

DELAWARE'S GROWTH MODEL FOR AYP DETERMINATIONS

August 1, 2008

AYP Performance for 2008

AYP is initially calculated using the Growth Model

- ◆ If it met the target, then the school received an “Above” rating for AYP
- ◆ If it did not meet AYP using the Growth Model, then the Original Model was employed to see if the school made AYP

AYP Performance

(Continued)

- ◆ If school made AYP using the Original Model, the school was assigned “Above” or “Meets” depending on whether or not confidence intervals or safe harbor were used
- ◆ If the school did not make AYP in Growth or in Original, the “Below” designation from Growth is assigned and is used for school improvement status

Background Information

- ◆ Second year of pilot project
- ◆ Model must demonstrate that it can raise student achievement and enhance school accountability
- ◆ “Bright Line” principles of NCLB upheld
- ◆ USED approved for use in 2006-07 with one condition
 - Cannot use Confidence Interval
- ◆ Calculate AYP by Growth and Original models
- ◆ Report both Growth and Original models

Why did we submit?

- ◆ To ensure more valid and reliable accountability determinations
- ◆ To monitor various subgroups' progress year to year
- ◆ To monitor individual student's progress year to year
- ◆ To support our value of continuous improvement and longitudinal student growth

What Growth Model are we using?

◆ Value Table Model

- Maintains emphasis on performance levels (standards based achievement)
- Values longitudinal individual student growth
- Gives schools credit for moving students towards proficiency
- Values growth especially below the standard

Who chose Delaware's Growth Model?

- ◆ Stakeholder Committee consists of:
 - Community Members
 - Parents
 - Teachers
 - District Administrators
 - School Administrators

How do value tables work?

- ◆ Values are placed in a table to indicate points earned from growth one year to the next
- ◆ Calculate the average growth value for the school and each subgroup in reading and math
- ◆ Compare average growth to the target

Value Table for Grade 3

	Grade 3 Level				
Grade 2 Level	Level 1A	Level 1B	Level 2A	Level 2B	Proficient
Below	0	0	0	200	300
Meets	0	0	0	0	300

Value Table for Grades 3-10

	Year 2 Level				
Year 1 Level	Level 1A	Level 1B	Level 2A	Level 2B	Proficient
Level 1A	0	150	225	250	300
Level 1B	0	0	175	225	300
Level 2A	0	0	0	200	300
Level 2B	0	0	0	0	300
Proficient	0	0	0	0	300

Growth Value Annual Target Table

Year	Reading	Math
2006	186	123
2007	204	150
2008	204	150
2009	219	174
2010	237	201
2011	252	225
2012	267	249
2013	285	276
2014	300	300

AYP Growth Model Matrix

Group	Reading Growth	ELA % Participation	Math Growth	Math % Participation	Other Indicator
All Students					
American Indian					
Asian American					
African American					
Hispanic					
White					
Economically Disadvantaged					
Special Education					
Limited English Proficient					

Delaware's Accountability System: Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP)

2006

- ◆ Participation (ELA, Math)
- ◆ Other Academic Indicators
- ◆ Performance (ELA, Math)
 - Total School
 - ◆ Original Model
 - ◆ Safe Harbor
 - Subgroup
 - ◆ Original Model
 - ◆ Safe Harbor

2007 and 2008

- ◆ Participation (ELA, Math)
- ◆ Other Academic Indicators
- ◆ Performance (ELA, Math)
 - Total School
 - ◆ Growth Model
 - ◆ Original Model
 - ◆ Safe Harbor
 - Subgroup
 - ◆ Growth Model
 - ◆ Original Model
 - ◆ Safe Harbor

Growth Model 2008 – How to meet AYP

- ◆ Meet Growth Target in Reading (204) and Math (150)

AND

- ◆ Meet Participation Targets in ELA (95%) and Math (95%)

AND

- ◆ Meet the Other Academic Indicator
 - Elementary/Middle: show progress
 - High School: 81% or progress
 - ◆ Graduation rate

Growth Model AYP Result

Growth Model AYP Result is expressed in the following terms:

- Above Target
 - ◆ Meets or exceeds all targets

- Meets Target
 - ◆ Meets or exceeds all targets but confidence interval (CI) was used for Other Academic Indicators (OAI)

- Below Target
 - ◆ Did not meet targets

School Ratings

School Rating is determined by the combination of:

- ◆ Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
- ◆ State Progress Determination (SPD)
- ◆ Combination of AYP and SPD plus school accountability history determines current rating

School Rating Table

AYP	STATE PROGRESS	STATE ACCOUNTABILITY DETERMINATION	AFTER 2 CONSECUTIVE YEARS
A	A	Superior	
A	M	Superior	
A	B	Commendable	
M	A	Superior	
M	M	Commendable	
M	B	Commendable	Academic Review
B	A	Academic Review	Academic Progress
B	M	Academic Review	Academic Progress
B	B	Academic Review	Academic Watch

Schools facing appropriate consequences per NCLB

Definitions of Ratings

- ◆ Superior
 - AYP is met while the school or district is not under improvement and additional rigorous state criteria are met

- ◆ Commendable
 - AYP is met while the school or district is not under improvement

- ◆ Academic Review
 - AYP is not met for one year and SPD is met OR
 - AYP is not met for one year and SPD is not met OR
 - AYP is met and SPD is not met (second year)

Definitions of Ratings (continued)

- ◆ Academic Progress
 - AYP is not met (different subject) two or more years and SPD is met

- ◆ Academic Progress – Under Improvement
 - AYP is not met (same subject) two or more years and SPD is met

Definitions of Ratings (continued)

- ◆ Academic Watch
 - AYP is not met two or more years (different subject) and SPD is not met

- ◆ Academic Watch – Under Improvement
 - AYP is not met two or more years (same subject) and SPD is not met

How to be Classified as “Under School Improvement”

- ◆ Two consecutive years not meeting
AYP targets in same area
 - Participation
 - Other Academic Indicator
 - ELA/Reading
 - Math

How to Move Out of “Under School Improvement”

- ◆ Two consecutive years of meeting
AYP targets in all areas
 - Participation
 - Other Academic Indicator
 - ELA/Reading
 - Math

Rewards and Sanctions

- ◆ Sanctions and rewards for Title I and non-Title I schools closely aligned
- ◆ Sanctions only apply when classified as Under Improvement

Consequences of being Under Improvement for Title I Schools

- **1 year** = school implements school choice
- **2 years** = school offers school choice and provides supplemental services
- **3 years** = same as year 2 plus school must identify and implement a corrective action
- **4 years** = same as year 3 plus school develops a plan for restructuring
- **5 years** = same as year 3 plus school implements the restructuring plan
- **›5 years** = same as year 3 plus continues to implement the restructuring plan with greater oversight/support from the district and state

Consequences of being Under Improvement for Non-Title I Schools

- **1 year** = review and modify School Improvement Plan (SIP)
- **2 years** = same as year 1; provide additional priority to subgroups that did not meet target
- **3 years** = same as year 2 plus school must identify and implement a corrective action
- **4 years** = same as year 3 plus school develops plan for restructuring
- **5 years** = same as year 3 plus school implements the restructuring plan
- **›5 years** = same as year 3 plus continues to implement the restructuring plan with greater oversight/support from the district/state

School Accountability Ratings

- ◆ Released on DOE website 8/1/08
(www.doe.k12.de.us)
- ◆ Includes specific data by school

District Accountability Ratings

Will be released Fall 2008

Will include specific data by district

Contact Information

- ◆ Robin Taylor
 - rtaylor@doe.k12.de.us
 - 735-4080
- ◆ Joanne Reihm
 - jreihm@doe.k12.de.us
 - 735-4090
- ◆ Adrian Peoples
 - apeoples@doe.k12.de.us
 - 735-4140
- ◆ DOE web site
www.doe.k12.de.us/aab