EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title: **Changes to NC's NCLB Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

Type of Executive Summary:

☐ Consent ☒ Action ☐ Action on First Reading ☐ Discussion ☐ Information

Policy Implications:

- ☐ Constitution _____
- ☐ General Statute #_____
- ☒ SBE Policy #TCS-I-005
- ☐ SBE Policy Amendment
- ☐ SBE Policy (New)
- ☐ APA #_____
- ☐ APA Amendment
- ☐ APA (New)
- ☒ Other NCLB

Presenter(s): Ms. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Curriculum, Instruction, Technology and Accountability Services) and Dr. Louis M. Fabrizio (Director of Accountability Policy & Communications)

Description:
Each year the US Department of Education (USED) allows the States to make amendments to their Accountability Workbooks. Changes for the 2009-10 school year, pending USED approval, include the following.

1) First retest results on end-of-course assessments in the calculations of ABCs Performance Composites and for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), where appropriate.
2) References to "Intermediate High" on the state's English language proficiency test changed to Level 4.0 expanding on the state's English language placement test. Additional information on Title III LEP (see pages 30-31) also included since the December meeting.
3) North Carolina's Checklist of Academic Standards (NCCLAS) removed from the testing program per decision of the USED and the peer review process.
4) Cohort Graduation Rate improvement indicators will be adjusted.

Resources:
Staff programming changes

Input Process:
USED letters, discussions with DPI staff, input from field

Stakeholders:
LEAs, administrators, teachers, students, parents, General Assembly

Timeline For Action:
The changes are presented for Discussion at the December 2009 SBE meeting and Action at the January 2010 meeting.

Recommendations:
It is recommended that the Board approve the revisions to the North Carolina Accountability Workbook and the amendments to TCS-I-005.

Audiovisual equipment requested for the presentation:

☐ Data Projector/Video (Videotape/DVD and/or Computer Data, Internet, Presentations-PowerPoint preferred)
Specify: _____

☐ Audio Requirements (computer or other, except for PA system which is provided)

Specify: _____

☐ Document Camera (for transparencies or paper documents – white paper preferred)

Motion By: _____ Seconded By: _____

Vote: Yes _____ No _____ Abstain _____

Approved _____ Disapproved _____ Postponed _____ Revised _____

---

*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Lucy Medlin, 919-807-3771

NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Policy Manual

Policy Identification
Priority: Twenty-First Century Systems
Category: State Plans
Policy ID Number: TCS-I-005

Policy Title: Policy regarding the No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Plan for ESEA Reauthorization

Current Policy Date: ~~01/08/2009~~01/07/2010

Other Historical Information: Previous board dates: 06/06/2002, 08/25/2003, 01/08/2004, 03/04/2004, 5/06/2004, 06/30/2004, 07/01/2004, 02/03/2005, 06/30/2005, 07/01/2008, 01/08/2009

Statutory Reference: PL 107-110 (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001)

Administrative Procedures Act (APA) Reference Number and Category:

***** Begin Policy *** (Do not tamper with this line)**

Please refer to the insert **No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Plan Application**. This document is available from the:

NC Department of Public Instruction
State Superintendent's Office
6301 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-6301

Questions regarding the **No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Plan Application** should be directed to:
Coordinator of Federal Programs at (919) 807-3443.

All components of the plan~~, listed below,~~ may be found at the following url: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/nclb/federal/ .

- ~~Consolidated State Application – 6/3/04~~
- ~~Consolidated State Application Baseline Data and Performance Indicators – Updated 5/1/03~~
- ~~Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook – 5/11/04~~
- ~~Consolidated State Application – Assurances – 6/7/02~~
- ~~Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook – 2/3/2005~~

State Board of Education
State of North Carolina

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)

Only pages with amendments that are shaded are printed for the SBE Meeting

(Contains proposed changes for approval by the State Board of Education January 7, 2010.)

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:

Dr. Zollie Stevenson
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 *all schools and districts in the state*.
F	1.2	Accountability system holds *all schools to the same criteria*.
F	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the *academic achievement standards*.
F	1.4	Accountability system provides *information in a timely manner*.
F	1.5	Accountability system includes *report cards*.
F	1.6	Accountability system includes *rewards and sanctions*.
Principle 2: All Students		
F	2.1	The accountability system includes *all students*
F	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of *full academic year*.
F	2.3	The accountability system properly includes *mobile students*.
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations		
F	3.1	Accountability system expects *all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14*.
F	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether *student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress.*
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a *starting point*.
F	3.2b	Accountability system establishes *statewide annual measurable objectives*.
F	3.2c	Accountability system establishes *intermediate goals*.
Principle 4: Annual Decisions		
F	4.1	The accountability system *determines annually the progress* 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 *includes all the required student subgroups*.
F	5.2	The accountability system holds *schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups*.
F	5.3	The accountability system includes *students with disabilities*.
F	5.4	The accountability system includes *limited English proficient students*.
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 *primarily on academic assessments*.

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

F	7.1	Accountability system includes *graduation rate for high school*s.
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an *additional academic indicator for elementary and middle school*s.
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 *reading/language arts* and *mathematics*.

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

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

Principle 10: Participation Rate

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

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
1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?	Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System. State has a definition of "public school" and "LEA" for AYP accountability purposes. • 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).	A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System. State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

North Carolina's pre-existing School-Based Management and Accountability Program (called the ABCs) included every school and LEA in the state. Our implementation of AYP will also include every school and LEA in the state. School AYP also will serve as a "closing the achievement gap" component of the ABCs in compliance with N.C. General Statutes §115C-105.35. Additionally, incentive awards will be provided at state expense (pending legislative approval) for schools that make AYP. The State Board of Education incorporated AYP into the ABCs by action at its June, 2002 meeting.

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?	All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination. If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.	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

AYP will be calculated in the same manner for all schools and LEAs in accordance with the requirements in NCLB and the Final Regulations. Based on State Board of Education action in June, 2002 AYP will be incorporated into the state's accountability system, the ABCs, as a "closing the achievement gap" component pursuant to North Carolina General Statute §115C-105.35.

The State Board of Education, however, will continue to calculate the growth component of the ABCs Accountability Program using the alternative schools model to designate which alternative schools have made the equivalent of expected growth or high growth. Note that all students in the alternative schools take the same state tests as those in the traditional public schools.

Evidence: Revised APA Policy HSP-C-005, and http://sbepolicy.dpi.state.nc.us/; look for HSP-C-013

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of *basic*, *proficient* and *advanced* student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?	State has defined three levels of student achievement: *basic*, *proficient* and *advanced*.[1] Student achievement levels of *proficient* and *advanced* determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the *basic* level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the *proficient* and *advanced* levels.	Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.

[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.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Yes. The state has four achievement levels defined for its End-of-Grade tests (grades 3-8) in reading and mathematics, the North Carolina Checklist of Academic Standards (NCCLAS; discontinued 2009-10 school year), the North Carolina High School Comprehensive Test of Reading (discontinued 2007-08 school year) and Mathematics (discontinued 2009-10 school year) (grade 10), the NCEXTEND2 OCS Test of English and Mathematics (not used for AYP effective 2008-09 school year), the NCEXTEND1, NCEXTEND2, the Algebra I, Biology and English I End-of-Course tests, and the Grade 10 Writing Assessment. Levels III and IV indicate grade level proficiency or above. For the 2006-07 school year, scores for tenth graders were taken from the new editions of Algebra I and/or English I end of course tests which were equated to the former test scale using an equi-percentile method. This enabled the scores from the new edition of the tests to be combined with the scores of tenth graders for whom banked scores from the former edition were being used. The achievement levels were used in the calculation of AYP.

In 2007-08 Algebra I and English I (AMOs) were reset. The SBE revised the AMOs at the high school level to reflect the impact of the higher achievement level standards (as was done for the 2005-06 school year when the new mathematics assessments were implemented in grades 3-8).

Historically, equating or linking studies are carried out whenever there is a transition in the curriculum and related tests to assure that the achievement level standards remain comparable across editions of assessments. However, on October 12, 2006, the State Board of Education approved higher standards for the third edition of the mathematics assessments in grades 3-8 with an accompanying recalculation of the annual measurable objectives as reflected on page ~~23~~ 24 of the workbook. On October 2, 2008, the SBE made similar changes for reading assessments.
Evidence: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/testing/eog/asb_achlev.pdf and http://www.ncpublicschools.org/newsroom/news/2006-07/20061012-01

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year. 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.	Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

In North Carolina, tests are scored locally within each LEA. The Department of Public Instruction provides software for scoring as well as for analysis. Software systems have been provided to allow LEAs to calculate AYP.

NCDPI released software to the LEAs in June 2003 to enable them to generate AYP results for their respective schools. LEAs were instructed to publicly announce AYP results for their schools before June 30, 2003 (prior to the beginning of the next school year).

In addition, all Title I schools that did not make AYP during the 2001-02 school year (total of 48 schools) were asked to send representatives to NCDPI for a meeting with Dr. Elsie Leak, Associate State Superintendent for Curriculum and School Reform, Mr. Bill McGrady, Section Chief for Compensatory Education and Mr. Gongshu Zhang, Title I Evaluation Consultant, to review their results from last year and discuss the steps needed to invoke NCLB sanctions if their school does not make AYP again this year.

North Carolina will report adequate yearly progress (AYP) results for the assessments in the 2007-08 school year under a staggered schedule. Due to the implementation of new reading assessments in grades 3-8 and subsequent standards setting, the State will not report elementary and middle school AYP reading results until November, 2008. Consequently, preliminary AYP determinations for elementary and middle schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) based upon mathematics results will be made in July. Preliminary High School AYP results also will be released in July. Schools and districts that are identified for improvement based upon the 2007-08 reading results will begin offering interventions immediately based upon the results released in November.

Effective with the 2008-09 school year, the higher of the original test score or first retest score on EOG assessments in grades 3 through 8 will be used in the calculation of ABCs performance composites and for AYP (where appropriate). All students who score Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG assessments will be retested, and parents of students who score Achievement Level I on the first administration will be notified that they may request that their children be retested. No students will be exempted from the retesting due to the former policy of excluding students who score within one standard error of measurement (SEM) of proficiency (Achievement Level III).

Effective with the 2009-10 school year, the higher of the original test score or first retest score on EOC assessments will be used in the calculation of ABCs performance composites and for AYP (where appropriate). All students who score Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOC assessments will be retested, and parents of students who score Achievement Level I on the first administration will be notified that they may request that their children be retested. No students will be exempted from the retesting due to the former policy of excluding students who score within one standard error of measurement (SEM) of proficiency (Achievement Level III).

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Yes. It has been designed to accommodate the elements in Appendix A as well as a wealth of other information.

The disaggregations of state data are generally completed around October, which is typically within two months after the ABCs results are released. The 2002 NC Report Card is currently on schedule for release in February 2003. There exists a Report Card Committee that will continue working to find ways to release the report card earlier.

The *North Carolina School Report Cards* for 2002, including schools, LEAs and State are on the DPI website at: http://www.ncreportcards.org/src/. These reports are supported by additional grade level and disaggregation detail (e.g., two year trends in percent proficient in each subject and grade level), found at http://www.ncpublicschools.org/vol2/rsds2002/index.html, and by additional reporting in the First in America report published by the NC Education Research Council (NCERC) at http://erc.northcarolina.edu/content.php/system/fia.htm .

These reports do not currently address all of the specific requirements in NCLB because: 1) they were designed before DPI had complete details about the requirements; and 2) because the first year of implementation for NCLB has not yet concluded and thus all of the necessary data are not yet available. However, the NCDPI, the NCERC and the NC Governor's office have coordinated to produce a comprehensive reporting system that will accommodate NCLB requirements.

The 2002 release of School Report Cards demonstrates the flexibility of the report card design to accommodate NCLB requirements. The supplemental disaggregated reports at the second website reflect the framework of the underlying database to support the disaggregation required by NCLB. The school report card committee that produced the 2002 report is working now to incorporate the NCLB reporting requirements, as specified in the law, the regulations and the Accountability Workbook (Appendix A) submitted January 31, 2003.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?[2]	State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are: • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs.	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.

[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)].

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State Board of Education revamped the incentive awards structure in June 2002 to include AYP as a basis for awards in addition to the usual ABCs criteria. Under the approved structure certified staff in public schools will receive up to $600 each if their school makes expected growth in the ABCs, up to an additional $600 if the school makes high growth, and $600 each if the school makes AYP for a maximum possible award of $1800 per certified staff if the schools makes all three goals. Teacher assistants can receive up to $200 each for each component, up to a maximum of $600.

SBE again will seek legislative action in the spring of 2004 to allow budgetary allotments to support the proposed incentive awards. [Note – The North Carolina General Assembly did not approve the changes to the incentive awards.]

Communication will play a major role in how the public views the accountability results from this school year. The NCDPI recently has been conducting "Media Briefings" across the state so that members of the media can have an opportunity to better understand NCLB. Part of the conversation involves the fact that the SBE will be making changes to the recognition categories to incorporate AYP starting with the 2003-2004 school year. The SBE (based on input from various advisory committees) wants to see data from the first year of NCLB implementation to better guide the final decisions about the changes in recognition categories. The SBE, whenever possible, avoids making major changes in the accountability program in the middle of the school year. Therefore, the public will be informed that this year's categories reflect the school as a whole while the AYP results reflect subgroup performance as well.

The following proposed timeline is presented for SBE changes to the recognition categories (it will be done sooner if data analyses are completed earlier than expected).

- June/July 2003 – Local Education Agencies (LEAs) report AYP results for their respective schools (prior to the beginning of the next school year); LEAs submit data to NCDPI for additional quality control and to do ABCs analyses and verify LEA AYP decisions
- September 2003 – SBE approves ABCs results and verifies AYP results reported by the LEAs).
- October 2003 – Compliance Commission for Accountability and other advisory committees review options for changes in recognition categories.
- November 2003 – SBE discusses recommendations from various committees.
- January 2004—SBE approves the addition of a new ABCs recognition category, "Schools of Excellence *Plus*," that will signify Schools of Excellence that make AYP, effective with the 2003-04 school year. In March 2004 the SBE officially names this new top recognition category Honor Schools of Excellence.

The State will not hold non-Title I schools to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)]; non-Title I schools that do not make AYP for two consecutive years due to missing one or more targets in the same subject area, (e.g., reading) will be required to amend their school improvement plan to address the situation.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System. 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.	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Every public school in the state is assigned a six-digit LEA/SCHOOL code. Each school maintains a student information management system (SIMS), later called NCWISE for purposes of recording membership, attendance, grades and other information about each student. When statewide tests are administered, schools are required to submit an answer sheet for every student in membership. Data collected for accountability purposes are submitted to numerous quality control checks to ensure that they are complete, accurate and consistent with the SIMS records. Operational procedures are spelled out in a variety of documents distributed to LEA Testing Coordinators who are trained through a system of Regional Accountability Coordinators who assist local personnel in maintaining and reporting their data according to agency requirements.

A full spectrum of assessment alternatives is offered ranging from multiple-choice tests to performance assessments and alternative assessments to allow every student to be tested in an appropriate manner.

Students who are absent may impact schools' ABCs outcomes by causing them to fail to meet testing requirements to test at least 95% of all students. The 95% requirement for NCLB will also be administered as part of AYP starting in 2002-03. Beginning in 2003-04, North Carolina will average participation rates for the last two or three years, depending upon how many years of data are available, whenever a school fails to meet the 95% tested standard for the current year. Schools that meet the 95% tested standard using the average will be noted in the reports.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define "full academic year" for identifying students in AYP decisions?	The State has a definition of "full academic year" for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP. The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.	LEAs have varying definitions of "full academic year." The State's definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade. The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
By action in November 2002, the SBE defines FAY as 140 days in membership as of the first day of EOG testing (which occurs during the final three weeks of school.) For Grade 10, FAY is defined as 140 days in membership as of the first day of spring EOC testing starting with the 2004-05 school year. Evidence: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/sbehighlights/nov02highlights.html		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?	State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year. 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.	State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability. State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability. State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Membership information from SIMS is contained in the master accountability files collected from each school. These files indicate the number of days in membership in the current school. Unfortunately the SIMS does not contain information about membership at previously attended schools whenever students transfer from one school to another. North Carolina plans to add a process for the Spring 2003 data collection that will require schools to code in the master accountability files whether the students who have not satisfied FAY in the current school have been in other schools in the LEA during the current year for a total of 140 days.

All students will be counted in the calculation of state AYP irrespective of the amount of time that they have attended schools in the state during the current year since there is no reliable method currently available to track the information statewide. The state is implementing a new student information system called NCWISE that can handle these data but it will be several years before it is installed in all schools. The NCWISE system was fully deployed in all school systems in the 2008-09 school year.

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
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?	The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts[3] and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.	State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014. State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The state's AYP timeline requires that all students reach proficiency no later than 2013-2014. See 3.2c.

As approved by the US Department of Education through a flexibility agreement, North Carolina will implement a growth model as a means of determining AYP for schools and districts. For details regarding the proposal, including the approval letter, refer to: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/growthmodel/nc/index.html. It is important to note that the growth model is not impacted by a change in proficiency standards due to the structure of the calculation, the new more rigorous standards will be used as the targets.

[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.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?	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. 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.	State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State's annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate (North Carolina will average participation rates for the last two or three years, depending on how many years of data are available, whenever a school does not meet the 95% standard for the current year) in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for graduation rate or attendance. (Graduation rate is the other academic indicator in schools that have a twelfth grade and graduate seniors. Attendance is the other academic indicator in schools that do not have a twelfth grade and/or do not graduate seniors.) For LEA and state AYP both attendance and graduation rate will be used as the Other Academic Indicators (OAI).

To determine whether annual measurable objectives for AYP are met, a 95% confidence interval will be used around the percentages of students scoring proficient in reading and/or mathematics to determine whether the standards have been met, effective with the 2003-04 school year. For schools that meet an annual measurable objective through application of the confidence interval, actual proficiency percentages will be reported with a note indicating that the confidence interval was applied.

However, if in any particular year a student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA will 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 the applicable academic indicator; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment. (We refer to this as the "safe harbor" provision.) (For the 2005-06 school year for Mathematics, the basis for Safe Harbor will be the percentage of students in the school in the subgroup in 2004-05 who would have been proficient using the new standard implemented in the 2005-06 school year. This will be determined using the concordance table from the linking study to determine at what point on the old scale, the new standard would have been placed.)

A Title I school not making AYP must have missed one or more targets in the same subject (e.g., reading) for two successive years before it would be required to enter Title I School Improvement.

Targeted Assistance Options:
Title I Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS) are given options to determine AYP differently from other schools. They can select how to determine AYP only using students actually served in the TAS program or eligible to be served in the TAS program. To select these options there are several procedures that must be followed per the February 4, 2004 letter to Dr. Mike Ward from Raymond Simon from the USED. However, more recent information was provided April 29, 2004 from the USED that warrants additional changes.

1. Initially, the NCDPI will analyze AYP results for TAS using all students in the school. If the TAS does not meet AYP, then the results for Title I served students will be analyzed. If the TAS again does not meet AYP, then the results for students eligible for Title I will be analyzed. These additional analyses are contingent upon the LEA "tagging" the appropriate students for the analyses. If the students are not "tagged," then that is the LEA's way of informing us that they are not interested in us conducting the additional analyses.
2. Unless the TAS meets the minimum number of 40 students being served or eligible to be served then the results will be based on all students in the school.
3. If the school provides services in only one subject area then the LEA must determine if the results for AYP for each subject will be based on only the served students, only the eligible students or all of the students in the school.
4. The other academic indicator can be calculated on any of the options unless safe harbor needs to be invoked. In that case the same criteria must be used for comparison purposes (only those served or only those eligible). If this is not possible then the other academic indicator must be based on all students in the school.
5. Results from all students in the TAS will be used for making AYP decisions at the LEA and State levels.
6. For schools without tested grades the AYP can be determined by back-mapping or forward mapping for students.

In 2007-08 the definition of a new school for the purposes of School Improvement changed. The Title I Committee of Practitioners recommended the following criteria to the SBE to determine the "restart" eligibility for Title I School Improvement; when two or more schools merge, the Title I School Improvement status sanction level will come from the school with the higher ADM; when a school divides, the resulting schools each take the status of the original school.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?	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. 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. 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…).	The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Using the data from the 2001-02, 2000-01 and the 1999-2000 school years for EOG (grades 3-8), and averaging the results for the three years, 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 in grades 3-8. Using the data from the 2000-01, 1999-2000 and 1998-99 school years for the NC High School Comprehensive Test of Reading and Mathematics (grade 10), and averaging the results for the three years, 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 in grade 10. Beginning in the 2004-05 school year, data from the 2003-04 school year for the Algebra I EOC tests, the English I EOC tests, and the Grade 10 Writing Assessments along with alternate assessments were used to set starting points for grade 10. (Note – the North Carolina High School Comprehensive Test was administered in 2001-2002 only in the high schools serving Title I students in grades 10-12.)

Each starting point calculation is based on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.

The starting points so established are the same for all like schools (e.g., schools containing any of the grades 3-8 or schools containing grade 10.) Schools containing grades from both grade ranges will be required to meet the intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives for both grade ranges.

The starting points are as follows for n=40:

Grade Ranges	Reading/Language Arts	Mathematics
3-8	68.896550615986 (Rounded to 68.9)	74.6495245710527 (Rounded 74.6)
10	52.0114667940755 (Rounded to 52.0)	54.8777467227979 (Rounded to 54.9)
Beginning in 2004-05 10	35.4304635 (Rounded to 35.4)	70.8333333 (Rounded to 70.8)

Note: See page 23 for intermediate goals.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	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. The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline. The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.	The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives. The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
Annual measurable objectives are set consistent with the starting points and intermediate goals established by the SBE. See 3.2c.		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline. • The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. • Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.	The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals. The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The SBE established in January 2003 that intermediate goals shall change in three-year increments. The first incremental increase will take effect in 2004-05; the second incremental increase will take effect in 2007-08; the third in 2010-11 and the last in 2013-14.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="10">Starting Points and Intermediate Goals
Originally Set January 30, 2003</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Grades 3-8 (%)</td><td colspan="6">Grade 10 (%)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Year</td><td>Reading</td><td rowspan="5">October 2, 2008</td><td>Mathematics</td><td rowspan="3">Modified October 12, 2006</td><td>Reading</td><td>Mathematics</td><td colspan="2" rowspan="2">Modified January 5, 2005</td><td colspan="2" rowspan="3">July 1, 2008</td></tr>
<tr><td>Starting Points (2001-02)</td><td>68.9</td><td>74.6</td><td>52.0</td><td>54.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>2002-03</td><td>68.9</td><td>74.6</td><td>52.0</td><td>54.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>2003-04</td><td>68.9</td><td>74.6</td><td>52.0</td><td>54.9</td><td>Reading/ Language Arts</td><td>Mathematics</td></tr>
<tr><td>2004-05</td><td>76.7</td><td>81.0</td><td>Mathematics</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>35.4</td><td>70.8</td></tr>
<tr><td>2005-06</td><td>76.7</td><td>---</td><td>65.8</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>35.4</td><td>70.8</td></tr>
<tr><td>2006-07</td><td>76.7</td><td>Reading</td><td>---</td><td>65.8</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>35.4</td><td>70.8</td><td>Reading/ Language Arts</td><td>Mathematics</td></tr>
<tr><td>2007-08</td><td>---</td><td>43.2</td><td>---</td><td>77.2</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>38.5</td><td>68.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>2008-09</td><td>---</td><td>43.2</td><td>---</td><td>77.2</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>38.5</td><td>68.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>2009-10</td><td>---</td><td>43.2</td><td>---</td><td>77.2</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>38.5</td><td>68.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>2010-11</td><td>---</td><td>71.6</td><td>---</td><td>88.6</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>69.3</td><td>84.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>2011-12</td><td>---</td><td>71.6</td><td>---</td><td>88.6</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>69.3</td><td>84.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012-13</td><td>---</td><td>71.6</td><td>---</td><td>88.6</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>69.3</td><td>84.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>2013-14</td><td>100</td><td>100</td><td>---</td><td>100</td><td>---</td><td>---</td><td>100</td><td>100</td><td>100</td><td>100</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Note: Calculations carry full precision (see page ~~21~~22) until final rounding.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* 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		
LEAs will make preliminary determinations of AYP for schools and LEAs each year following the annual state testing based on data for that year. AYP decisions for public schools, LEAs and the state will be confirmed and reported by the state annually as part of the ABCs and NC State Report Card after data are collected from the LEAs.		

[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)].

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

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

North Carolina master accountability files contain data for identifying the subgroups to be used for AYP. They are:

- The school as a whole
- Asian
- American Indian
- Black
- Hispanic
- Multi-racial
- White
- Economically disadvantaged
- Limited English Proficient
- Students with Disabilities

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
Each identified subgroup must attain AYP annual measurable objectives. Some may do so using the confidence interval (see Critical Element 3.2), "safe harbor" or growth model provisions. Schools and/or subgroups that use these provisions will be appropriately noted in AYP reporting as having used the confidence interval, safe harbor or growth.		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	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. State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.	The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments. State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All students with disabilities must be assessed either with the state's multiple choice reading and mathematics tests (EOGs or EOCs) administered under standard conditions, or with accommodations, and the state's Grade 10 Writing Assessment administered under standard conditions, or with accommodations, or take one of the state's alternate assessments as indicated in the student's IEP. Results from students taking these assessments are included in the AYP calculations for reading/language arts and mathematics.

The state also computes and reports the numbers and percentages of students with disabilities participating in the assessments.

North Carolina has a specifically designed alternate assessment that an IEP team can designate for students with significant cognitive disabilities. It uses alternate achievement standards for these students that are aligned with North Carolina's academic content standards and reflect professional judgment of the highest learning standards possible for these students. It is intended that the percentage of students held to these alternate achievement standards and deemed proficient at the district and State levels will not exceed 1.0 percent of all students in the grades assessed. If an LEA exceeds the 1.0 percent cap for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities scoring proficient on the alternate assessment the LEA may submit a request for an exception to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Superintendent of Public Instruction will make a decision regarding the exception and will report the action to the State Board of Education. For any LEAs that exceed the 1% cap and an exception is not granted, the state will devise a plan to randomly determine which of the students proficient scores will remain as proficient and the remaining scores will be changed to non-proficient for accountability purposes at the school, LEA and state level to attain the 1% cap. These changes in scores for accountability purposes will not affect what is recorded in the student's records or reported to the parent(s) or guardians.

North Carolina also will implement alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards. North Carolina will include students who score proficient on the North Carolina EXTEND2 assessment, which assesses grade level academic standards and is based on modified achievement standards, according to the final regulations posted in the *Federal Register* dated April 9, 2007, regarding the one percent cap for students with significant cognitive disabilities and the two percent cap for students assessed using modified assessments. The process to determine which of the students' proficient scores will be changed to comply with the regulations for students assessed using modified assessments will be done using a randomized procedure analogous to the one used for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Evidence: Revised APA Policy HSP-C-021

Starting with the 2003-04 school year, the SBE will allow a process for medical exclusions from testing for students with serious medical conditions.

Starting with the 2008-09 school year, students previously identified as students with disabilities (SWD), who have exited SWD identification during the last two years, were included in the calculations for determining the status of the SWD subgroup for AYP only if that subgroup already met the minimum number of 40 students required for a subgroup.

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All LEP students must be assessed either with the state's multiple choice reading and mathematics tests administered under standard conditions, or with accommodations, and the Grade 10 Writing Assessment or take the state's alternate assessment for LEP students except for LEP students described below. The alternate assessment is based on grade level standards and is not the assessment instrument used for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

The state calculates and reports the numbers of LEP students participating in the state's assessments. On February 20, 2004, US Secretary of Education, Rod Paige, issued a letter offering states some flexibility as it relates to testing limited English proficient (LEP) students in their first year in US schools and how the scores can be used for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP).
See http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/secletter/040220.html for a copy of the letter. Based on this flexibility the following procedures will be followed:
Schools shall:

1. continue to administer state reading and mathematics tests for LEP students who score at or above Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test during their first year in US schools. Results from these assessments will be included in the ABCs and AYP.
2. not require LEP students (who score below Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test) in their first year in US schools to be assessed on the reading End of Grade tests, High School Comprehensive Test in Reading, or the alternate assessment for reading.
3. for purposes of determining the 95% tested rule in reading, use the language proficiency test from the spring administration for these students.
4. not count mathematics results in determining AYP or ABCs performance composite scores for LEP students who score below Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test in their first year in US schools.
5. for students previously identified as LEP, who have exited LEP identification during the last two years, be included in the calculations for determining the status of the LEP subgroup for AYP only if that subgroup already met the minimum number of 40 students required for a subgroup.

Evidence: Revised APA Policy HSP-C-005

Starting in 2004-05, LEP students who were in their first year in US schools who scored below Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test in the year they took the English I course are counted as proficient based on their performance on the Grade 10 Writing Assessment alone. Students who are LEP and are in their first year in US schools in grade 10 who scored below Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test are not included in the calculations for proficiency at the high school level.

Effective with the 2008-09 school year, "Intermediate High" on the state's reading section of the English language placement test became "Level 4.0 Expanding."

In June 2008, the State Board of Education approved the adoption of the WIDA (World Class Instructional Design and Assessment) Standards as the *North Carolina English Language Development Standard Course of Study* and joined the WIDA consortium. The ACCESS for ELLs® (Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State to State for English Language Learners), which is the English language proficiency test aligned to the WIDA standards, reinforces the standards goals and objectives and has a strong emphasis on the measurement of academic English language acquisition. The Access for ELLs® replaced the IPT as the state annual English language proficiency test and was first administered in the spring of 2009.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS (cont.)
Effective with the 2008-09 school year the WIDA ACCESS Placement Test, also known as the W-APT, is the state-designated English language proficiency identification test. The ACCESS for ELLs® is the state-designated English language proficiency test annually administered starting with the 2008-09 school year. If a student scores below Level 5.0 Bridging on the reading subtest of the W-APT/ACCESS for ELLs®, the student is eligible to receive state-approved LEP testing accommodations on all state tests other than the state writing assessment at grade 10. If the student scores Level 5.0 Bridging or above on the reading subtest of the W-APT/ACCESS for ELLs® or exits LEP identification, the student must participate in all state tests (other than the state writing assessment) without accommodations. If a student scores below Level 5.0 Bridging on the writing subtest of the W-APT/ACCESS for ELLs®, the student is eligible to receive state-approved LEP testing accommodations on the state writing assessment. If the student scores Level 5.0 Bridging or above on the writing subtest of the W-APT/ACCESS for ELLs® or exits LEP identification, the student must participate in the state writing assessment without accommodations. Evidence: Revised Policy GCS-A-011 ***Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) For Title III*** AMAO 3. The LEP Subgroup at the LEA level must annually meet all AYP targets in reading and mathematics. Calculations for determining AMAO 3 are completed consistent with the decision rules used for determining AYP at the LEA level as contained in this Accountability Workbook. More information on other aspects regarding Title III can be found at URL TBD. Consortium subgrantees must meet AYP targets individually rather than as a consortium.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.[5] Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.	State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes. Definition is not applied consistently across the State. Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
The SBE has adopted 40 students' scores as the minimum number of scores to be statistically reliable and valid for AYP purposes. This number is based on the students that meet the definition of a full academic year. In the ABCs, the minimum 'n' = 30 requirement applies to the ABCs growth composite scores. Those scores are a weighted average of grade and subject level growth components, across all grades and subjects in the school. In the growth composites, reading and mathematics growth results are combined, and one overall index is created for the entire school. The ABCs components are combined in a compensatory manner to produce the overall composite. There are no subgroup growth composites. The minimum N count used in determining the AYP status of LEAs is 40, or 1% of the tested students, whichever is greater. This minimum N will be applied in each LEA to grades 3 through 8 as a group and high school as a group. However, in order for an LEA to enter Improvement Status, the LEA must **not make** AYP in the same subject area (reading/language arts or mathematics even if because of the 95% rule) or other academic indicator in each of the following grade spans [3-5, 6-8, and high school] for two consecutive years. The ABCs growth composites benefit from the averaging and weighting that takes place. The averaging helps reduce the volatility that would be more inherent in having multiple summary statistics. The weighting (each component is weighted proportional to the number of scores involved) helps reduce the impact of the volatility associated with smaller groups of students in some grades or subjects. The compensatory nature of the growth composites allows excellent growth in one grade or subject to compensate for a lesser growth in another subject or grade. In contrast, with AYP, reading/language arts and mathematics analyses are separated and multiple summary statistics are created (i.e., a percentage for each subject/subgroup combination). AYP calculations are combined in a conjunctive manner to arrive at an AYP designation. So one subgroup performance in one grade cannot compensate for poor performance by another subgroup or grade in determining the school's overall status. It seems appropriate to have a more stringent criterion for minimum 'n' for AYP calculations than for ABCs growth because: 1) AYP requires multiple summary statistics for each school to make an AYP designation (ABCs uses only one growth composite to make a determination of whether a school made expected growth); 2) AYP is a conjunctive standard (ABCs growth uses a compensatory one); and, 3) AYP represents even higher stakes than the ABCs. The agency will continue to report scores for groups of five (5) or more students.		
CRITICAL ELEMENT	**EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS**	**EXAMPLES OF *NOT* 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.

[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.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

AYP:
For schools in the state with less than 40 students assessed in the tested grades (other than K-2 schools, special education schools, hospital schools and vocational and career centers where a feeder pattern is used to determine AYP), the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) will use whatever state test data are available to make an AYP determination for the school, regardless of the numbers of students below 40, although the results for the school will be flagged as "results based on less than 40 students."

Site visits by a team or teams of educators from the School Improvement Division for schools with two (2) or fewer students meeting the FAY requirements will be conducted effective with the 2003-04 school year to make AYP designations.

Beginning in 2006-07, AYP determination for schools with two (2) or fewer students meeting the full academic year requirements will be made by NCDPI by collecting LEA justifications (including consideration of supplemental data) to determine AYP.

Reporting:
Aggregate results will not be reported when based on fewer than five scores. Instead, the report will show "*" (or other symbol) with an appropriate explanation.

As suggested by the USED, whenever all students in a subgroup in a school, LEA or the state score in the same achievement level, NC will report the results as ">95%" of the students score in the respective category. A consequence of complying with this privacy protection requirement may be that the underlying score summary information will not be completely verifiable to the schools, LEAs or the general public and reported summary information may not appear to aggregate accurately in such cases. This is an unavoidable consequence of compliance.

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
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.[7] Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

For North Carolina, AYP will be based on the End-of-Grade Reading Comprehension and Mathematics tests administered annually in grades 3-8; and on a combination of the English I End-of-Course test and the Grade 10 Writing Assessment, and the Algebra I End-of-Course test in grade 10. In addition the results for students who take the alternate assessment administered in grades 3-8 and 10 are included. ~~For students who are following a course of study that does not require them to take the English I or Algebra I End-of-Course tests, or the Grade 10 Writing Assessment, AYP is based on the NC High School Comprehensive Test of Reading (discontinued in the 2007-08 school year) and Mathematics, NCEXTEND1 or NCEXTEND2.~~ Finally, AYP also includes performance on the other academic indicators of attendance and graduation rates at the school as a whole level.

For 2007-08 science results will not be included in AYP determinations and/or ABCs Performance Composite calculations for grades 5 & 8. However, starting in the 2008-09 school year, the results will be used in the calculations of the ABCs Performance Composite.

The USED approved the use of the Biology EOC assessment and its alternate assessments as the high school science component under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) using results from all 10th graders (including banked scores from students who took the assessment in earlier grades). However, due to several high schools with different science course-taking sequences, and in an effort to ensure that more students are included in the high school science reporting, results will be computed at the 11th grade level, as opposed to the existing use in 10th grade. These results will not be used for AYP determinations.

[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
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	State definition of graduation rate: • 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. Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause[8] to make AYP.	State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The state proposes to start with a "simple" definition of graduation rates based on the actual definition contained in the NCLB legislation. The state acknowledges the new definition contained in the final regulations and will migrate to a more desirable cohort definition over the next four years. The current plan is as follows:

"Simple" Definition

To be within DPI implementation capabilities for 2002-03, the proposed definition would be based on the wording provided in the NCLB legislation.

In that framework, we propose that the North Carolina "graduation rate for public high schools" be initially defined as "The percentage of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma in the standard number of years." According to final regulations, "diploma" does not include "an alternative degree that is not fully aligned with the State's academic standards, such as a certificate or a GED." SBE Policy HSP-N-004 describes the requirements for a North Carolina diploma and provides evidence that North Carolina issues only one diploma to all students, regardless of which Course of Study they successfully complete. See http://sbepolicy.dpi.state.nc.us/ for a copy of this policy. The "standard number of years" will be defined as four years or less.

Data source for 2002-03: The 2002-03 ABCs masterbuild files will be coded to reflect diploma recipients. The same files will indicate the date when students took End-of-Grade (EOG) tests in 8th grade. Calculating the elapsed time between 8th grade EOG tests and diploma receipt will ascertain the number of years. Schools will be given the capability to manually record the necessary information for students that do not have 8th grade EOG data (e.g., students who moved into the state after the 8th grade or who previously attended private schools).

Timeline for Moving to a Cohort Definition of Graduation Rate

For the longer term, we propose a prospective (forward) on-time graduation rate. The first step would be to establish a baseline for membership in ninth grade during the 2002-03 school year. Current student information management systems in North Carolina do not have the capability to track students over a four-year period anywhere in the state. Therefore, LEAs would be asked to generate student rosters for ninth graders in 2002-03 and retain them for future reference. LEAs and/or schools would record the transition outcomes for each student on the roster over the next four years and maintain that information so that it could be matched with the diploma recipient information collected through the 2005-06 masterbuild files (or other data collection that may be more appropriate at that time). Thus the first year in which a cohort based graduation rate could be calculated would be the 2005-06 school year, and the first year in which "progress" could be ascertained using a cohort definition for two successive graduation rates would be 2006-07.

The calculations will avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. The graduation rate will be used for AYP for the school as a whole and to invoke the exception clause ("safe harbor") as appropriate for determining AYP for groups in a school. The graduation rate will be the other academic indicator for schools that have a twelfth grade and graduate seniors. Progress will be defined as at least ~~0.1~~TBD percentage point increase from one year to the next (up to a threshold of ~~80%~~TBD) for the 4-year cohort graduation rate or at least TBD percentage point increase from one year to the next (up to a threshold of TBD) for the 5-year cohort graduation rate. Any fluctuations above 80% for the graduation rate will meet the requirement for progress.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	State 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] 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.	State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
Attendance rates will be used for elementary and middle schools for the other academic indicator. It will be included (in the aggregate) to determine AYP and will be disaggregated (as necessary) for applying the exception clause ("safe harbor") to groups within the school. Progress on attendance will be defined as at least 0.1 percentage point increase from one year to the next up to a threshold of 90%. Any fluctuations above 90% for attendance will meet the requirement for progress.		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable. State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.	State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
Yes, they were required or recommended by the NCLB Act of 2001.		

[9] NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics. [10] AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
Yes.		

[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
9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?	State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions. State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice. State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions. State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.	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. State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters. State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The state will monitor the AYP outcomes yearly and examine their characteristics, including consistency across years and in relation to other indicators of progress. The Compliance Commission for Accountability and the Division of Accountability Services Technical Advisory Committee will be consulted for advice regarding how "decision consistency" can be defined in the context of AYP and NCLB.

North Carolina has a history of giving great attention to the reliability and validity of its assessments and accountability system. All assessments are developed to meet or exceed industry standards for psychometric validity and reliability. The ABCs system was originally developed empirically using replication and cross-validation procedures. For example, the growth standards were based on data for three years (two successive, independent, two-wave longitudinal cohorts.) Similarly, End of Course (EOC) prediction formulas (for high school growth standards) were checked with cross-validation samples during the developmental years and by replication of the models in subsequent years. All models for setting growth standards have been monitored annually to verify that they continue to operate according to their respective designs, in an equitable and consistent manner. In addition, each year all data collection and analysis procedures are subject to numerous quality control checks and are subjected to verification at the school, LEA, and state levels.

The NCDPI will adopt a similar attitude with respect to the system for calculating AYP. The system and the results will be monitored annually. The processes for data collection and analysis will be monitored to ensure that they continue to comply with existing quality standards. Additional quality control standards will be developed as necessary to address specific requirements related to NCLB. Verification will be required at the school, LEA and state levels.

The validity and reliability of the system will be studied and monitored. The NCDPI plans to consider and use, whenever appropriate, ideas suggested in the papers referenced in the *Peer Review Guidance* document issued by USED—specifically, the references:

- Marion, S.F., White, C., Carlson, D., Erpenbach, W.J., Rabinowitz, S, Sheinker, J. (2002). Making valid and reliable decisions in the determination of adequate yearly progress: A Paper in the Series: *Implementing The State Accountability System Requirements Under The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.* Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Hill, R., & DePascale, C. (2002). Determining the reliability of school scores. National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment.
- Baker, E. & Linn, R.L. (2002). Validity issues for accountability systems. CRESST/CSE Technical Report #585.
- Baker, E., Linn, R.L., Herman, J., & Koretz, D. (2002, Winter). Standards for educational accountability systems. CRESST Policy Brief 5.

Validity and reliability of accountability systems is a fairly new concept, as evidenced by the uniformly recent publication dates of the suggested papers. NCDPI will monitor the literature in this area and refine its efforts in this regard as the field evolves over the next few years to address this important concern.

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The state already has an appeals process related to growth standards. The Compliance Commission for Accountability serves as the appeals committee and advises the SBE in matters related to appeals. However, for AYP determinations, the LEAs will be required to establish an appeals process for their respective schools.

Before identifying a school for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, an LEA must provide the school with an opportunity to review the school-level data, including academic assessment data, on which the proposed identification is based.

The SBE has designated the Title I Committee of Practitioners as the review body for an LEA appealing its being considered for LEA Improvement Status. The LEA will have two weeks to appeal and the SBE authorizes the State Superintendent to make a final determination for the LEA.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	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] State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System. State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.	State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP. State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The state transitioned to a new mathematics assessment two years ago and will experience a change in Reading Comprehension tests in 2002-03. Each year the Division of Accountability Services does analyses to monitor the stability of the current accountability model. These analyses will continue under the new system. Equating, linking and comparability studies are used as necessary to ensure that transitions can be made appropriately. These issues will be discussed with the state's Technical Advisory Committee. We also are planning for additional components (e.g., science) to be added to our program as required by NCLB.

New mathematics assessments in grades 3-8 were implemented in 2005-06 and new reading assessments in grades 3-8 were implemented in 2007-08.

[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.

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
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate). State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate). Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.	The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments. Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Membership rosters will be collected from all schools. We have implemented testing requirements for several years in which we determine violations of percent tested rules. The accountability system may deny incentive awards if schools do not test the required percentage. Data are crosschecked with other membership reports to ascertain accuracy. Students with invalid assessment scores are counted as non-participants. Participation rate will be calculated using the number of students with valid assessment scores divided by the number of students in membership on the first day of spring testing.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
The 95% rule will apply whenever the number of students in membership in a group is at least 40.		

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 B

Chronology of Amendments to the Accountability Workbook

Changes to AYP rules implemented in 2003-04

The State Board of Education and the U.S. Department of Education (USED) approved changes in the process for determining AYP for the 2003-04 accountability year that included:

1. Adding a new ABCs recognition category to denote schools that made expected or high growth and met AYP (January 08, 2004).
2. Naming the new category *Honor Schools of Excellence* (March 04, 2004).
3. Allowing a process for medical exclusions from testing for students with serious medical conditions (March 04, 2004).
4. Averaging participation rates for the last two or three years, depending on how many years of data were available, whenever a school did not meet the 95% participation standard for the current year (May 06, 2004).
5. Providing for special analysis of AYP for targeted assistance schools (TAS) (March 04, 2004).
6. Making these additional TAS analyses contingent upon the LEA "tagging" the appropriate students for the analyses (May 06, 2004).
7. Applying a 95% confidence interval to the percentages of students scoring proficient in reading and/or mathematics to determine if subgroups met the AMO (January 08, 2004).
8. Requiring a Title I school not making AYP to miss targets in the same subject (e.g., reading) for two successive years before entering Title I School Improvement (January 08, 2004).
9. Requiring non-Title I schools not making AYP to miss targets in same subject area (March 04, 2004).
10. Placing a 1.0 percent cap on the percentage of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities held to alternate achievement standards and deemed proficient (through the Alternate NCAAP, and NCAAAI administered at least three years or more below students' assigned grade levels) at the district and State levels (March 04, 2004).
11. Not requiring LEP students (who score below Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test) in their first year in U.S. schools to be assessed on the reading End-of-Grade tests, High School Comprehensive Test in Reading, or the NC Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory (NCAAAI) for reading. (Schools were to use the language proficiency test for determining the 95% participation; mathematics results were not used in determining AYP or ABCs performance composite scores for LEP students who scored below Intermediate High.) Students previously identified as LEP who exited LEP identification during the last two years were included in the AYP calculations only if the subgroup already met the minimum number of 40 students (March 04, 2004).
12. Setting the minimum N count used in determining the AYP status of LEAs at 40 or 1% of the full academic year (FAY) students, whichever was greater (July 1, 2004).
13. Providing that an LEA could enter Improvement Status only if the LEA did not make AYP in the same subject area in both the 3-8 and high school grade spans for two consecutive years (July 1, 2004).

14. Allowing site visits by a School Improvement team to make AYP designations for schools with two (2) or fewer students meeting the FAY requirements (July 1, 2004).

Changes implemented in 2004-05

The State Board of Education and the U.S. Department of Education (USED) approved changes in the process for determining AYP for the 2004-05 accountability year that included:

15. Defining Full Academic Year (FAY) for Grade 10 as 140 days in membership as of the first day of spring EOC testing (February 03, 2005).
16. Using Algebra I and a combination of English I and the Grade 10 Writing Assessment to determine AYP in mathematics and language arts at grade 10. New starting points for Grade 10 were set as a result: those are 35.4% proficiency in reading/language arts, and 70.8% in mathematics (February 03, 2005).
17. Counting LEP students who were in their first year in US schools who scored below Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test in the year they took the English I course as proficient based on their performance on the Grade 10 Writing Assessment alone. Students who are LEP and are in their first year in US schools in grade 10 who score below Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test are not included in the calculations for proficiency at the high school level (February 03, 2005).
18. Providing that an LEA could enter Improvement Status only if the LEA did not make AYP in the same subject area in each of three grade spans: elementary, middle, and high school, for two consecutive years (March 02, 2005).
19. Allowing the LEA two weeks to appeal its LEA Improvement Status and authorizing the State Superintendent to make a final determination for the LEA (March 02, 2005).
20. Placing a 2.0 percent cap on the percentage of students with persistent academic disabilities deemed proficient on alternate assessments (May 04, 2005). [Note: not approved by the USED in May, 2005.]
21. Allowing schools that would have missed AYP solely due to the students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup to take advantage of the Secretary of Education's May 10, 2005 guidelines to use Option #1 for the 2004-05 school year. For NC it adds 14.4% to the actual percentage of students scoring proficient in the SWD subgroup and this higher total percentage, without confidence interval, is compared with the annual measurable objective to see if the school now meets the AYP target (June 30, 2005).
22. Adding that LEA and state AYP both attendance and graduation rate will be used as the Other Academic Indicators (OAI) and removing of references to NCAAAI and NCAAP alternate assessment tools due to changes in alternate assessments (November 3, 2005).

Changes implemented in 2005-06

23. Describing staggered release of AYP (July 12, 2006).
24. Including EXTEND2 students' scores for ABCs/AYP purposes (July 12, 2006).
25. Removing references to Option #1 for students with disabilities (July 12, 2006).
26. Clarifying definition of participation rate (July 12, 2006).
27. Including Other Academic Indicator for LEA Improvement determinations (July 12, 2006).

28. Including a growth model component as part of the process for determining AYP (July 12, 2006)
29. Approving higher standards for achievement levels in mathematics for grades 3-8 and revising the annual measurable objectives in light of the more rigorous student proficiency standards (October 12, 2006).

Changes implemented in 2006-07

30. Algebra I and English I (Equated scores) – The SBE approved new achievement level standards for the new Algebra I and English I End-of-Course (EOC) assessments administered during the 2006-07 school year. In order to combine the results from 10th graders taking the new EOC assessments, with those 10th graders who have banked scores from the former editions of the Algebra I and English I EOC assessments, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) will equate the new assessment scores to the old scale using an equi-percentile method and continue to use the current annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for this year's reporting of AYP at the high school level. (May 3, 2007)
31. Cohort Graduation Rate – On February 28, 2007, the SBE reviewed the first report for a 4-year cohort graduation rate for NC's schools. This summer will be the first time that the 4-year cohort graduation rate will be used to determine if a subgroup can access safe harbor at the high school level. The SBE adjusted the current threshold of 90% to 80%. (May 3, 2007)
32. Two percent regulations – this change implements the final regulations posted in the *Federal Register* dated April 9, 2007, regarding the one percent cap for students with significant cognitive disabilities and the two percent cap for students assessed using modified assessments. (May 3, 2007)

Changes implemented in 2007-08

33. Algebra I and English (reset AMOs) – The SBE revised the AMOs at the high school level to reflect the impact of the higher achievement level standards (as was done for the 2005-06 school year when the new mathematics assessments were implemented in grades 3-8). (July 1, 2008)
34. Science Tests at Grades 5 & 8 – Science results will not be included in AYP determinations and/or ABCs Performance Composite calculations. (July 1, 2008)
35. Science Testing at the High School Level – The Biology EOC assessment and its alternate assessments will be used as the high school science component under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) using results from all 11th graders (including banked scores from students who took the assessment in earlier grades). These results will not be used for AYP determinations. (July 1, 2008)
36. Definition of a New School for Purposes of School Improvement – The "restart" eligibility for a Title I School in Improvement: when two or more schools merge, the Title I School Improvement status sanction level will come from the school with the higher ADM; when a school divides, the resulting schools each take the status of the original school. (July 1, 2008)
37. AYP Determination for Schools with Two (2) or Fewer Students Meeting the Full Academic Year Requirements – NCDPI will collect LEA justifications (including consideration of supplemental data) to determine AYP. (July 1, 2008)

38. Revised AMOs for Reading – SBE approved high standards for achievement levels in reading for grades 3-8 and revised the annual measureable objectives in light of the more rigorous student proficiency standards. (October 2, 2008)

Changes implemented in 2008-09

39. Students taking the OCS EXTEND2 assessments were counted as non-participants for AYP purposes. They continue to be included in calculating the ABCs Performance Composites. (April 2, 2009/May 6, 2009)
40. Students previously identified as students with disabilities (SWD) who exited SWD identification during the last two years were included in the AYP calculations only if the subgroup already met the minimum number of 40 students. (May 6, 2009)
41. The SBE allowed first retest results on EOG assessments in grades 3 through 8 in the calculation of ABCs performance composites and for AYP. All students who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG assessments were retested, and parents of students who scored Achievement Level I on the first administration were notified that they may request that their children be retested. (April 2, 2009/May 6, 2009)

Changes implemented in 2009-10

42. The SBE allowed first retest results on EOC assessments in the calculation of ABCs performance composites and for AYP (where appropriate). All students who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOC assessments were retested, and parents of students who scored Achievement Level I on the first administration were notified that they may request that their children be retested.
43. References to "intermediate high" on the state's language proficiency test changed to "Level 4.0 Expanding."
44. North Carolina Checklist of Academic Standards (NCCLAS) removed from the testing program per decision of the USED and the peer review process.
45. Improvement for cohort graduation rate changed to TBD.