

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
(Revised July 2005)**



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

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

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

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

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

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

Status	State Accountability System Element
Principle 1: All Schools	
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> .
P	1.4 Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
F	1.5 Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
F	1.6 Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
Principle 2: All Students	
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> .
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations	
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> .
Principle 4: Annual Decisions	
F	4.1 The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:

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

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

F	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> .
F	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> .
F	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> .
F	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> .
F	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
F	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

F	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> .
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> .
F	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

F	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

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

Principle 10: Participation Rate

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

STATUS Legend:

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

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

Instructions

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The Accountability and Reporting policy (revised for the February 2003 State Board meeting) includes all public schools in accordance with Nebraska law (Rev. Stat. 79-760 at http://statutes.unicam.state.ne.us/corpus/statutes/chap79/r7907060.html). In April, the State Board approved the School Performance Policy that defines accountability for student performance for all schools and districts.</p> <p>Schools without grades included in the assessment system (i.e., K-2) will be given the same status and held to the requirements of the school to which the majority of their graduates attend. This also applies to districts or schools with no students in the grades assessed. There are no charter or State operated schools in Nebraska. The juvenile justice schools are under the Department of Corrections. Students in detention and treatment centers who are wards of the court or the State are considered by law to be residents of the district where they resided at the time of wardship.(Rev. Stat. 79-215)</p> <p>Schools designed to serve only contracted Special Education school-age students will not be included since the students who are contracted for Special Education services will be included with the student’s resident district. Prekindergarten only schools will not be included since preschool services are not required by the State.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All schools and districts in the State are held to the same criteria when making AYP determinations. The STARS assessment results are used for determining AYP status. All schools and districts submit data specifically for AYP determinations. The AYP definition is integrated into the State accountability system but the nature of Nebraska's schools present a unique challenge.

Almost 50% of Nebraska's districts (n = 271) are Class I districts serving only grades K-8 or less. The average enrollment is only about 30 students for each district. The range of enrollment for these districts is 822 to 0 (8 districts contract all of their students to another district). Nebraska's 18 Class VI (secondary only) districts have an average enrollment of 198 students with a range of enrollment from 680 to 33. Almost 30% of the remaining students in Nebraska are enrolled in the two largest districts (Class IV and V). Almost 70% of all districts in the State have an enrollment of 600 or less. This means that there will be schools and districts with less than the minimum number of results needed for statistical reliability of AYP determinations.

However, all schools and districts in Nebraska are included in the State's policies on Accountability and Reporting and School Performance. In April, the State Board approved a policy holding all schools accountable for student performance and the quality of the STARS assessments. Starting with the results of the 2002-03 school year, a rating of Unacceptable or Acceptable, Needs Improvement triggers consequences and penalties related to accreditation for all schools regardless of the number of students included in the assessments. Appendix A provides details on the State's accountability policy for STARS including how it applies to small schools.

District reorganization is an ongoing process in Nebraska. Each year more than a dozen districts merge or consolidate, dissolve, or join together as a new "unified" system. Unified systems are considered an LEA and will be included as one "district". The State will ensure continuity for accountability purposes by following the same procedures used for reallocating grants when districts change.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>In the STARS (School-based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System) assessment system, student performance achievement levels are determined for each classroom assessment according to criteria established under the Quality Indicators. This process must be conducted in a technically appropriate manner, i.e., the Angoff method. (Appendix D provides detailed information on the review of student performance levels in the assessment portfolios.) To assist schools in applying the technical requirements of assessment development under STARS, the State has initiated assessment training for veteran teachers, administrators and staff developers from throughout the State. Each district annually submits an assessment portfolio for external review by assessment experts who evaluate sample assessments and the process established by the district for determining student achievement levels. Student performance on Reading and Math standards is reported in four levels – basic, progressing, proficient and advanced.</p> <p>The STARS system establishes a rating for the percent of students performing at mastery (proficient and advanced) level for each Reading and Math. Each grade level in each school receive a rating on the Report Card on one of five levels of performance: Unacceptable; Acceptable, Needs Improvement; Good; Very Good; or Exemplary. These ratings levels are determined in a standards setting cut score process by The Buros Center for Testing.</p> <p>STARS information is provided at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html</p>		

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Currently, student performance results are submitted by June 30 but the external expert review of the district assessment portfolios delays the determination of the ratings of Quality of the assessments, an integral component of the assessment system, until mid-October.

To shorten the timeline for notifying schools before the start of the following school year of AYP determinations, the State is proposing the following transitional process. The State Board approved a revised the Assessment schedule as follows: starting in 2004-05 school year, districts will not need to submit annual assessment portfolios once the district has received quality ratings of Exemplary or Very Good unless the assessments change significantly. By the 2004-05 school year, each district will have submitted an assessment portfolio for a field test year and a first full year of implementation for both Reading and Math. The goal is to have all district assessments at the Very Good or Exemplary status by this time so external peer review for Reading and Math will only be needed for those districts changing assessments. Without the external review of assessment portfolios, decisions about adequate yearly progress can be made prior to the start of the next academic year. Districts submit student performance data by June 30. Even with processing time and time for district audit of data, preliminary information would be available on progress by mid-August.

Until all districts meet the minimum acceptable rating on the quality of STARS assessments and the timelines can be shortened to have the results available by August, Title I schools that are newly identified to be in need of improvement will be required to offer public school choice, supplemental services and all other NCLB requirements and timelines starting with the second semester of the following school year. All Title I schools that have already been identified as being in need of improvement for at least two consecutive years will be required to provide the public school choice and supplemental services by the start of the following school year. Since most (89%) of the Title I schools already had a rating of Good, Very Good or Exemplary in 2001-02 school year, it can be anticipated that Title I schools will be able to use their preliminary data to determine AYP status and begin requirements by the start of the following year.

Title I districts that meet the Good, Very Good, or Exemplary rating on their STARS assessments will be able to determine their AYP status based on the data submitted in June and will be directed to begin planning for NCLB requirements for school improvement over the summer so that they can begin notifying parents and providing supplemental services by the start of the following year. The guidance will indicate that, if the final AYP decisions following the appeal process, etc., has changed from the preliminary data, students who have taken transferred under the public school choice option or are receiving supplemental services will be able to continue throughout that school year.

STARS information is provided at: <http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State has provided an annual Report Card since 2000. The current Report Card can be viewed at <http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/>. The Report Card provides State, district and school level information. In Nebraska, districts report student performance on every standard in the subject area assessed that year in the STARS assessments. Statewide writing and norm-referenced test results are also provided. The Report Card includes district goals as well as demographic, student, staff and financial information. Trend data are provided. A summary of the online annual report card is distributed through the daily newspapers throughout the State. This summary is available in English and Spanish, the second most common language in the State.

Section 1111(h)(1)(C) requirements will be met when a State student record system is implemented (anticipated for the 2004-05 school year data). (1) The Report Card currently provides data on the performance of all students, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities at each proficiency level. For the 2002-03 Report Card, the number of students at the mastery level will be reported for all the subgroups identified for AYP determinations plus the subgroups of gender and Migrant Status. (2) For the 2002-03 school year data, the comparison of achievement for each subgroup to the State goals will be included. (3) The number of students not tested is currently provided but won't be available as disaggregated data until the State student record system. (4) Trend data is currently provided for both STARS and the NRT data. (5) Data on the other academic indicators will be added to the Report Card. (6) Graduation rates will be disaggregated when the State student record system is implemented. (7) The AYP status of each school and district will be included in the report card as these determinations are made. (8) The State is in the process of revising the definition of "highly qualified teachers" following on on-site review by the U. S. Department of Education in January, 2005. The inclusion of all data available on highly qualified teachers, pending USDE's approval of the proposed revisions, will be provided on the 2004-05 school year. The percentage of teachers with emergency or provisional credentials will be added.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?²</p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	<p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The State currently recognizes districts that develop exemplary assessments under the STARS assessment system. These exemplary assessments can be used as models for other districts. The State does not have monetary rewards for districts. It is highly unlikely that the State legislature will be providing additional funds for high performing districts since it is proposing to cut State support for districts in order to meet a financial shortfall. Because standards, assessment and accountability are incorporated into Rule 10, school districts are in danger of losing accreditation if they are not in full compliance with the assessment system.</p> <p>The State Board of Education approved a policy on school performance in April, 2003. In addition to the actions for schools with low student performance or quality assessments (See Appendix A), this policy identifies rewards for high quality assessments as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special recognition in the State of the Schools Report and other documents • Involvement in leadership opportunities of model quality practices linked to high student performance • Reduction in requirements for annual submission of assessment quality documentation to the Department of Education. <p>Rewards for high student performance ratings include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special listing in the State of the Schools Report and other documents • Involvement in leadership opportunities to model quality practices. <p>The NCLB requirements will continue to apply to all Title I schools. Title I funds (the 2% and 4% reservation) will continue to be made available to Title I schools identified as needing improvement.</p> <p>Rule 10 can be found at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/legal/clean10.pdf STARS information is provided at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html</p>		

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?</p>	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	<p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Rev. Stat. 76-960 requires all students to be included in the State assessments.</p> <p>Schools without grades included in the assessment system (i.e., K-2) will be held accountable to the school to which the majority of their graduates attend.</p> <p>Schools designed to serve only contracted Special Education school-age students will not be included since the students who are contracted for Special Education services will be included with their resident district. Prekindergarten only schools will not be included since preschool services are not required by the State.</p> <p>The Guidance for District Reporting for Adequate Yearly Progress requires districts to report all students enrolled in the district, even if enrolled in more than one school in the district in a single year. When the State student record system is implemented, students who are enrolled in multiple districts within one year within the State will be included. All districts must report all students at the grade levels required for STARS assessments and for AYP determinations. Data from all districts will be aggregated up to the State level for State AYP determination.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p>	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Nebraska standards are imbedded in the curriculum of the classroom and assessed multiple times over the course of the school year. There is no set date(s) for conducting the assessments. Some districts have developed summative assessments for the standards that are given in the Spring of the year. To ensure that all districts have the opportunity to include all assessments, a full academic year for a student is defined as being enrolled from the Last Friday in September (the official enrollment date for the State) until the end of the assessments or the end of the school year. The end of the assessment year could not occur prior to February since that is the month all districts are required to participate in the statewide writing assessment.</p> <p>STARS information is provided at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Nebraska is in the process of developing a student level data system that will allow the State to follow students who transfer during the school year between districts. Districts are required to track and report students who transfer within the district. Until the student level data system is implemented, guidance has been provided to all districts to ensure that all students who transfer within a district are included in the reporting of student performance and the calculation of enrollment for a full academic year for the district level determination of the participation rates for AYP. All district data will be aggregated for State level determination of AYP.</p>		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The State's definition of adequate yearly progress is provided in Appendix B.</p>		

³ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>Until the State has implemented the student record data system, districts will report aggregate numbers for student performance for each accountability group for each school. Since the purpose of an accountability system is to ensure that schools or populations of students needing to improve are appropriately identified for intervention, each district must not demonstrate progress for two consecutive years in the same grade span and subject area to result in identification of needing improvement. If in any particular year, an accountability group fails to meet or exceed the progress goal but has decreased by 10% the percentage required to be considered proficient, and that group has at least 95% participation rate in the assessments, and meets the goal for the other academic indicator, that accountability group will be considered to have made adequate yearly progress.</p> <p>To ensure high levels of reliability, the State is proposing that each accountability group must include a minimum of 30 participants enrolled for a full academic year before the 95% participation rate is applied for determining AYP. Data from all schools within a district will be aggregated to a district level. The district data will be used to measure AYP status using the State goals. In Nebraska, only about 10% of the districts have multiple buildings with the same grade spans. For the vast majority of districts, the data will be the same at the school and district level. There are some Class I districts in the State that encompass more than one reporting level (i.e., K-8). The data from the reporting levels will be aggregated for district AYP determinations.</p> <p>Schools or districts with no accountability groups containing a minimum of 30, will be held to the provisions of the State policies on Accountability defined in Appendix A.</p> <p>The procedure for determining whether any group, school or district has met the State goal is amended as follows:</p> <p>A 99% confidence interval will be applied to the Reading, Mathematics, and Writing (other academic indicator at the elementary and middle grade levels) for all groups, schools and districts having the minimum number of 30. This amendment changes the previously approved minimum number for students with disabilities from 45 to 30.</p> <p>The Safe Harbor procedure is amended to include the use of a 75% confidence interval.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK
See Appendix C.

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The annual measurable objectives will be applied to each school building and school district, as well as to each subgroup at the school building, district, and statewide levels to determine AYP status. Data will be aggregated in districts with multiple schools and grade levels to determine district AYP status.

See Appendix C.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p>	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. •Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
See Appendix C.		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>Beginning with the 2002-03 student performance results, an annual determination of AYP status will be made for each public school and district reporting results for the minimum required number of students. Small schools and districts will be held accountable and identified as needing improvement based on the State accountability policy regardless of the number of students. (See Appendix A.)</p> <p>The following procedure will be used to make the annual AYP determinations:</p> <p>Indicators --</p> <p> Student Performance A determination of whether Reading and Mathematics student performance results met the State goal for that subject using a 99% confidence interval for each group that contains at least the minimum number of 30.</p> <p> Participation Rate of 95% Participation rates will be determined using the higher rate of the current year or the average of the previous year and the current year.</p> <p> Other Academic Indicator</p> <p> a) Elementary and middle schools – A determination of whether Statewide writing results meet the State goal using a 99% confidence interval or demonstrate a higher percentage at proficient than the previous year.</p> <p> b) Graduation rate at high school – a determination of whether the graduation rate meets the State goal or demonstrates a higher percentage than the previous year.</p> <p> c) Quality of the STARS Assessments – The rating for the assessment portfolio must be at Good, Very Good or Exemplary.</p> <p>School Level AYP Determinations A school will be classified as not having met AYP if any one of the these indicators is found to not meet the State goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading student performance results and Reading participation, 2. Math student performance results and Math participation, 3. Other academic indicator (State writing assessment at the elementary and middle school levels, graduation rate at the high school level), and 4. Quality of the STARS assessments. <p>Two consecutive years of not making AYP in any group in the same indicator will classify the school as being in need of improvement . Safe Harbor, as described below, will be applied to AYP determinations at the school level..</p> <p>Safe Harbor will be applied using the procedure defined in the law and applying a 75% confidence interval to the results. The goal for the participation rate must still be met.</p> <p>District Level AYP Determinations Two consecutive years of not making AYP in any group in the same indicator in all grade levels present in the district will classify the district as being in need of improvement. Safe Harbor, as described above, will be applied to the aggregated data.</p>		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?</p>	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	<p>State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The STARS assessment system has required disaggregated data for English Language Learners and Special Education students. For the 2002-03 and 2003-04 school year, districts will report aggregate numbers of students for each accountability group required by NCLB. Schools and districts will report the following subgroups for AYP determinations: all students, gender, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status (low-income), English Language Learners, students with disabilities and students served in Migrant programs. Disaggregated data for gender and Migrant students are required for the State Report Card but are not included in the AYP determinations.</p> <p>STARS information is provided at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.</p>	<p>State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Schools and districts will be held accountable for the performance of the following groups that meet the minimum size requirements for accountability purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All students; o Socio-economic status (low income defined as eligible for free or reduced lunch program); o English Language Learners; o Students with disabilities (defined under section 602(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act); o Major Race/ethnicity groups (Asian/Pacific Islander, Black/Not Hispanic, Hispanic, Native American and White/Not Hispanic). Major race/ethnicity groups will be revisited when additional guidance is available about upcoming changes in the national classification system. <p>The definition of Limited English Proficient in NCLB is as follows: an individual whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual (i) the ability to meet the State’s proficient level of achievement on State assessments, (ii) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English, or the opportunity to participate fully in society. The students to be included in the determination of AYP for the subgroup of English Language Learners are those who meet the definition of Limited English Proficient as defined in NCLB, or students who have exited from services or a program in the district within the last two full years.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>All students with disabilities participate in the STARS assessment systems with regular assessments, accommodations for assessments as defined in the student's IEP, or an alternate assessment. Nebraska has developed alternate standards for the most severely involved special education students and determined four levels of performance for each standard. Locally developed assessments are used to determine student performance on the standards. Student performance results on alternate assessments are reported annually by each district.</p> <p>For determining AYP status, students with alternate assessments will be counted as performing at the level of performance they demonstrate on the assessments of the alternate standards. The number of students taking alternate assessments based on alternate standards should not exceed 1% of the population of any school. For the 2001-02 school year, the statewide percentage of students taking alternate assessments was 00.794%.</p> <p>The new guidance requires States to establish a 1% cap on the percent of scores of alternate assessments included as proficient. Nebraska will collect the additional data and calculate the percentage for each district. If these calculations indicate a district has exceeded the 1% cap, the SEA will provide a waiver, if appropriate, using the guidelines provided by the U. S. Department of Education (including REAP eligible as a definition of small). Since the State's participation rate for alternate assessments has remained below .80%, it is not anticipated that the State or any district will exceed a 1% cap on "proficient scores".</p> <p>The expectation in Nebraska is that <u>all</u> students are assessed at grade level. Special education students receive accommodations according to their IEPs in order to provide them appropriate testing opportunities. If a student's IEP requires that a student be tested with a test below grade level, districts have been instructed to report that student at the "beginning" or lowest level of performance.</p> <p>STARS information is provided at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>All English Language Learners are required, under Rev. Stat. 79-760 to participate in the State assessment system. Alternate assessments are allowed only for non-English speakers (as determined by a language proficiency test)If the alternate assessment is not aligned to the content standards or cannot produce a score that is equivalent to the proficiency levels at grade level (out of level testing) then the student's performance must be included at the lowest (basic) level. (STARS Update, Feb. 2003).</p> <p>Nebraska will implement the new guidance for "new immigrant" students (first time enrolled in a U. S. Public School). For AYP reporting, districts must include new immigrant students in the determination of participation rate but are not required to include the performance results. As noted above, the State assessment system requires assessments in Reading and Math for all students.</p> <p>Nebraska will use the NCLB definition of Limited English Proficient for AYP reporting purposes. The following is from the Department's guidance provided to all districts: The definition of Limited English Proficient in NCLB is as follows: an individual whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual (i) the ability to meet the State's proficient level of achievement on State assessments, (ii) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English, or the opportunity to participate fully in society. The students to be included in the determination of AYP for the subgroup of English Language Learners are those who meet the definition of Limited English Proficient as defined in NCLB, or students who have exited from services or a program in the district within the last two full years.</p> <p>.</p> <p>STARS information is provided at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p>	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>For public reporting of results, the State uses less than 10. All accountability groups with less than 10 students or with all students in the same proficiency level will have results masked for public reporting.</p> <p>For accountability purposes, the State will use a minimum number of 30 students in an accountability group. The State is unable to determine the impact of using a minimum number of 30 for statistical reliability since the 2002-03 school year will be the first collection of disaggregated data for all the accountability subgroups. Given the enrollment data of the schools in the State, it can be anticipated that many schools and districts will not meet the minimum number of 30 students in many, if not all, the required subgroups. Small schools and districts will still be held accountable for student performance in Reading and Math and the Statewide writing assessment annually under the State's accountability system.</p> <p>The rationale for selecting an "n" of 30 for statistical reliability was based upon three things: 1) examination of statistical tables illustrating where data begins to level off; 2) NCES' use of 30; and 3) the recommendation of the Buros Center for Testing.</p>		

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
Nebraska will protect the privacy of students for public reporting by masking all results for groups with less than 10 students or all students in the same proficiency level.		

⁶ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The multiple measures of progress include student performance on Reading and Math assessments, the Quality of Assessments rating, graduation at the high school level and the Statewide writing assessment at the middle and elementary school levels.</p> <p>The other academic indicator for the elementary and middle schools will be the Statewide writing assessment. Currently, this assessment is to be provided on a schedule that assesses grade 4 and grade 8 only once every three years. The schedule will be adjusted to include the Statewide assessment of writing in grades 4 and 8 every year. For the 2002-03 school year, the results from the Statewide Writing assessment of Grade 4 (2001-02) the Grade 8 (2002-03) will be used. The validity and reliability of the statewide writing assessment process has been validated through the Buros Center for Testing as well.</p> <p>The Nebraska assessment schedule (See response for Element 9.1) requires districts to report STARS reading results for the 2002-03 school year. Since the schedule does not require reporting of STARS mathematics results in 2002-03, districts must submit mathematics results for AYP using the required NRT if STARS mathematics results are not available. For 2003-04, districts will submit STARS mathematics results and for reading results, report student performance on STARS or NRT if STARS reading results are not available. Starting in the 2003-04 school year, the Statewide writing assessment will be conducted annually for grades 4 and 8 so that results can be used for the other academic indicator for AYP purposes at these grade levels.</p>		

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p>	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, • Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and • Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁸ to make AYP.</p>	<p>State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.</p>

⁸ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Nebraska will use the previous year's data on graduation rate in order to provide timely information of making AYP determinations.

Nebraska uses the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition for graduation rate.

FORMULA

High School Completers Year 4

$$\frac{\text{Dropouts (Grade 9 Year 1+Grade 10 Year 2+Grade 11 Year 3+Grade 12 Year)} + \text{High School Completers Year 4}}{\text{Total}} \times 100$$

- Does not include GED or other diploma recipients.
- Includes on-time graduates who receive a regular diploma
- NEW: includes students with disabilities who graduate with a regular diploma in a program described in their Individualized Educational Program that may take more than four years.
- NEW: includes English Language Learners who are enrolled in a LEP program that provides services that allow a fifth year in order to receive a regular diploma. Inclusion of ELL students must be made on a case-by-case basis as determined by the district and will only be applicable to students entering a U. S. school system at some point in the secondary grades (middle and high school).
- Does not count students who drop out as transfer students.
- Is able to calculate graduation rate in the aggregate for AYP status decisions.
- Graduation rate currently only available for all students, racial-ethnic categories and gender. Comparable data currently not available for other sub-groups.
- Data currently collected only at the LEA level. Nebraska has 18 school districts with multiple high schools.
- Graduation data for all sub-groups will be available when state level students records system is implemented. Until that time, districts will need to submit disaggregated data if the application of the safe harbor provision is appropriate.

Nebraska Department of Education
 2001-2002 Graduation Rate
 Public School Graduation Rate (NCES definition)

Racial Ethnic Background	Graduation Rate
White, Not Hispanic	88.02
Black, Not Hispanic	55.33
American Indian/Alaska Native	46.89
Asian/Pacific Islander	87.17
Hispanic	56.27
TOTAL:	83.97

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>The other academic indicator at elementary and middle schools will be the statewide writing assessment administered to all students in grades 4, 8 and 11. A trait-based writing model is used. In the statewide writing assessment students demonstrate their writing skills in response to a prompt designed and selected for their appropriate grade levels. The Nebraska Department of Education convenes panels of teachers annually to develop, refine and pilot the prompts with students prior to their statewide implementation. Students in the three grade levels respond to prompts in different modes of writing: descriptive (grade 4), narrative (grade 8), and persuasive (grade 11).</p> <p>The writing assessments are scored by experienced Nebraska teachers trained in trait-based writing. The scoring is based upon six traits of writing with clearly identified performance indicators. Scoring rubrics have been designed at each grade level assessed: 4th, 8th and 11th. The scoring occurs at three regional scoring locations within the state. At each of the geographically representative scoring sites, a random sample of writing assessments is also scored. The results are examined and analyzed by the Buros Center for Testing. The same random sample of papers is also scored out of the state by an independent and externally contracted test maker. In this way, Nebraska provides checks and balances to the regional scoring and to the assessment system as a whole.</p> <p>All of the results are analyzed by the Buros Center for Testing for technical reliability. Additionally, the Buros Center for Testing conducts and facilitates a standard-setting process annually in order to establish the proficiency levels used to determine whether or not students mastered the writing standards. This standard-setting process uses teams of experienced teachers from across the state of Nebraska. Once the mastery levels have been statistically determined and finalized, Nebraska school districts received access to their results electronically as well as in written reports. These reports include information at the district, building, and individual student levels. These written reports provide information about the achievement of Nebraska students on the writing standards.</p> <p>Statewide Writing Assessment Schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2001 Field Test Year: Grades 4, 8, and 11 2002 Grade 4 2003 Grade 8 2004 Grades 4, 8, and 11 2005 Grades 4, 8, and 11 2006 Grades 4, 8, and 11 	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?</p>	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>In the STARS assessment system, districts measure student performance on reading and mathematics using a combination of norm-referenced assessments and criterion-referenced assessments or locally developed criterion or classroom assessments. Reading and mathematics student performance results are valid and reliable. School districts are required to document the technical processes used for establishing validity and reliability for locally developed assessments. (See Appendix D for an example of Quality Indicator 6) The documentation submitted by the districts in the Assessment Portfolio is reviewed and evaluated by external experts. Statewide validity and reliability of the process used has been determined through the work of the Buros Center for Testing in the standards alignment, reliability and Quality Indicators and the statewide cut-score process.</p>		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Reading and Math results are reported separately.</p> <p>STARS information is provided at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html The current Report Card can be viewed at http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/.</p>		

¹⁰ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

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

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>In consultation with the Buros Center for Testing, statistical strategies for calculating the reliability of a local assessment system have been discussed. Dr. Barbara Plake, Director of the Buros Center has suggested "split halves" as the only possible decision consistency model that might be employed as a statistical analysis for reliability. However, in order to apply that model, a much different data system would need to be in place. Otherwise undue burden would be placed on local districts. Therefore, it is the recommendation of Nebraska's technical advisor, the Buros Center for Testing, that other procedural methods be implemented in order to verify the validity and reliability of Nebraska's AYP plan. Those seven strategies include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The individual data elements of assessment quality, reading and math performance, statewide writing assessment, graduation rate, and participation rate selected for our AYP will be reviewed annually to determine continued match to Nebraska's accountability purpose: improved student learning through high quality assessment in every building. 2) Those individual components (listed above) will be evaluated collectively each year to determine their effect on buildings meeting AYP. Close annual monitoring of building improvement will be conducted. 3) Verification procedures will be implemented including: data audits, assessment visitations, and district self-checks. 4) External testing measures will continue to validate local performance on standards: NAEP, NRT, ACT and the Statewide writing assessment. 5) Minimum "n = 30" will contribute to the validity and reliability of AYP decisions. 6) Safe Harbor provisions will be applied for purposes of validity and reliability. 7) An appeals process for AYP is used that meets NCLB requirements. 	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

STARS performance data is analyzed by the Buros Center for Testing and the Department of Education. The STARS portfolio system currently has an audit and appeal timeline and process in place. Each district has a 10 working day “window” to audit and submit information relative to the proposed data for the State Report Card. Districts may request a review of the ratings received on their assessment portfolios. The appeal process for assessment portfolios involves a second review by external assessment experts of the existing portfolio or of additional information submitted.

The STARS assessment system includes an opportunity for districts to review student performance and portfolio ratings prior to finalizing the Report Card. Section 1116(b)(2) provides an appeal process and timelines for schools and districts regarding AYP decisions. A school may appeal an AYP status determination to the district based on objective factors the school considers relevant such significant demographic changes in the student population, errors in data or other significant issues. The district has 30 days to respond. The district may appeal an AYP status to the State, based on objective data, and the State must make a final determination within 30 days of the date of appeal. In addition, NCLB adds “safe harbor”. Any subgroup that does not meet or exceed the State goal for student performance but has decreased the percentage below mastery, from the previous year, by at least 10% of the expected growth for the annual goal and meets the other requirements is considered to have made adequate yearly progress. This would not be applied the first year of collecting data. Districts would need to submit disaggregated data for the other academic indicator for the subgroup applying for “safe harbor” that indicates that subgroup met the State goal for that year.

STARS information is provided at: <http://www.nde.state.ne.us/stars/index.html>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p>	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

¹¹ Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
Nebraska Assessment Schedule		
<u>STARS – School-based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System</u>		
2000-01	Initial year (field test) for Reading/Writing/Speaking/Listening in Grades 4, 8, and 11	
2001-02	Initial year (field test) for Mathematics in Grades 4, 8, and 11	
2002-03	First year of full implementation of Reading/Writing/Speaking/Listening in Grades 4, 8, and 11	
2003-04	First year of full implementation of Mathematics in Grades 4, 8, and 11	
2004-05	Annual reporting of results in both Mathematics and Reading/ /Speaking/Listening in grades 4, 8 and 11	
2005-06	Reporting for Reading/ /Speaking/Listening and Mathematics in Grades 3-8 and 11 Initial year (field test) of Science in Grades 5, 8 and 11	
<u>Norm-referenced tests</u>		
Annual Elementary, Middle and Secondary School in Reading and Mathematics		
<u>Statewide Writing Assessment</u>		
2000-01	Initial year (field test) of Writing Assessment in Grades 4, 8, and 11	
2001-02	Writing Assessment in Grade 4	
2002-03	Writing Assessment in Grade 8	
2003-04	Change in schedule – Writing in Grades 4, 8, and 11 annually	
2004-05 – pilot year for the State of a student level data system		
2005-06 – implementation of the Nebraska Staff and Student Record System		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>STARS assessments are given throughout the school year. The participation rate includes all students who have participated in at least 75% of the assessments or were assessed on at least 75% of the standards over the course of the year. Parent refusal is not an option for STARS assessments since they are embedded in the curriculum and instruction of the classroom and administered throughout the school year.</p> <p>See http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/ for current student performance reporting format.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?</p>	<p>State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.</p>	<p>State does not have a procedure for making this determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The 95% assessed requirement will be applied when the accountability group includes the minimum number of students (30) to provide statistically reliable information. For AYP reporting, districts are to report the number of students who participated in at least 75% of the assessments or were assessed on at least 75% of the standards over the course of the year.</p>		

Appendix A

Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

**Appendix A
Policy on School Performance**

Nebraska’s State Board Policy on School Performance identifies the consequences (rewards and penalties) for district performance in the Quality of the STARS assessments (ratings from the portfolio review) and student performance. This policy applies to all districts.

Year	Quality of STARS Assessments	Student Performance
2002-03	Technical Assistance and one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff development • Local assessment team • Mentor schools or educators • Submission of assessment documentation • Visitation • Other similar appropriate activities 	Technical Assistance and one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff development (use of data, improvement processes, etc.) • Partnership with others • Special assistance through targeted federal or state resources • Submission of improvement plans or annual progress reports • Research on effective instructional strategies • Visitation • Work with on-site coaches • Other similar appropriate activities
2003-04	Continued low rating – Penalties related to accreditation	Continued low rating -- Technical Assistance and one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff development (use of data, improvement processes, etc.) • Partnership with others • Special assistance through targeted federal or state resources • Submission of improvement plans or annual progress reports • Research on effective instructional strategies • Visitation • Work with on-site coaches • Other similar appropriate activities
2004-05		Continued low rating -- Technical Assistance and one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff development (use of data, improvement processes, etc.) • Partnership with others • Special assistance

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

		<p>through targeted federal or state resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of improvement plans or annual progress reports • Research on effective instructional strategies • Visitation • Work with on-site coaches
2005-06		Continued low rating – Penalties related to accreditation

AYP Status Decisions for Small Schools and Small Districts

	Yes	No
A. Does any accountability group meet minimum “n” number?	<p>1st year: Any “NOT MET” and the school or district is on “Alert” status</p> <p>After 2002-03; any “NOT MET” in same subject (for schools); same subject and same grade span (for districts) as the previous year for the school or district is identified as needing improvement</p>	Go to Question B.
B. Are any student results reported?	<p>If student performance is NOT at Good, Very Good or Exemplary in STARS assessments for Reading or Math or the Statewide Writing Assessment, or the quality of the STARS assessment portfolio rating is not at Good, Very Good or Exemplary, the school or district is on “Alert” status for Title I*; on “Watch” status for State Accountability</p> <p>After 2002-03; any “NOT MET” in same subject and same grade span as the previous year and the district is identified as needing improvement (see * for Title I small schools or districts)</p>	School or district is assigned the AYP status of the building to which the students would attend when “graduating” from the school or district
<p>“Alert” Status – 1st year of two consecutive years “Watch” Status – 1st year of three consecutive years – applies only to State Accountability for small schools and the Quality of Assessments ratings. *For 2002-03, an AYP decision for a small Title I school or district will be based on the previous year’s AYP status.</p>		

Appendix B – Definition of AYP

Component/ requirement	Definition of “Met”	Progress Made	Goal
<p>Student Performance STARS assessments or the Rule 10 required norm-referenced test (NRT), if STARS assessments are not available for 2002-03 and 03-04 only</p>	<p>The percentage of the students, enrolled a full academic year, at the proficient or advanced levels of performance (Districts define proficient and advanced levels of performance for each assessment for STARS; for NRT tests proficient level is a National Percentile Rank of 50–74 %ile; advanced level is 75-99%ile)</p>	<p>The percentage is equal to or exceeds the State goal for that year. The State goal percentage increases until 100% in 2013-14. A 99% confidence interval will be used.</p>	<p>Starting Point for 1st year; intermediate objectives for each year until 2013-14 Reading – Grade 4 62% Reading – Grade 8 61% Reading – Grade 11 66% Math – Grade 4 65% Math – Grade 8 58% Math – Grade 11 62%</p>
<p>Quality of the STARS assessments</p>	<p>Portfolio rating of STARS assessments</p>	<p>Must meet the Goal</p>	<p>Good, Very Good, or Exemplary</p>
<p>Other academic indicator at elementary & middle school levels Statewide Writing Test</p>	<p>A cut-score defines the proficient performance for each grade level</p>	<p>The percentage of all students at the proficient level must be equal to or exceed the State goal or show progress from the previous year. A 99% confidence interval will be used.</p>	<p>State goal is 62% for Grade 4 and 61% for Grade 8 (Reading starting points for these grades)</p>
<p>Graduation rate at high school</p>	<p>State goal of 83.97% (State average using the NCES definition)</p>	<p>The school's rate must be equal to or exceed the State goal or show progress from previous year even if not at the State goal.</p>	<p>State goal is 83.97%</p>
<p>Participation rate</p>	<p>Percentage of students that participate in the assessments of Reading and Math by grade and accountability group. The participation rate shall be the larger of a) the current year's rate or b) the average of the current and the previous year's rate.</p>		<p>At least 95% of the students must participate in the assessments.</p>

Appendix C – Starting Points and Intermediate Goals

Nebraska collects student performance results on a “standards” basis. That is, each district reports, for each school, the number of students at each of the four performance levels (Beginning, Progressing, Proficient, Advanced) on each standard. To determine the percent of the students performing at the proficient and advanced levels at the elementary, middle and high schools, the average number of students at each performance level was determined and used to identify the percent of students at the proficient and advanced levels. This was calculated for each school. Starting points for the performance targets were established using the percent of the students at the proficient and advanced levels for each school and the enrollment data for that school from the State’s official enrollment data. Schools were ranked on the percent of students at the proficient and advanced levels in order from highest percentage of “not proficient” for each grade level. Enrollment data were used to determine the school at the 20% of enrollment for that grade level. Nebraska did not have disaggregated data by each of the subgroups to calculate starting points and performance targets by the lowest performing subgroup.

The baseline data for determining the starting points and the first intermediate goal will be the STARS assessment reading data from the 2000-01 school year and the STARS assessment math data from the 2001-02 school year. Since both of these were field test years for these subject areas, the State will revisit, and revise if necessary, the intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives in the 2004-05 school year when data are available for the full year of implementation of reading and math assessments (Reading – 2002-03 and Math – 2003-04). For the 2002-03 and 2003-04 results, districts and schools will be held accountable for meeting the percentage proficient as determined by the starting points. Schools, districts and each group required under NCLB will be held accountable for progress on the first intermediate goal for the 2004-05 data.

From the Starting points, equal intervals were determined with increases expected every third year. The interval is provided for each goal.

Year	Read 4	Year	Read 8	Year	Read 11
	Goal (3.167)		Goal (3.250)		Goal (2.833)
Baseline	62	Baseline	61	Baseline	66
2002-03	62	2002-03	61	2002-03	66
2003-04	62	2003-04	61	2003-04	66
2004-05	72	2004-05	71	2004-05	75
2005-06	72	2005-06	71	2005-06	75
2006-07	72	2006-07	71	2006-07	75
2007-08	81	2007-08	81	2007-08	83
2008-09	81	2008-09	81	2008-09	83
2009-10	81	2009-10	81	2009-10	83
2010-11	91	2010-11	91	2010-11	92
2011-12	91	2011-12	91	2011-12	92
2012-13	91	2012-13	91	2012-13	92
2013-14	100	2013-14	100	2013-14	100

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Year	Math 4	Year	Math 8	Year	Math 11
	Goal (2.917)		Goal (3.500)		Goal (3.167)
Baseline	65	Baseline	58	Baseline	62
2002-03	65	2002-03	58	2002-03	62
2003-04	65	2003-04	58	2003-04	62
2004-05	74	2004-05	69	2004-05	72
2005-06	74	2005-06	69	2005-06	72
2006-07	74	2006-07	69	2006-07	72
2007-08	83	2007-08	79	2007-08	81
2008-09	83	2008-09	79	2008-09	81
2009-10	83	2009-10	79	2009-10	81
2010-11	92	2010-11	90	2010-11	91
2011-12	92	2011-12	90	2011-12	91
2012-13	92	2012-13	90	2012-13	91
2013-14	100	2013-14	100	2013-14	100

Appendix D

Quality Indicator 6 (Instructions from the Assessment Portfolio Guide)

The mastery levels are appropriate.

This criterion is about determining “how good is good enough” in terms of levels of student achievement.

- Districts should provide evidence that the student mastery decisions were made using procedures that take into account the difficulty of the items or tasks in the assessments or classifications of students on an independent criterion. The procedure used to set mastery levels should include systematic judgments about assessment content and the different levels of student performance.
- The important thing here is for districts to identify and describe the method used to set mastery levels. Districts may not rely on their traditional grading scale to make these decisions. Professional judgment about students or about the test/work itself need to be used to arrive at mastery level decisions.

Quality Criteria 1-4 are done during the assessment development phase. Quality Criteria 5 and 6 typically occur after assessments have been administered, and you have actual student results.

In order to meet this criterion, districts should answer and document the following questions:

1. **Who** did the process?

Include the number of panelists, their years of experience (collective estimates are appropriate), the grade levels that are represented and in what configurations: grade level, grades above or below the assessed grade, whether or not the groups involved teachers in multiple grade levels. Include the number of teachers who participated in comparison to numbers of total staff.

If you compiled information from teachers or others and used forms or questionnaires to collect that data, include a copy of all forms that were used to include information from others.

Describe who led your process. Was it a teacher leader, an educational service unit staff developer, an administrator? Include qualifications.

2. **What** did they do in this process?

Your district may have used one of the following processes or others that you have chosen. For example:

Method 1. Modified contrasting group - Student based method – can be used for both objective and subjective items/tasks. *If you have a small number of students and have difficulty with this method, you may want to consider Method 2.* This method is based upon the teacher knowing the students and their work.

- a. Start with a list of the students to be assessed and the levels of proficiency that must be determined, i.e. beginning, progressing, proficient, advanced. (See Attachment A)
- b. With the teachers who know the students, discuss and agree upon definitions of what student work would “look like” in each of those categories (e.g., what can progressing students do that beginning students cannot do?). Describe the process you went through in having the discussion.
- c. Prior to the testing but after the definitions are discussed, have the teachers predict the level where each student will score. (Attachment B)
- d. After the assessment results are in, the prediction is replaced by the actual student scores. (Attachment C)
- e. Figure the averages (means) of student scores for each level of proficiency and place the average at the bottom of each column. (Attachment D)
- f. If you have extreme differences between your scores, you may want to use the median (middle score) rather than the mean.
- g. Determine the cut scores for each proficiency level by using the score that is the average midpoint between means of adjacent groups. Example: the cut score for progressing will be the average of the means of the beginning and progressing categories, the cut score for proficient will be the average of the means from the progressing and proficient, and the cut score for advanced will be the average of the means of the proficient and advanced categories.
- h. With small numbers of students you may need to determine two levels, not four. You may collapse the advanced and proficient as well as the beginning and progressing columns together, so that you have “Met” and “Not Met” categories.

Method 2. Angoff Method - Test-based method.

Teachers participating must know both the test content and the characteristics of the students taking the assessment.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

- a. With the teachers who know the content and typical students at the appropriate level, discuss and agree upon definitions of what student work would “look like” in each of those categories (e.g., what can progressing students do that beginning students cannot do?). Describe the process you went through in having the discussion.
- b. The panel of teachers talk about the item and its difficulty level.
- c. The panelists estimate the performance of a typical borderline student on each item to be either right or wrong – Round One. (Attachment E)
- d. Panelists see the actual difficulty level of each item based upon how all students actually scored – teachers see the % of students who got each item right. (Attachment F)
- e. Panelists see “impact” data – an estimate of the percentage of students who will be classified as nonmasters if the first cut score is used. (Attachment G)
- f. Teachers may go back and reconsider their initial item performance decision in Round Two. (Back to Attachment E)
- g. Round Two average (or median) results become the cut score by averaging the responses for each item across all panelists and then summing the averages (alternatively the total score for each panelist can be obtained by summing the number of rights and then finding the average (mean or median) across all the teachers).

Method 3. Modified Analytical Judgment – Test-based Method – best for performance assessments or assessments with multiple steps. This can be expanded to set multiple cut scores.

- a. Need 50 (or more, score on the number of performance categories) scored (but blinded) papers that include all levels. Participants cannot see the scores. Typically, if only two performance categories are being defined (met/not met) more papers in the middle range of scores will be used. If there are more than two performance categories, then the number of papers at each score point will be about the same across all score points except at the extreme low and high scores. The steps below assume only two performance categories.
- b. Form a panel of qualified teachers (those who know both the test content and the characteristics of the target students).
- c. Define three categories of papers below proficient, “proficient”, and “above proficient”. Discuss the characteristics of each of those categories.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

- d. Have each panelist separate papers into three categories: below proficient, proficient, above proficient.
 - e. Have each panelist find the three best papers from the group classified as below proficient.
 - f. Have each panelist find the three poorest papers from the group classified as being proficient.
 - g. For the six papers selected, take the average of the actual scores.
 - h. Calculate the average across panelists – average the averages. The answer becomes the final cut score.
3. *What* were the **results** of the process and **how** did you act upon them?

Describe the results or any new learning in the process you used. Provide the actual numbers that will be used as your mastery levels.

Modified Contrasting Group Method

Teacher Name _____

DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE LEVELS	
Level	Definition
Beginning	
Progressing	
Proficient	
Advanced	

<u>Student Name</u>	<u>Beginning</u>	<u>Progressing</u>	<u>Proficient</u>	<u>Advanced</u>
Student One	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Two	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Three	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Four	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Five	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Six	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Seven	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Eight	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Nine	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Ten	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Eleven	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Twelve	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Thirteen	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Fourteen	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Fifteen	_____	_____	_____	_____

Modified Contrasting Group Method

DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE LEVELS	
Level	Definition
Beginning	
Progressing	
Proficient	
Advanced	

Teacher Name _____

<u>Student Name</u>	<u>Beginning</u>	<u>Progressing</u>	<u>Proficient</u>	<u>Advanced</u>
Student One	_____	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____
Student Two	<u>XX</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Three	_____	_____	_____	<u>XX</u>
Student Four	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____	_____
Student Five	_____	_____	_____	<u>XX</u>
Student Six	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____	_____
Student Seven	_____	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____
Student Eight	<u>XX</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Nine	_____	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____
Student Ten	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____	_____
Student Eleven	_____	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____
Student Twelve	<u>XX</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Thirteen	_____	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____
Student Fourteen	_____	<u>XX</u>	_____	_____
Student Fifteen	_____	_____	_____	<u>XX</u>

Modified Contrasting Group Method

DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE LEVELS	
Level	Definition
Beginning	
Progressing	
Proficient	
Advanced	

Teacher Name _____

<u>Student</u>	<u>Beginning</u>	<u>Progressing</u>	<u>Proficient</u>	<u>Advanced</u>
Student One	_____	_____	<u>86</u>	_____
Student Two	<u>71</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Three	_____	_____	_____	<u>86</u>
Student Four	_____	<u>67</u>	_____	_____
Student Five	_____	_____	_____	<u>98</u>
Student Six	_____	<u>80</u>	_____	_____
Student Seven	_____	_____	<u>83</u>	_____
Student Eight	<u>48</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Nine	_____	_____	<u>78</u>	_____
Student Ten	_____	<u>74</u>	_____	_____
Student Eleven	_____	_____	<u>88</u>	_____
Student Twelve	<u>55</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Thirteen	_____	_____	<u>84</u>	_____
Student Fourteen	_____	<u>63</u>	_____	_____
Student Fifteen	_____	_____	_____	<u>95</u>

Modified Contrasting Group Method

DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE LEVELS	
Level	Definition
Beginning	
Progressing	
Proficient	
Advanced	

Teacher Name _____

<u>Student Name</u>	<u>Beginning</u>	<u>Progressing</u>	<u>Proficient</u>	<u>Advanced</u>
Student One	_____	_____	<u>86</u>	_____
Student Two	<u>71</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Three	_____	_____	_____	<u>86</u>
Student Four	_____	<u>67</u>	_____	_____
Student Five	_____	_____	_____	<u>98</u>
Student Six	_____	<u>80</u>	_____	_____
Student Seven	_____	_____	<u>83</u>	_____
Student Eight	<u>48</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Nine	_____	_____	<u>78</u>	_____
Student Ten	_____	<u>74</u>	_____	_____
Student Eleven	_____	_____	<u>88</u>	_____
Student Twelve	<u>55</u>	_____	_____	_____
Student Thirteen	_____	_____	<u>84</u>	_____
Student Fourteen	_____	<u>63</u>	_____	_____
Student Fifteen	_____	_____	_____	<u>95</u>
Mean (Average):	58	71	84	91
		↓	↓	↓
Cut Scores:	65	78	88	

* Average between the adjacent groups.

Attachment E

Modified Angoff Method

<u>Item</u>	<u>Round 1</u>	<u>Round 2</u>
1	<u>R</u>	<u>W</u>
2	<u>R</u>	<u>R</u>
3	<u>W</u>	<u>R</u>
4	<u>R</u>	<u>W</u>
5	<u>R</u>	<u>R</u>
6	<u>W</u>	<u>R</u>
7	<u>R</u>	<u>R</u>
8	<u>W</u>	<u>W</u>
9	<u>R</u>	<u>W</u>
10	<u>R</u>	<u>W</u>
Estimated Total Right	7	5

“R” means - a student who has barely mastered the standard would likely answer correctly.

“W” means a student who has barely mastered the standard would not likely answer correctly.

Modified Angoff Method Example

Student Performance Data

This represents the proportion of **all** students who got the item right.

Item Number	Proportion Correct
1	.52
2	.66
3	.78
4	.46
5	.80
6	.60
7	.82
8	.55
9	.42
10	.54

Modified Angoff Method Example

Student Cumulative Percent Distribution

This is the “Impact” data. If the cut score is 7, a score of 6 or lower would be used to identify “nonmasters”. Therefore 74.5% of the students would be classified as “nonmaster” if 7 was the cut score.

Number of Items	Cumulative Percent
10	100.0%
9	96.7%
8	88.9%
7	81.4%
6	74.5%
5	60.1%
4	44.9%
3	37.6%
2	12.2%
1	8.6%
0	4.1%