

Oregon Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

DUE: JANUARY 31, 2003

Approved: May 29, 2003

Revision Approved: January 26, 2004

Revision Approved: May 20, 2004

Revision Approved: June 10, 2005

Revision Approved: August 24, 2005

Revision Approved: July __, 2006



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

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

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

Transmittal Instructions

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

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

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

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

Status	State Accountability System Element
Principle 1: All Schools	
F	1.1 Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .
F	1.2 Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .
F	1.3 Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .
F	1.4 Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
F	1.5 Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
F	1.6 Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
Principle 2: All Students	
F	2.1 The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>
F	2.2 The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> .
F	2.3 The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations	
F	3.1 Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .
F	3.2 Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> .
F	3.2a Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .
F	3.2b Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .
F	3.2c Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .
Principle 4: Annual Decisions	
F	4.1 The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval (Approved by State Board, awaiting USDOE approval)

W – Working to formulate policy

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

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

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

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

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

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

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

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

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

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

Principle 10: Participation Rate

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

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval (Approved by State Board, awaiting USDOE approval)

W– Working to formulate policy

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

Instructions

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

ORS 329.105 establishes a state report card for all schools and districts as the basis of a single statewide accountability system. All schools with resident students enrolled in grades K – 12 will receive school report cards and AYP designations.

~~Schools without any grades in which state assessments are administered, will be evaluated on the basis of the performance of their students in the first subsequent test administration. For example, AYP of K-2 schools will be assessed on the basis of their students performance on grade 3 tests. Small schools with a total tested population below the minimum N criterion will be assessed by the LEA. The state will provide guidelines for LEAs to use in determining AYP for small schools. These guidelines include using additional years of data and including local assessments of academic achievement to build a sufficient quantity of assessment data to make a reliable judgment.~~

Schools Without Benchmark Grades

The preliminary designation for the sending school will be the same preliminary designation as the single receiving school into which the largest group of students was promoted, as identified by the district.

During the appeals process, a district may request review of the preliminary AYP designation for the sending school using one of the alternatives listed below.

- The sending school's attendance plus the results of third grade assessments, of only the students sent to the receiving school by the sending school, may be used to determine AYP. The sending school may choose to limit the identified students to those that attended the sending school for a full academic year. K-2 Targeted Assistance Schools may also elect to look only at the third grade assessment results of students served by the sending school for any groups designated as not making AYP in the preliminary determination.
- For Kindergarten-only schools: The results of assessments of foundation skills in reading and mathematics that are administered locally and are aligned with the Oregon Statewide Content Standards and have pre-determined, standard passing levels may be used to determine AYP. The Department of Education will provide assistance to districts in identifying and determining which Kindergarten assessments meet these criteria.

AYP Reports for New Schools

New schools will receive AYP ratings when they have operated for two years. High schools may have two years of assessment data (from 2003-2004 and 2004-2005) but only one year of graduation data (from 2003-2004, the most current data available). If the school has not administered state assessments in the first two years of operation, AYP determinations will be made based on feeder patterns (see below) or the first year the school administers state assessments. Districts must provide data for any school that does not administer benchmark assessments for which there is no clear feeder pattern. Preliminary AYP designations will be issued in each of these cases, and the Oregon Department of Education will work with districts to ensure that final AYP determinations for these schools are valid.

Very Small Schools and Districts

A number of small schools and districts may not meet minimum cell size requirements for participation, assessments, and attendance or graduation, even after combining four years of data. In these cases, districts and schools will provide additional data during the review period in order to determine a final AYP designation.

For additional assessment data, schools or districts can submit

- Two additional years OSA data
or
- Local assessments that assess student achievement of state content standards and are reported on a scale aligned with the Oregon Statewide Assessments. The Oregon Department of Education will assist schools and districts in identifying local assessments that meet these criteria.

For additional graduation and attendance data, schools or districts can submit

- Two additional years of attendance or graduation data to reach the minimum cell size or
- Data on other academic indicators approved by the Oregon Department of Education

If the school or district is still unable to meet the minimum cell size after applying one of the options above, then the school or district may waive the minimum required cell sizes and request an AYP determination with the additional data included. In this circumstance, academic AYP targets will be based on the margin of error for 42 students.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?</p>	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>AYP determinations will be based on the results of statewide assessments in reading knowledge and skills, writing performance assessment (Reading/LA), math knowledge and skills and math problem solving (Mathematics). Oregon reading and math knowledge and skills tests are scored on a common scale across all grades. Writing and math performance assessments are scored on multi-trait analytic scoring guides. Each test yields a composite score. Scores on all tests are evaluated to performance standard criteria (exceeds standard, meets standard, nearly meets standard, low and very low). Since all test results can be located on a common five-point scale, the test results for any school can be evaluated on that scale. Scores in the meets and exceeds categories are proficient. All scores below meets are not proficient.</p> <p>http://www.ode.state.or.us/asmt/standards/</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon identifies five levels of performance. "Exceeds Standard" indicates advanced achievement. "Meets Standard" indicates proficient achievement. Oregon uses three levels of basic performance to indicate progress towards proficiency: "Nearly Meets", "Low" and "Very Low". Page 138 of the Report Card Technical Manual posted at http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/results/?id=273 charts the specific cut points for each test and grade level. http://reportcard.ode.state.or.us/docs/2002RCMan.pdf</p>		

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

Oregon statute requires the state to issue report cards by January 31 based on tests from the previous academic year. Oregon administers tests throughout the year and returns individual results as soon after testing as possible. Online assessment results are available immediately after testing. Knowledge and skills tests administered on paper are returned in six weeks. Performance assessments are returned within three months. School and LEA results are aggregated over the summer and summaries are published as they are ready. Schools and LEAs review and verify results during the fall and the state report card published in January has been the determination of AYP through 2002.

All schools and LEA's will be notified of their preliminary AYP status by early August, which is before the start of school in September. ~~Schools who did not make AYP for the previous year, will be notified by July 1. There are a very small number of schools, and no districts, in this status currently, which allows us to calculate their AYP status in advance of the August announcement. Since many more schools will be in this status next year and since Oregon law prohibits administering state performance assessments earlier in year, we may not be able to notify schools much before August 1.~~ However, that will permit schools who fail to meet AYP two or more years in a row to offer school choice or make other required responses before school begins in the fall. If the determination is that a school has not met AYP for the second year in a row and an appeal cannot be resolved before school starts, the school will provide choice (or other required actions as appropriate if the school has not met AYP for more than two years) based on the preliminary determination. If the final resolution of the appeal leads to the determination the AYP was met, the school will continue to provide transportation for the remainder of the school year. Final AYP determinations are made public prior to the start of school in September.

Additionally, the state provides schools and LEAs with "pre-preliminary" AYP reports based on available assessment results and other indicator data beginning in mid-June to facilitate data correction and school and LEA planning efforts.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>ORS 329.105 requires the state to produce a report card annually. The cards for each school and LEA are available on our public website and paper copies are sent to each LEA. LEAs must distribute the report cards to all parents by a specific date. Report cards are available in English and Spanish (The two major languages spoken in Oregon.). The following URL is a link to the current report cards: http://reportcard.ode.state.or.us/ http://www.ode.state.or.us/data/reportcard/reports.aspx</p> <p>We propose to send out this year’s report card on the current schedule of January, 2004. However, most of the data will be published on Oregon’s web site and on printed assessment reports as soon as they are available. In future years, Oregon will send out the combined report card during the fall (beginning) of the school year following testing.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?²</p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	<p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>All schools that fail to meet AYP will be required to submit a plan of correction that indicates how state and federal funds provided to the school will be used to improve performance of subgroups not making AYP. This plan will be integrated into the current statutory requirement for Consolidated District Improvement Plans (CDIP; ORS 329.095). Title I schools will also face the sanctions defined by NCLB for not meeting AYP two years in a row or more.</p> <p><u>Identifying Title I schools and districts for improvement.</u> Continued AYP failure is predicated on repeated failure relative to a specific content area. A school or district that does not meet participation and/or performance targets in a content area in year 1 and again does not meet targets in the same area in year 2 would be classified as “in improvement status”. Likewise, for a school or district to be identified as in school improvement based on “other indicator” performance, failure to meet the state target for the other indicator must occur in two consecutive years. In other words, to be designated as needing improvement, a school or district must not meet AYP in English/language arts for two consecutive years, in math for two consecutive years, in both subjects simultaneously for two consecutive years, or relative to the other indicator for two consecutive years.</p> <p>For example, if in year 1 a school does not meet the language arts targets, but meets the math attendance targets and in year 2 the school meets the language arts targets, the school would <u>not</u> be classified as needing improvement (whether or not the school meets the targets for math and attendance in year 2). If in year 1 a district does not meet the graduation target, but meets the math and English /language arts targets and in year 2 the district does not meet the graduation and math targets but meets the English /language arts targets, the district would be classified as needing improvement since the graduation target was not met two years in a row.</p> <p>A district (LEA) will be identified for improvement only when all three grade spans (3-5, 6-8, 9-12) fail AYP in the same subject for two consecutive years. If a district does not meet the minimum n of 42 test scores over two years at any grade span, AYP will be calculated and reported using all grade spans combined. In addition, AYP will be calculated and reported using all grade spans combined for all districts that are comprised of a single school.</p> <p>All schools that show exceptional achievement will be rewarded through the Blue Ribbon Schools Program. Title I schools that show exceptional achievement will also be rewarded by the Title I Distinguished Schools Program. As the State economy improves, the Oregon Department of Education will examine further opportunities to provide financial rewards to the outstanding schools and districts.</p>		

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?</p>	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	<p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon statute defines LEA or “school district” (ORS 332.002; ORS 332.007; ORS 332.072). Policy on schools are defined in the following document: https://district.ode.state.or.us/docs/sfda/reference/schooldef.pdf</p> <p>The school definition document established an institution ID system that is used as the basis of the state’s accountability system.</p> <p>All students enrolled in the state on the first school day in May are included in accountability reports based on the resident district and school of the student reported in the Spring Membership Collection. The resident district is defined as the district responsible for the education of the student and also is the basis on which the State School Fund, the Common School Fund, and the County School Fund are distributed to local districts.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p>	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon defines “full academic year” to be more than half the number of instructional days in the school’s calendar prior to May 1 (the date of enrollment used for determining the participation denominator). Oregon sets standards for instructional time in terms of hours and sets separate numbers of required hours at different grade levels. The above definition can be applied consistently across all schools.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon is developing a statewide student registration system, but it does not currently include dates of enrollment. LEAs must keep that information to report summary data for our school funding formula. Therefore, the state will report results on all students tested and ask LEAs to identify students who should be excluded from AYP calculations because they were not enrolled for at least a half year.</p> <p>Our plan is to develop our student identification to include the capacity to identify enrollment dates so that the state can calculate full academic year from a central dataset. Our target is to have this function in place for the 2003-04 school year.</p>		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>On May 16, 2002, the State Board adopted the ESEA performance goals including Goal 1, which sets 2013-14 as the year by which all students will meet proficiency standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>		

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Oregon will establish a series of annual targets that apply to all groups (state, district, school and subgroups) The targets can be displayed as two tables (one for reading/language arts and one for mathematics) with a column for each year from 2002 to 2014 and a row for each subgroup (total, students with disabilities, limited English proficiency, poverty, and six ethnic/racial groups). A growth target for each subgroup will be defined as 1/12th of the difference between the 2014 target of 100% and the 2002 starting point. (The annual targets are displayed at the end of this document.)

A school may meet AYP if the percent meeting for each subgroup is within the 99% confidence interval of the target or the percent not meeting was reduced by 10 % from the previous year (safe harbor). The additional indicator (graduation rate for high schools and attendance for middle and elementary schools) must also meet or exceed the minimum standard and at least 95% of the students must be tested.

Oregon’s online testing system (TESA) provides multiple assessment opportunities during a year. Each administration will present students with a separate test made up of a new set of items. Every test is aligned with and scored against the standards set for the end of the student’s grade. If a student meets the standard on any administration prior to the official administration date in the spring, that student will be counted as meeting standard for purposes of calculating AYP.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>As described in the answer to 3.2 above, targets are set separately for reading/language arts and for mathematics. Targets are set for each year and subgroup as shown in the table on the last page of the workbook, and they apply to all schools, LEAs and to the state.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. •Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon will establish reading/language arts and mathematics intermediate goals for all schools and LEAs that increase in equal increments over the 12-year timeline. There will be five intermediate goals (2005, 2008, 2011, 2012, and 2013) as shown in the table on the last page of the workbook.</p>		

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		
<p>ORS 329.105 establishes an annual report card to assess the effectiveness of schools and LEAs. This report card is the basis of our accountability system and we will continue to determine effectiveness as defined by AYP annually.</p> <p>We will use two years of data to determine if a school or district has made AYP each year. For example, the 2002 baseline will be calculated on the aggregation of 2001 and 2002 results. This provides a more reliable measure of effectiveness and allows us to hold more small schools and LEAs accountable for all subgroups.</p>		

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
<p>5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?</p>	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	<p>State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The administration manuals for our assessments describe the definition of the subgroups of racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency. http://www.ode.state.or.us/asmt/administration/manuals/</p> <p>The Limited English Proficient group will include transitioning students in AYP performance calculations. Transitioning students are LEP students who demonstrate fluency in English on a formal English language proficiency assessment and are on monitoring status for up to two years. LEP students are on monitoring status for up to two years when they no longer need instructional services and methods provided by the district’s LEP program. The NCLB Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Collection provides districts the opportunity to identify these transitioning students.</p> <p>Transitioning students are included in the district’s count of LEP students for NCLB accountability purposes only. Transitioning students who are no longer receiving instructional services from the district’s LEP program do not qualify to receive the State’s added ADM for LEP students and are NOT included in the district’s count of LEP students for the purposes of Title III funding allocations.</p> <p>For the 2002-03 school year, economically disadvantaged students are identified by a question about access to computer technology in the home that is embedded in every test form. This definition was approved under the prior reauthorization of ESEA. However we are planning to Beginning in 2003-04, the department implemented data collection systems to include family income measures (e.g., free and reduced lunch program applications) into our definition.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.</p>	<p>State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon assessments are disaggregated by the student characteristics of economic disadvantage, disability, limited English proficiency, and the ethnic/racial groups of Asian, African American, Hispanic, Native American, White and multi-ethnic. Schools, LEAs and the state are held accountable for the achievement of each subgroup and well as the total population.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>All students in Oregon, including students with disabilities, are expected to participate in state assessment in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10. Students with disabilities are included in the calculation of AYP in both participation and performance. The subgroup size for students with disabilities is equal to that of the overall group size (cell size of 40 for both the overall group and special education subgroup).</p> <p>Oregon has a wide range of options available to assess all students with disabilities. This document describes the options available: http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/testing/admin/comprehensiveasmt04.pdf . Oregon maintains and quarterly updates a table of accepted accommodations and modifications: http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/testing/manuals/tables/ . Testing with Accommodations is considered a standard administration. These accommodations are available to all students including students with and without disabilities and students who are English language learners. Modifications are not considered part of a standard administration. Modifications are available only to English language learners, students with IEPs, and students eligible under section 504. Scores obtained under modified conditions do not allow students to meet standards and are counted as not proficient for AYP calculation.</p> <p>All students enrolled in an LEA are included in AYP calculations. If a student is served in a school other than the school of enrollment, scores are reported to both schools, however the scores are counted in the school of enrollment for accountability purposes.</p> <p>On March 18th, 2004 the State Board of Education adopted alternate achievement standards for students with the most severe cognitive disabilities. Beginning with the 2003-2004 school year, up to 1% of total test scores in the district used to determine AYP may be from CLRAS and extended assessments if the scores meet or exceed the alternate achievement standards adopted by the state. An explanation of the calculation of performance levels for these assessments is available at: http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/testing/admin/alt/ea/altachstnd/extendedassesandaltstand62904.pdf</p> <p>For the 2004-2005 school year only, up to 2% of total test scores in the district used to determine AYP may be from students with persistent academic disabilities who meet or exceed performance standards on an assessment below the student’s grade level that most appropriately measures their progress toward benchmark standards, when the student’s IEP has determined that such an assessment is appropriate and when the assessment is taken under standard conditions with or without accommodations.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon provides mathematics tests that present questions in English and two other languages (Spanish and Russian) side by side. Students also have the option of taking math tests with the questions presented in simplified language. A simplified language reading test is being piloted this year. (See the administration manual for description of the options: http://www.ode.state.or.us/asmt/administration/manuals/) All LEP students must be assessed with a standard assessment, one of the alternatives described above, or with modified administration (e.g., local translation).</p> <p>LEP students during their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools must take an English Proficiency Assessment, but are not required to participate in the state's reading and writing assessments. If a student takes the district's English Proficiency Assessment, the student is counted as participating for AYP calculations whether or not (s)he takes the reading and/or writing assessments. If a student takes the state reading and/or writing assessments, the scores will not be included in AYP performance calculations of a school or district.</p> <p>LEP students during their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools are required to participate in the state's mathematics assessments. The mathematics assessment results of these students will not be included in AYP performance calculations.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p>	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon administers two tests to assess each content area. Therefore the minimum cell size is expressed in terms of a number of scores rather than number of students. In reviewing the variance of our tests and the reliability of decisions based on percent of students proficient, we have determined that a minimum of 42 scores (21 - 28 students) will result in adequate statistical reliability and sufficient inclusion of schools and subgroups. Oregon will combine scores from two years to make annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>Oregon has been collaborating with Brian Gong and Richard Hill of the Center For Assessment. We are currently conducting analyses using the methods outlined by Richard Hill and Charles DePascale (http://www.nciea.org/publications/CCSSO02_Reliability_RHCD03.pdf) These methods will allow us to estimate the reliability of the AYP determination over time. If we find that the reliability of the AYP model is sufficient to allow a smaller minimum, we will amend our proposal. Similarly, if statistical reliability requires more scores, we will raise the minimum N. These analyses will be conducted annually.</p>		

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Oregon policy is to suppress reporting of groups smaller than six students (http://reportcard.ode.state.or.us/docs/2002RCMan.pdf). We will continue that policy to protect the privacy of individual students. Schools or subgroups that have 99% or 100% of students meeting standard will be reported as “99% or above” to protect the privacy of students where all meet the standard.</p>		

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Reading/language arts is assessed by a knowledge and skills test (multiple-choice format) and a writing test (on-demand performance assessment). Mathematics is assessed by a knowledge and skills test (multiple-choice format) and a math problem-solving test (on-demand performance assessment). The percents meeting calculated from these test results will be the major determinants of meeting AYP. The only other factors will be the additional indicators of graduation rate, attendance and participation.</p>		

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

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The ~~criteria~~ state target for making AYP on the graduation indicator will be **68.1%** over two years combined or in the most current year, equivalent to the percentage of Oregon 9th grade students who receive a regular diploma within 4 years.
~~the inverse of the dropout rate standard used on existing state report cards or measurable progress towards that goal.~~

The graduation rate is calculated using a one-year version of the modified NCES graduation rate formula:

$$\frac{\text{Graduates}}{\text{Graduate} + \text{Dropouts}}$$

Where **Graduates** is the number of students who graduated with a standard diploma in the school year and following summer school session in the standard number of years, and **Dropouts** is the number of students dropping out of grades 9-12 in the school year in accordance with the NCES dropout definition.

Oregon chose to use the data for four classes in one school year instead tracking one class over four years in determining the number of dropouts, in order to better measure the immediate effect of educational policies that existed in the reporting year. However, beginning in the 2003-04 school year, October 1 enrollment is collected at the student level. This will enable the state to calculate a 4-year cohort graduation rate following the 2006-07 year that could be used in AYP determinations for the 2007-08 school year.

Beginning in 2003-04 both graduation and dropout data are collected at the student level. We will get one report (record) from every student who completes the 12th grade showing what credential they earned, or that they did not earn a credential. Each record will contain a place where the school can indicate race/ethnicity, gender, and special education status. LEP and economically disadvantaged status will come from the English Language Proficiency Collection and the Spring Membership Collection, respectively.

For the 2002-03 school year, the Department ~~is proposing two methods of collecting graduation data that will satisfy the needs of NCLB. One is to~~ expanded the existing school level collection form by adding boxes to indicate the number of LEP, special education, and economically disadvantaged students who graduate in order to produce graduation rates for all subgroups.

For the 2001-02 school year school level collections provided graduation data ~~The graduation and dropout counts~~ for schools and all subgroups except economically disadvantaged ~~can be determined with confidence for 2001-02 using data currently collected by the Department.~~ For this subgroup, the Department ~~will~~ calculated a one-year graduation rate, using the formula

$$\frac{\text{Graduates}_{ED}}{\text{Students}_{G12ED}}$$

where

Graduates_{ED} is the number of economically disadvantaged students graduating in 2001-02, and

Students_{G12ED} is the number of economically disadvantaged students enrolled in grade 12 in 2001-02.

The reason Oregon chose to calculate a one-year rate for this subgroup is that reliable data ~~did~~ does not exist for the 2001-02 school year to calculate a four-year rate.

~~Beginning with the 2002-03 school year, the Department is proposing two methods of collecting graduation data that will satisfy the needs of NCLB. One is to expand the existing school level collection form by adding boxes to indicate the number of LEP, special education, and economically disadvantaged students who graduate.~~

~~Either way, from 2002-03 on, the Department will be able to gather the data it needs to calculate graduation rates for all subgroups using the NCES formula.~~

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon will use attendance as the additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools. This indicator is a required element in our current report card system (ORS 329.105). and We will use the currently established standard for adequate attendance for the report card of 92% over two years combined or in the most current year or measurable progress towards that goal as the criterion for making AYP.</p>		

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?</p>	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>As previously noted, Oregon uses the additional academic indicators in our current accountability system. The selection of the indicators was based on a review of research and of systems that had been working in other states prior to Oregon's decision to include them in 1999. We have established reliable methods of data collection and review. In our experience, these indicators are valid for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of schools and districts.</p>		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Separate determinations will be made for reading/language arts and mathematics. Reading/language arts are defined by Oregon’s English content standards and assessed by knowledge and skills tests (multiple-choice format) and a writing assessment (performance assessment rated using an analytic trait rubric).</p> <p>Mathematics is assessed by knowledge and skills tests and a performance assessment of math problem solving.</p>		

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon has been collaborating with Brian Gong and Richard Hill of the Center For Assessment. We are currently conducting analyses using the methods outlined by Richard Hill and Charles DePascale (http://www.nciea.org/publications/CCSSO02_Reliability_RHCD03.pdf) Our projections reveal that this proposal will provide as reliable and inclusive formula as possible under the law.</p> <p>The analyses we are currently conducting will allow us to estimate the reliability of our model for determining AYP. We will review our results each year with both our in-state advisory groups and a national technical advisory panel.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Oregon has developed an online application for LEAs to use in verifying summary results. Post Assessment Data Management (PADM) allows LEAs to review the demographic data associated with each test score. If an LEA believes that there is an error in the summary rating, they are asked to identify the specific data elements that are in error. For example, if the student's ethnic code was entered in error on the answer sheet, the LEA can change the code to the correct value online. The principle underlying the use of PADM is that the assignment of a summary rating such as meeting an AYP target is the result of applying a formula defined by state policy. If the LEA disagrees with a rating, it must be the result of an error in the underlying data. PADM allows LEAs and the SEA to agree on the data and the ratings.</p> <p>During the review period following preliminary AYP designations, districts continue to have the opportunity to correct errors related to student identifiers, student demographics, student program participation, student enrollment, and test administration codes. In rare circumstances, data in the preliminary AYP report cannot be corrected through district initiated changes to student test records or student level collections (e.g., a student answer sheet that was misplaced and later found). In these cases, the district may submit a substantive appeal during the review period.</p> <p>Substantive appeals for AYP designations will be considered by a representative committee of education professionals when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school is determined to not meet AYP based on unique events that could not be predicted and/or controlled by the school or district • The data issue contributing to the substantive appeal could not otherwise be remedied through district corrections of related data. <p>Substantive appeals will not be considered by the committee when based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems that could be have been avoided based on correction to student test records or student level data • Challenges to state policy and rules, federal law, regulations or non-regulatory guidance or provisions described in the State's Accountability Workbook • Lack of knowledge of policies outlined in the AYP/RC manuals and/or the Assessment Administration Manual or numbered memos 		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p>	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon owns all the items used in our assessments and maintains the single scale that is used to measure progress in each subject area. Therefore, new assessments can be easily calibrated to exiting standards. Oregon will be piloting additional assessments in grades 4, 6 and 7 this year. The new tests will be administered in 2004 and 2005 to sufficient numbers of students to allow statistical equating of the tests to established annual objectives.</p> <p>For the 2004-05 school year, Oregon includes the results of reading/literature assessments in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10, writing assessments at grades 4, 7, and 10, and mathematics assessments at grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 in AYP determinations. In the 2005- 06 school year assessments for reading/literature and mathematics in grades 4, 6, and 7 will be operational with students at these grades accountable for performance levels for meeting and exceeding standard approved by the State Board of Education in September 2005. The Department of Education will recalculate the state targets for 2006-07 incorporating the results of the assessments of the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years. Results from the 2005-06 and 2006-07 assessments at these grades will first be used in AYP determinations for the 2006–2007 school year in order to give schools and districts the opportunity to show improvement from the baseline year and to allow for valid calculation of academic growth (safe harbor).</p> <p>New schools will be held accountable as soon as sufficient data points are available. Two years of data are used to determine if a school has met the annual objective. For established schools, two years data are also used to determine growth. Students enrolled in newly reconstituted schools will be included in LEA accountability. State policy is that if enrollment of a school changes by more than 40% due to boundary changes, it is considered a new school. Assessment data will be reported on new schools the first year.</p>		

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Oregon has a national reputation for providing assessments for all students and a policy of requiring that all students be tested (see test administration manual http://www.ode.state.or.us/asmt/administration/manuals/). Schools and LEAs will be held accountable for the achievement of all students. AYP calculations will be made with total enrollment on the first school day in May as the denominator. Students who were absent from testing and students whose parents refused to allow them to participate (under conditions specified by OAR 581-022-1910 or OAR 581-022-0611) will be counted as not participating as are students with test scores resulting from invalid test administrations. The standard is 95% participation. These students will not be included in the calculation of percent proficient.</p> <p>Districts, schools, and disaggregated groups may meet the participation target if the participation rate in either the most current year exceeds the state target or if the combined participation rate exceeds the state target.</p> <p>The combined participation rate is: $\frac{\text{StudentsTested}_{\text{priorYr}} + \text{StudentsTested}_{\text{CurrentYr}}}{(\text{StudentsEnrolled}_{\text{priorYr}} + \text{StudentsEnrolled}_{\text{CurrentYr}})}$</p> <p>Students will be omitted from the participation rate calculation when such students cannot take the State assessment during the entire testing window, including the make-up dates, because of a significant medical emergency. School systems will maintain appropriate documentation that such students have been determined by a medical practitioner to be incapacitated to the extent they are unable to participate in the appropriate State assessment.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?</p>	<p>State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.</p>	<p>State does not have a procedure for making this determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Since schools and LEAs are accountable for the achievement of all students, the participation rate requirement applies to all schools and LEAs.</p>		

Appendix A

Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

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

AYP Targets

ELA (KS Reading and Writing)	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Total	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
SWD	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
LEP	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
Poverty	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
American Indian	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
Asian	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
African American	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
Hispanic	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
White	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
Multi-ethnic	40	40	40	50	50	50	60	60	60	70	80	90	100
Math (KS and Problem-Solving)	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Total	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
SWD	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
LEP	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
Poverty	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
American Indian	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
Asian	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
African American	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
Hispanic	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
White	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100
Multi-ethnic	39	39	39	49	49	49	59	59	59	70	80	90	100