.</p> <p>Subgroups will include the economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students. LEAs are required to collect and report all required data to allow the State to disaggregate data consistent with the regulations of NCLB. Additionally, the SEA will require School Improvement Plans to specifically describe how the academic needs of major subgroups will be met.</p>	

Revised August 2015

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>All students with disabilities participate in the statewide assessment with accommodations as appropriate. Students who meet the state criterion – i.e., students with the most significant cognitive disabilities – will be eligible to participate in the state alternative assessment which is based on alternative achievement standards. The state participation on the alternative assessment must not exceed 1 percent. This criterion or cap applies to the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State’s definition of AYP?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>All LEP/NEP students will be included in the State’s definition of AYP and the large majority will participate in the general assessment with accommodations (unless they are eligible to participate in the alternative assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities).</p> <p>In accordance with NCLB guidance, scores for LEP/NEP students who have enrolled in schools in the United States within the previous 12 months will not be required to participate in the reading portion of the state assessment and will be counted as participants for AYP if they participated in the state language proficiency assessments. Such students will, however, participate in the state mathematics assessment.</p> <p>Scores for students who were classified as limited English or non-English proficient, but become fully English proficient, will be included in the school, district, and state LEP/NEP subgroup summaries for 2 years after the students exit the LEP/NEP program.</p> <p>Service levels for NEP/LEP students will be identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. LEP and NEP student (now referred to as English language learners) are those students who score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test.</p> <p>State guidance prescribes how students with disabilities and English language learners are assessed in regard to testing accommodations (see Appendix F).</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT							
5.5 What is the State’s definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?							
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS							
<p>The following table details the minimum number of students for reporting and accountability for all subgroups. The rationale for the determination of the minimum reported group size is provided in Appendix B.</p> <p>For small schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, data are aggregated across years. School data are aggregating for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Minimum-N</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>For reporting (privacy)</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>For AYP determination (reliability)</td> <td>25 (academic indicators) and 40 (for participation rate)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Minimum-N	Number	For reporting (privacy)	10	For AYP determination (reliability)	25 (academic indicators) and 40 (for participation rate)
Minimum-N	Number						
For reporting (privacy)	10						
For AYP determination (reliability)	25 (academic indicators) and 40 (for participation rate)						

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>State assessment policies and procedures will not reveal personally identifiable information on students. This confidentiality is assured by the policy of not reporting results for groups of less than 10. In cases where all students in a group score at the same performance level and confidentiality is compromised, the state is examining the feasibility of reporting the results as ranges of performance rather than exact percentages. Issues include the size of the group, the level of performance, and the reporting method.</p>	

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>AYP is calculated based on the State Assessment and demonstrated improvement on one additional academic indicator.</p> <p>In 2005-2006, a new state assessment, the District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) was implemented. The standard-setting was approved by the state Board of Education on July 27, 2006 (see Resolution, Appendix E).</p> <p>By October 31, 2006, results of the 2005-2006 will be released and all NCLB reporting and notification requirements will be implemented. This delay will be made necessary so that new performance standards will be set based on the results from the first operational administration.</p>	

Revised August 2006

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>Graduation will be the additional academic indicator for determining AYP for senior high schools. The graduation rate is defined as the total number of graduates for a given year with a regular diploma divided by the sum of the number of graduates (for that year) and dropouts for the current year and the three preceding years. The definition of diploma excludes GED, certificates of completion, certificates of attendance, or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards.</p> <p>For SY2006, a three year graduation rate will be calculated because data from 2002-2003 is not available statewide. The NCES method described above will be used. To ensure that the graduation rate is a four-rate, graduates will be identified by their entry date for the ninth grade. The state is studying the practices of other states in regard to the reporting of graduation data for students with disabilities. For SY2006, however, only four-year graduates will be reported.</p> <p>As a result of a change in State Board of Education policy, the District of Columbia will begin in SY2006-2007 collecting the data needed to calculate the graduate rate using the student cohort method recommended by the National Governors’ Association in July 2005. Complete four-year data using the new method will not be reported until the SY2010 – the class of 2010</p> <p>Adequate yearly progress, in relation to the graduation rate, will be based on the SEA average. The baseline three-year SEA average will be calculated after SY2005-2006. Schools above the state average are defined as achieving AYP. Schools with graduation rates above the state average must not decline by two percentage points two consecutive years or they will be defined as not achieving AYP.</p> <p>For schools below the state average to make AYP, the graduation rate must increase each year by one percentage point until they reach the SEA average.</p> <p>For the graduation rate, the state has the capacity to report this data at the subgroup level as a result of improved student level data collection.</p> <p>Dropouts are defined based on the criterion established by the National Center for Educational Statistics and as reported in the Common Core of Data.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
7.2 What is the State’s additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>Attendance will be the additional academic indicator for Elementary AYP. Attendance will be calculated by dividing the total daily attendance over the full academic year by the total daily enrollment taken over the same period. Schools will be required to record and report both daily attendance and enrollment. Baseline 2001-2002 attendance data are provided in Appendix G.</p> <p>For most students in the state, attendance and enrollment data are identified using automated student data bases that are updated in real time by staff at the school level. In some public charter schools, these data are provided to the state using excel files that are created for this purpose. In some cases, attendance is reported manually.</p> <p>To make the attendance AYP indicator, a school must meet the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A school with less than 90% attendance must show annual improvement up to a target of 90% attendance • Any school, including those performing at or above the 90% target, which demonstrate a 2% decline or more in attendance each year for two consecutive years will not make AYP for this indicator 	

Revised August 2016

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) uses an automated student information system that requires schools to take attendance daily. The District of Columbia Board of Education Charter Schools and the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) are collaborating to implement systems that will permit the state to monitor and report state level data. The DCPS Office of Information Technology (OIT) is able to provide daily and periodic extracts and summary reports. Currently, the District of Columbia Public Charter Authority schools are required to report monthly attendance; they are currently studying more efficient ways to gather and transmit attendance data. Appropriate data collection strategies and quality control measures are being applied to the attendance, enrollment, and graduation rate data to ensure graduation rate and attendance data is valid and reliable. For example, all DCPS schools are required to undergo an internal enrollment audit conducted jointly by the Offices of Educational Accountability and Assessment and Student Services. All schools within the District of Columbia, including charter schools, are required to fully participate in an external census audit of enrollment, special education and bilingual service participation, and attendance. The state auditor is Thompson, Cobb, and Bazilio and Associates (TCBA).</p> <p>By October 31, 2006, the state will publish a technical report assessing the reliability and validity of the new state assessment. This report will be reviewed by the state's Technical Advisory Committee and will be presented to US DOE.</p>	

Revised August 2006

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>The State AYP determination for all students will separately measure reading and mathematics in the aggregate and for each identified subgroup.</p> <p>For accountability purposes, all schools are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have separate accountability targets (see Appendix A). All grade level performance percentages within a category (e.g., elementary) are compared to the same annual measurable objective (AMO). For schools that include both elementary and secondary grades, grade level performance will be compared to the appropriate annual measurable objective. For example, for a school that includes students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12, the performance for students in grades 3-5 will be compared to the elementary AMO while the performance of students in grades 6-10 will be compared to the secondary AMO for the purpose of determining AYP.</p>	

Revised August 2006

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>By October 31, 2006, the state will complete an evaluation design to study the reliability of AYP determinations and examine the feasibility of utilizing error bars in the reporting of AYP data. The accountability model was presented to the state's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in March 2006 and the TAC is assisting the state in the development of the evaluation design.</p> <p>By October 31, 2006, the state will publish a technical report assessing the reliability and validity of the new state assessment. This report will be reviewed by the state's Technical Advisory Committee and will be presented to US DOE.</p> <p>The validity and reliability of the District of Columbia accountability system incorporates three components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Test reliability and validity ➤ Reliability of disaggregated data ➤ Quality control systems <p>The reliability of the disaggregated data is discussed in Principle 10.1.</p> <p>Quality control issues are primarily concerned with the development of state data collection, maintenance and reporting systems. The DCPS is working closely with the public chartering authorities and city agencies to establish quality control systems. The SEA will report annually on the status of these systems.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>In order to ensure valid AYP determinations, the State has established an appeal process for all LEAs to appeal an accountability decision. Appeals must be based only on questions concerning the accuracy of the data and must be initiated by the school, district or a significant group of parents at a particular school. Schools are provided 30 days to appeal AYP decisions.</p> <p>By October 31, 2006, the state will examine the decision accuracy of the accountability system including an examination of the reliability of AYP determinations and the feasibility of utilizing error bans in the reporting of AYP data. The accountability model was presented to the state's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in March 2006 and the TAC is assisting the state in the development of the evaluation design.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>As new schools meet the two criteria (membership and budget code) they will be incorporated into the Accountability System.</p> <p>By October 31, 2006, the state will examine the decision accuracy of the accountability system including an examination of the reliability of AYP determinations and the feasibility of utilizing error bans in the reporting of AYP data. The accountability model was presented to the state's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in March 2006 and the TAC is assisting the state in the development of the evaluation design.</p> <p>By October 31, 2006, results of the 2005-2006 will be released and all NCLB reporting and notification requirements will be implemented. This delay will be made necessary so that new performance standards will be set based on the results from the first operational administration. In November 2005, the District of Columbia requested flexibility in regard to the identification of schools as being in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on the new performance standards that will be finalized no later than October 31, 2006. This request was approved by the U.S. Department of Education on January 18, 2006 in a letter from Dr. Henry L. Johnson, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education (see Appendix C).</p> <p>To establish new intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, the state utilized the 2005-2006 DC CAS results and the same methodology used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003 as prescribed by NCLB and described in Critical Element 3.2a. Based on the operational administration of the new state assessment, DC CAS, the revised starting points, annual objectives, and intermediate goals are presented in Appendix A. As can be seen, while the starting points were recalculated, the annual objectives</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
<p>for 2005-2006 are still at the second step. The estimated impact of these recalculations is presented in Appendix D.</p>	

Revised August 2006

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>The State Accountability System will hold LEAs accountable for reaching the 95% participation rate for assessment. The accountability for participation will be separate from that for proficiency and the other academic indicators.</p> <p>The State will use the spring, first day of testing, enrollment in calculating the 95% rate of participation, both in the aggregate and by subgroup. The participation rate corresponds to the population reported on the mandated state, district, and school report cards – i.e., the student population on first day of testing.</p> <p>Participants or test takers are students that complete the reading and mathematics subtests. Invalid scores and students that do not participate are reported as non-proficient.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>The State Accountability System will ensure that the 95% participation requirement will be applied when the group size is statistically significant according to State definitions and regulations. The minimum group size for participation is 40.</p>	