Arizona's School Accountability System 2011

Technical Manual

State of Arizona
Department of Education

Volume II: Adequate Yearly Progress

Research & Policy
Arizona Department of Education
Achieve@azed.gov

Published by the Arizona Department of Education, January 2012.

Research and Evaluation • 1535 West Jefferson • Phoenix, Arizona 85007 • 602-542-5151 • www.azed.gov

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1. Introduction

The federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) requires states to establish an accountability system to evaluate the performance of local public schools and schools districts, including charter schools (LEAs). Specifically, states are required to:

- Institute performance standards for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.
- Develop and administer tests in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science in grades 3 through 8 and high school to measure whether students meet these standards. Arizona meets this requirement with the AIMS test.
- Establish a timeline to ensure that all students are proficient according to state standards by 2013-2014.
- Create a statewide accountability system to evaluate school progress in meeting the goals of the timeline, and issue report cards informing parents of school performance.

In 2001, Arizona voters approved Proposition 301 that, among other things, called for a state accountability system for public schools. Since the passage of NCLB and Proposition 301, the staff of the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) has worked with scholars, school officials ranging from superintendents to teachers, and members of the public to develop an accountability system that fulfills the requirements of both laws. The result is a system that consists of two components. The system created to comply with NCLB, commonly referred to as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), provides a single-year snapshot of school performance. AZ LEARNS was created to comply with Proposition 301. Its primary focus is on longitudinal change through time of student performance. Table 1.1 provides a brief comparison of the two accountability systems.

The State of Arizona's complete plan to meet the requirements of NCLB is contained in the workbook submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. The workbook is available here:
http://www.azed.gov/research-evaluation/files/2011/07/conappaypwb-10_07_06.pdf.

Table 1.1 Comparison of Arizona's Accountability Systems for 2011	
NCLB	AZ LEARNS
Required by federal law	Required by state law
Components of evaluation • AIMS scores • Growth model • Percent students assessed • Attendance/Graduation rates	Components of evaluation • AIMS scores • Measure of Academic Progress • English language assessment • Graduation/dropout rates
Labels school on a yes/no system	Labels schools on a graded scale: • Failing to meet academic standards • Underperforming • Performing • Highly performing • Excelling

2. Overview of the NCLB Evaluation System

This section provides an overview of how to calculate adequate yearly progress (AYP) for a school. More detailed discussions how to determine AYP, including descriptions of equations, algorithms, and data used are given in the following chapters.

The No Child Left Behind Act requires that every public school and district/charter holder (LEA) in a state be evaluated on three measures:

1. Progress toward meeting the goal of 100 percent proficiency in state standards;
2. Percentage of students assessed; and
3. An additional measure of school performance. NCLB mandates that for high schools this indicator be the graduation rate. State may select an alternative indicator for elementary schools. Arizona, along with many other states, has chosen attendance rate for the third indicator for elementary schools.

If an entity - school or LEA - passes on all three measures, then it is deem to have met adequate yearly progress (AYP).

Schools to be Evaluated

All schools - including extremely small schools, new schools, and school that only serve grades K-2 - must receive an AYP determination. Similarly, the state's system for school accountability, AZ LEARNS, provides profiles for all schools. A major difference in the two evaluations is that AZ LEARNS allows alternative and extremely small schools to be evaluated under different criteria where NCLB requires *all* public schools in the state to be given an AYP determination based on the same criteria.

Schools that do not have any grade with 40 students enrolled are considered small schools. The calculation of AYP for these schools is described in chapter nine of this document.

Proficiency Standards

NCLB requires that every student in Arizona meet state standards in reading/language arts and mathematics - that is, pass AIMS - by the year 2013-2014. To further this goal, the state must set annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for each grade and subject evaluated. In Arizona, the grades evaluated by AIMS are three through eight, and high school (at the high school level, AIMS is administered in the 10th grade). The annual measurable objectives describe yearly growth in fractions of students passing AIMS. These objectives are necessary for Arizona to reach the 100 percent passing requirement by 2013-2014. To make AYP, an entity must reach the AMOs for both mathematics and

reading/language arts in each grade it serves. If an entity fails to reach an AMO, it still may be deemed to have met adequate yearly progress if it satisfies the safe harbor provisions that will be described later.

In 2010, Arizona revised the annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for mathematics to account for implementation of new standards and a new test.

In June of 2008, the State Board of Education approved new math standards for Arizona. Students were first tested on these standards in the 2009-2010 school year. In June 2010, the State Board approved new performance standards for the math assessment, resulting in a more difficult test. The percentage of proficient students fell across all grades, with the size of the decrease ranging from 7 to 16 percentage points.

This decrease was not only caused by higher standards on the test, but was also the expected, transitory impact of a change in instruction. Teachers had to learn the new standards and adjust their instruction. Also, students may not have been exposed in previous years to material the standards now expect.

The AMOs were adjusted to allow for this transition period for the 2010-2011 school year.

The AMOs for Arizona are given in table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 Arizona Annual Measurable Objectives		
Grade 3	**Reading AMO (percent passing)**	**Math AMO (percent passing)**
2011	71.9	65
2012	81.2	77
2013	90.5	88
2014	100	100
Grade 4		
2011	67	63
2012	78	75
2013	89	88
2014	100	100
Grade 5		
2011	65.9	58
2012	77.2	72
2013	88.5	86
2014	100	100
Grade 6		
2011	67	57
2012	78	72
2013	89	86
2014	100	100
Grade 7		
2011	69.4	58
2012	79.6	72
2013	89.8	86
2014	100	100
Grade 8		
2011	65.5	58
2012	77.0	72
2013	88.5	86
2014	100	100
High School		
2011	61.4	61
2012	74.2	74
2013	87.0	87
2014	100	100

There are two additional steps taken when determining if a school has met the AMO for a specific subject and grade. First, rather than comparing the actual percentage of students who are proficient to the AMO, a 99 percent confidence interval is calculated around the percent proficient. If the upper bound of this confidence interval is above the AMO, the school is deemed to have met the objective.

Second, if a school fails to meet the objective are the confidence interval is applied, it may still be deemed to have met the AMO if it meets the safe harbor provision. Safe harbor is a two-part test that requires schools to demonstrate sufficient progress over the previous year in the percentage of students failing to meet the standard *and* meet a threshold set by the ADE for an additional indicator. Both the confidence interval and safe harbor will be discussed in more detail later.

Growth Model

In 2007, Arizona was approved by the U.S. Department of Education to implement a growth model for AYP evaluations. Under Arizona's growth proposal, students are only counted proficient in the current year, regardless of whether they have passed the AIMS, if they are making sufficient progress to reach proficiency within three years or by eighth grade, whichever comes first. If the percentage of students in a subgroup who meet their growth target is equal to or greater than the AMO, that subgroup has met the AMO. The growth model is applied to grades four through seven. The growth model is not used for small schools, K-2 schools, and high schools.

Percentage of Students Assessed

In order for a school or LEA to meet AYP, it must assess 95 percent of its students for each subject in every grade offered, including each applicable subgroup. Students count as assessed if they had a valid score for AIMS or the alternate assessment for the severely disabled, AIMS-A. Starting in 2006, in compliance with federal guidance, students who tested with alternate accommodations were not counted as tested.

All the students enrolled on the day of testing (high school) or the first day of the testing window (elementary) represent the population to be assessed.

Applicable Subgroups

In addition to assessing 95 percent of its students and meeting the AMOs for all subject and grade combinations it encompasses, an entity must also meet the same objectives for every applicable subgroup within each subject/grade combination. NCLB

specifies the following subgroups be evaluated: the five major ethnic groups - Hispanic, White, African American, Asian-Pacific Islander, and Native American - English Language Learners (ELL), students with disabilities (SPED), and students from low-income families. A student is identified as being from a low-income family if the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS demographic information indicates she is eligible for a free or reduced lunch. Students are considered members of a program (SPED, ELL, or free or reduced lunch) if they were enrolled in that program at any time during the school year at the school in which they were tested.

Additional Indicators of School Performance

NCLB requires that an additional indicator be used for AYP determinations. The law mandates that a four-year graduation rate be used for high schools, but allows states to select the standard schools must meet. To meet adequate yearly progress, a high school must have a four-year graduation rate of 80 percent, or show a 2 percentage-point improvement in the graduation rate over the previous year.

NCLB allows states to select the additional indicator used for elementary schools. Arizona has chosen to use the school-wide attendance rate. To meet AYP, elementary schools must have a school-wide attendance rate of 90 percent, or show a 1 percentage-point improvement in the attendance rate over the previous year.

Putting it All Together

Table 2.2 provides an example of how the three performance measures - proficiency in state standards, percentage of students assessed, and an additional indicator - are combined to determine whether a school has made AYP. The example given is for a middle school serving grades 7 and 8. The school is evaluated based on student performance on AIMS reading and mathematics tests for these two grades, the percentage of students evaluated for each test and attendance rates. All the combinations for which a typical middle school would be evaluated under NCLB are provided; there are 73 separate combinations examined.

NCLB requires that schools be evaluated using a conjunctive model. That is, to make AYP, a school must meet the performance objective in *every* category in which it is evaluated. For example, if the school in table 2.2 fails to meet the objective in any one of the cells in the table, it fails to make AYP.

Table 2.2 Categories Evaluated Under NCLB for a Middle School								
Grade	Seventh				Eighth			
Subject	Math		Reading		Math		Reading	
Subgroup	Met 95% tested?	Met AMO?	Met 95% tested?	Met AMO?	Met 95% tested?	Met AMO?	Met 95% tested?	Met AMO?
All students	Yes/No	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
African American	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Asian-Pacific Islander	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Hispanic	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Native American	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
White	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Special Education	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
English Language Learner	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Low Income	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Met Other School wide Indicator: Attendance Rate?	Y/N							

3. Timeline

Districts and charter holders (Local Education Agencies - LEAs) are solely responsible for submitting the data necessary for calculating AYP determinations for their schools and for ensuring its accuracy. Because of the stakes involved and the volume and scope of the data used, the ADE considers it prudent to allow LEAs to review their data before preliminary AYP evaluations are carried out.

From April 27, 2011 through June 30, 2011, schools and LEAs were given the opportunity to review and correct the data used for calculating the four-year graduation rate used in the AYP evaluation, their testing data through the Common Logon on the ADE website, and their student demographic information, including program membership, and student activity codes. All data relevant to AYP evaluations was taken from the state's SAIS database of student records. Consequently, the only information that schools needed to correct in the ADE AIMS testing files were student SAIS IDs (needed for matching). If any demographic or program information was incorrect, schools and LEAs were required to correct it in the SAIS database. Schools were not allowed to correct the indicators for alternate testing modifications.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The criteria used to select AIMS scores for AYP evaluation differ from the criteria used to select scores for AZ LEARNS. Indeed, the criteria differ among the separate components of the AYP evaluation. The criteria also differ from the scores provided to schools by the testing contractor, and the scores publicly reported by ADE, which are available here: http://www.azed.gov/research-evaluation/aims-assessment-results/.

Timeline

The timeline for the 2011 AYP determinations was:

April 27, 2011	Start of statistical review and appeals of the graduation rate data.
April 27, 2011	Start of testing data verification process.
April 27, 2011	Start of statistical review and appeals of demographic information.
June 15, 2011	Start of substantive appeals submission process.
June 15, 2011	Preliminary release of AYP evaluations for all schools and LEAs.
June 30, 2011	End of all data verification and correction and appeals processes.
July 27, 2011	Public release of AYP evaluations for all schools and LEAs.

4. Meeting the Annual Measurable Objectives for Proficiency

Calculation of Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)

This section describes the calculation used to determine if a school met the annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for student proficiency in math and reading/language arts. NCLB requires that schools meet the AMOs set by the state in order to make AYP. Schools must meet the AMOs for each subject/grade combination and all the applicable subgroups.

The formula used to calculate the percentage of students passing AIMS is:

$$\text{Percent Passing} = \frac{\text{\# of students meeting or exceeding the standard in AIMS}}{\text{\# of students tested}}$$

This fraction is rounded to two digits, e.g.: .941=.94; .946 =.95

To ensure that the decision regarding whether a school met the AMOs is reliable and not overly influenced by random factors, the determination for meeting the AMOs is made employing a 99 percent (one-tailed) confidence interval. The confidence interval methodology is designed to ensure that 99 out of 100 times the confidence interval will contain a school's true performance level. If the AMO in question is below the upper bound of the confidence interval calculated for the school, the school is deemed to have met the standard.

Example: Fifty percent of a school's third graders passed the AIMS mathematics test. The upper bound of the 99 percent confidence interval for this subject/grade combination for this school is calculated to be 68 percent. Since this is greater than the AMO of 65 percent, the school is considered to have met the standard.

Let p = the percent of students in a group passing the AIMS and n = the number of students in the group. Then the equation of the upper bound of the 99 percent confidence interval (UB99) is:

$$UB99 = p + 2.33\sqrt{p(1-p)/n}.$$

As can be seen from the equation, the confidence interval depends upon the percent of students who passed the test, and the number of students tested. Thus, the confidence interval will differ among grades, subjects, and schools.

The equation is an approximation of the confidence interval for a binomially distributed variable. It uses the normal distribution and is sufficiently accurate if the group size and percentage of students passing are large enough. For small values of n and small p, a more accurate estimate of the confidence interval is made using statistical tables that provide confidence intervals for a binomially distributed variable.[1] The tables were applied using the rules given in table 4.1. [1]

Table 4.1. Rules for Determining UB99 for Small n and p.

If n ≥ 40 and n <45, and

p ≥ 0.00 and p < 0.05, UB99 = 0.13
p ≥ 0.05 and p < 0.10, UB99 = 0.22
p ≥ 0.10 and p < 0.15, UB99 = 0.28
p ≥ 0.15 and p < 0.20, UB99 = 0.35

If n ≥ 45 and n <50, and

p ≥ 0.00 and p < 0.05, UB99 = 0.12
p ≥ 0.05 and p < 0.10, UB99 = 0.21
p ≥ 0.10 and p < 0.15, UB99 = 0.27

If n ≥ 50 and n < 55, and
p ≥ 0.00 and p < 0.05, UB99 = 0.11
p ≥ 0.05 and p < 0.10, UB99 = 0.20

If n ≥ 55 and n < 60, and
p = 0.00, UB99 = 0.10

If n ≥ 60 and n < 100 and
p = 0.00, UB99 = 0.09

If n ≥ 100 and n < 200 and
p = 0.00, UB99 = 0.06

If n ≥ 200 and
p = 0.00, UB99 = 0.00

Even if after calculating the confidence interval the percent of students proficient in a subgroup still falls short of the AMO, the group may still make AYP if its achievement indicators meet certain safe harbor provisions. To make safe harbor, a subgroup must meet the following two-part test:

a) Make a 10 percent decrease in the percentage of students failing to meet the standard (i.e. failing AIMS) from the previous year, and

b) Meet the performance goal or make a one-percentage point improvement for the additional indicator: graduation rate for high school and attendance rate for other grades.

For example:

[1] Mansfield, Edwin. 1991. *Statistics for Business and Economics, 4th Edition*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 280-284.

In 2011, 50 percent of fifth graders in Gila Monster Elementary passed the AIMS reading test. The upper bound of the confidence interval was 52 percent, still below the AMO of 54.6 percent. However, in the previous year, 40 percent of the fifth graders passed the AIMS reading test, thus Gila Monster Elementary saw a decrease of 17 percent in the percentage failing [(50-60)/60 = -17 percent]. Furthermore, the attendance rate for Gila Monster's fifth grade was 96 percent, greater than the standard of 90 percent. So, Gila Monster's fifth graders make AYP in reading.

Data Used

Students are included in the calculation if they meet the following criteria:

- Have taken either the AIMS or AIMS-A and received a score of FFB or above;
- Were enrolled in the school on the spring testing date (high school graduation cohort, cohort 2013 for 2011 test dates) or the first day of the testing window (grades 3 through 8) and were matched to SAIS with a valid SAIS ID;
- Were enrolled in the school for the full academic year (FAY). A student was considered FAY if she enrolled in a school during the first 10 school days of the school year and remained continuously enrolled up through the testing date (first day of the testing window for grades 3 through 8). This information was obtained from SAIS.
- Did not take the test with alternate accommodations;
- Were not recently arrived limited English proficient (RALEP). A student was identified as RALEP if he met the following criteria: a) was enrolled in SAIS as a member in an English language learner program; b) has no enrollment in SAIS one year or more before the test date; c) his birthplace was outside of the United States; and d) the enrollment code for first enrollment in SAIS indicates that the student was not previously enrolled in any Arizona school.

Special Rules

Tests used. AIMS reading and mathematics tests are used for the AMO calculations. The writing test is not used.

High school cohort. The AMO calculation only includes students who are in their second year of high school. Thus, students retained in ninth grade are included. Students retained in 10th grade are not included.

Minimum group size. A group or subgroup is not evaluated if it had less than 40 test scores that meet the selection criteria.

Concurrently enrolled students. Students enrolled in two schools on the testing date are only included in the AMO determination of the school in which they were tested.

English language learners. For AMO determinations, former English language who have become proficient are included in the English language learner subgroup for two additional years. Former ELL students are <u>not</u> counted toward the minimum group size of 40.

For example, in an ELL subgroup of 50 students, 45 of which were enrolled in the ELL program and 5 were former ELL students, this subgroup will be evaluated. If an ELL subgroup of 50 students has 35 enrolled in the ELL program and 15 former ELL students, it will not be evaluated.

5. The Growth Model

The approved growth model is calculated for all subgroups for both schools and LEAs, parallel to the traditional AYP evaluation. The model looks at progress individual students make toward proficiency from one year to the next. The goal is proficiency within three years for grades three and four, or by the eighth grade for grade five through seven. Annual growth targets are set that measure each student's progress toward that goal. Students are deemed to have made sufficient progress if they meet the annual growth target. Scores for individual students are aggregated by the relevant subgroups. If the percentage of students in a subgroup that meets the target for growth is equal to or greater than the AMO, then the subgroup is considered to have met AYP.

Setting the Growth Targets

The growth target for each student is how much improvement measured by scale score points the student would have to make over her previous year's score in equal intervals in order to achieve proficiency within three years or by the eighth grade, whichever comes first. The growth target is set by subtracting the student's previous year scale score from the scale score for proficiency in the target grade and dividing by the number of remaining grades. The targets are rounded to the nearest whole number. Demographic factors are not used to set the target.

Example: A student scores 402 on the 3rd grade math test in 2007. The passing score on the 6th grade math test is 496. The student's match score must improve 31 points each year -- (496 - 402)/ (6-3) = 94/3 = 31-- for him to reach proficiency by 6th grade.

Determining If a Student Meets the Growth Target

To ensure that schools do not receive credit for spurious changes that may be a function of regression to the mean or statistical error, a corrected score is calculated for the student and compared to the growth target. To calculate the corrected score, current year scores are regressed on the previous year's scores using a regression model with school fixed effects. The estimated coefficients are used to generate predicted scores for the current year for each student. The standard error of the prediction is then used to evaluate whether the predicted value is truly larger than the growth target or whether the difference is due only to measurement error.

Specifically, the following equation is estimated by subject and grade:

$$Scalscor_{it} = \alpha_j + \beta Scalscor_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_i$$

$Scalscor_{it}$ is the scale score of student *I* on the AIMS test for the current year.

$Scalscor_{i,t-1}$ is the scale score of student *I* on the AIMS for the previous year.

α_j is the fixed effect for school *j*; ε_i is a normally distributed error term with mean zero and standard deviation σ.

The estimated coefficients are then used to generate predicted scores, $PRED_{it}$, for each student:

$$PRED_{it} = \hat{\alpha}_j + \hat{\beta} Scalscor_{i,t-1}.$$

Also estimated is the standard error of the prediction: $SEPRED_{it}$. The lower bound value found using the 97.5th percentile of the t distribution is then calculated for the prediction:

$$Lower_{it} = PRED_{it} - t_{2.5}\, SEPRED_{it}$$

where $t_{2.5}$ is the 97.5th percentile of the t distribution.

If $Lower_{it} \geq$ Growth Target, then the student is deemed to have met the growth target. This estimate is used to evaluate whether the fitted value at time *t* is truly larger than the expected score at time *t*.

The standard error of the prediction is calculated using the following formula:

$$SEPRED_{it} = \sqrt{h_i s^2}$$

where $h_i = x_i \left(X'X\right)^{-1} x_i'$; *X* is the matrix of regressors, x_i is the *i*th row of X, and s^2 is the mean squared error.

The estimates of the parameters, the predicted values, and the standard errors of the predicted values are all generated using the SAS PROC MIXED procedure. Since we assume there are no random effects and the variance is constant across schools, the procedure is equivalent to ordinary least squares.

The following table shows the results for 4th grade math for a single school.

Table 5.1 Annual Growth Target for 4th Grade Math

Student	3rd Grade Score	3rd Grade Performance Level	4th Grade Score	Predicted 4th Grade Score	Standard Error of Prediction	Lower Bound	Growth Target	Met Growth Target?
A	362	FFB	447	417	4.27	409	407	Y
B	409	A	456	455	4.27	447	438	Y
C	456	M	470	493	4.27	485	469	Y
D	521	E	579	546	4.27	537	513	Y

For this grade, subject, and school the estimated parameters are:

$$\hat{\alpha}_j = 123.26;$$
$$\hat{\beta} = 0.8111.$$

Sample calculations are given for student A:

$$PRED_A = 123.26 + 0.8111 \text{ X } 362 = 417$$

$$LOWER_A = 417 - 1.96 \text{ X } 4.27 = 409.$$

where $t_{2.5}$ with 62,600 degrees of freedom is approximately 1.96.

The following example illustrates how the expected score at time *t* is determined for student A:

$$\text{Annual growth target} = (496 - 362)/ (6 - 3) = 45.$$

The student must score 362 + 45 = 407 on the 4th grade math test in order to meet the growth target. Since 409 > 407, the student met the growth target.

Meeting the AMO

To determine if a subgroup meets the AMO, the following percentage is calculated:

$$\frac{\text{\# of students (proficient and non-proficient) meeting growth target}}{\text{\# of students in analysis}}$$

If this percentage is greater than or equal to the AMO, the subgroup is deemed to have made AYP.

Data Used

Students are included in the calculation if they meet the following criteria:

- Have taken either the AIMS or AIMS-A and received a score of FFB or above;
- Were enrolled in the school on the testing date and were matched to SAIS with a valid SAIS ID;
- Were not recently arrived English language learners (RALEP). A student was identified as RALEP if he met the following criteria: a) was enrolled in SAIS as a member in an English language learner program; b) has no enrollment in SAIS one year or more prior to the test date; c) his birthplace was outside of the United States; and e) the enrollment code for first enrollment in SAIS indicates that the student was not previously enrolled in any Arizona school.

- Did not take the test with alternate accommodations;
- Were enrolled for the full academic year (FAY). A student was considered FAY if she enrolled in a school during the first 10 school days of the school year and remained enrolled up through the testing date. This information was obtained from SAIS.

Special Rules

Unmatched students. Students without a score for the previous year are counted at their current performance level. Proficient students are considered to have met their growth target; non-proficient students are considered not to have met their growth target.

Inclusion of students. To be included in the growth measure, a student must have been enrolled in his current school for the full academic year. However, the student does not have to have been enrolled in the same school or LEA for two consecutive years. Furthermore, to be included, a student does not have to have been enrolled for the full academic year the previous year.

Minimum group size. Only subgroups with 40 or more students who have been present the full academic year are evaluated.

Confidence interval. A confidence interval is not used for the growth model.

New growth targets are set for each student, each year. The model sets new individual growth targets for each student each year. The clock starts over for students who leave and then return to the Arizona public school system.

Alternate tests. Students who take the AIMS-A are included in the growth model. Students who move up a performance level are considered to have met their growth target.

Table 5.2. Met Annual Growth Target for Alternate Assessment

	Performance Level Current Year			
Performance Level Previous Year	**FFB**	**A**	**M**	**E**
FFB	N	Y	Y	Y
A	N	N	Y	Y
M	N	N	Y	Y
E	N	N	N	Y

Third and eighth grade. These grades are evaluated using the standard status/safe harbor method rather than the growth model.

K-2 schools, high schools, and small schools. The growth model is not used in the evaluation of K-2, small, or high schools. Those schools continue to be evaluated using the current method.

6. Meeting the Goal for Number of Students Tested

Calculation

This section describes the calculation used to determine if a school has assessed 95 percent of its students. To meet AYP, schools must test 95 percent of their students in reading and mathematics in all grades in which AIMS is administered, and must test 95 percent of their students in each applicable subgroup.

The formula used to calculate the percentage of students tested is:

$$\text{Percent Tested} = \frac{\text{Number of students tested}}{\text{Number of students enrolled}}$$

The fraction of percent tested is rounded to two digits, e.g.: .941=.94; .946=.95.

Data Used

Number of students tested. A student is counted as tested if she took either the AIMS or AIMS-A and received a score of FFB or above; was enrolled on the spring testing date (for high school) or the first day of the testing window (grades 3 through 8); and was matched to SAIS with a valid SAIS ID number. Students who receive a score of Did Not Attempt (DNA) or took the test with alternate accommodations are not counted as tested.

Number of students enrolled. A student is counted as enrolled if she is enrolled on the first day of the testing window (for grades 3 through 8) or on the specified test day (for high school). For high school, enrollment used is the number of students in the specified graduation cohort (cohort 2013 for 2011 test dates) for the day the test was administered. Students are counted in the enrollment of a program (SPED, ELL, Low SES) if they participated in that program at the school in which they were tested at anytime during that school year.

Special Rules

Tests used. AIMS reading and mathematics tests are used for the percent tested calculation. The writing test is not used.

High school cohort. The percent tested calculation only includes students who are in their second year of high school. Thus, students retained in ninth grade are included. Students retained in tenth grade are not included.

Minimum group size. A group or subgroup is not evaluated if it has less than 40 students enrolled on the relevant day. A sample size of 40 was considered large enough to provide statistically meaningful results.

Best of current year or three-year average. If a school does not test 95 percent of its students in a subgroup for the current year, a three-year average of percent of students tested is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Percent Tested} = \frac{\text{\# tested in 2009 + \# tested in 2010 + \# tested in 2011}}{\text{\# enrolled in 2009 + \# enrolled in 2010 + \# enrolled in 2011}}$$

If the three-year average is greater than or equal to 95 percent, the subgroup is deemed to have met the goal of testing 95 percent of its students.

Concurrently enrolled students. If a student is enrolled in two schools on the testing date and has tested in one of the schools, she is included in the percent tested calculation of the school in which she was tested. She is not included in the calculation, neither in the number tested nor the number enrolled, of the other school. If a student is enrolled in two schools on the testing date and has tested in neither school, she is counted against both schools.

7. Additional Indicators of School Performance

This section describes the calculation used to determine if a school met the additional performance indicators for AYP. NCLB requires that schools be evaluated on a third performance indicator as well as percentage of students assessed and percentage of students proficient in the standards. The law requires that graduation rate be used as the third indicator for high schools and gives states the discretion to choose the third indicator for elementary schools. Arizona has chosen the school-wide attendance rate as the third indicator for elementary schools. To meet AYP, a high school must have a graduation rate of 80 percent; an elementary school must have an attendance rate of 90 percent.

Attendance Rate

Calculation. The formula used to calculate the attendance rate is:

$$\text{Schoolwide Attendance Rate} = \frac{\text{Average Daily Attendance}}{\text{Average Daily Membership}}$$

The attendance rate is rounded to two digits, e.g.: .891=.89; .896=.90.

Data used. The average daily attendance (ADA) and average daily membership (ADM) for the 100-day counts for <u>all</u> grades, except for pre-school and kindergarten, offered by a school are used in the calculation.

Safe harbor. If a school demonstrates a one-percentage point improvement in its attendance rate from the previous year, it is deemed to have met the performance standard. The growth rate is rounded to the nearest hundredth of a point, e.g.: .009=.01; .004=.00.

Special rules. Safe harbor is not determined for schools with an ADM of less than 40. However, if the school does not meet the goal in the current year, it is considered to have met the goal if the weighted average of the attendance rates over the past three years is greater than 90 percent.

Graduation Rate

The graduation rate is a four-year, longitudinal measure of how many students graduate from high school. The formula used to calculate the graduation rate is:

$$\text{Graduation Rate} = \frac{\text{Number in cohort who graduated within four years}}{\text{Original cohort + Transfers in - Transfers out}}$$

The graduation rate is rounded to two digits, e.g.: .705=.71; .704=.70.

Data used. Federal requirements mandate that Arizona use the four-year graduation rate rather than the five-year rate used for AZ LEARNS. The graduation rate in 2011 was for the cohort class of 2010, which represents the most recent graduation rate available, with growth being measured against the graduation rate for the cohort class of 2009.

Students are considered a potential member of the 2010 cohort if:

1. The student was enrolled in 9th grade or ungraded secondary (US) for the first time in the 2006-2007 school year.
2. The student was enrolled in 10th grade or US in the 2007-2008 school year, and was not previously enrolled in a high school grade (9-12, US).
3. The student was enrolled in 11th grade or US in the 2008-2009 school year, and was not previously enrolled in a high school grade (9-12, US).
4. The student was enrolled in 12th grade or US in the 2009-2010 school year, and was not previously enrolled in a high school grade (9-12, US).

For the calculation of the four-year graduation rate, students in the cohort fall into three categories:

A. Students who have graduated. These are students in the 2010 cohort who have graduated on or before the beginning of the 2011 school year (defined as September 1, 2011). They have exit/year-end codes of W7, G, or S7.

B. Students who remain in the cohort but have not graduated. These are students in the 2010 cohort who remained in school but did not graduate, or who have left the school and have not re-enrolled in another school. They have exit/year-end codes of W2, W3, W4, W5, W10, W11, W12, W13, S2, S3, S4, S5, S10, S11, S12, S13, C, A, SA, SC, or SE.

Note: students with year-end codes P or R are considered dropouts if there is no subsequent enrollment or appropriate summer withdrawal.

C. Students who have exited the cohort. These are students who were in cohort 2010 but who have exited the cohort. They have exit/year-end codes of W1, W6, W8, W9, S1, S99, S6, S8, and S9.

$$\text{Graduation Rate} = \frac{\text{Students in category A}}{\text{Students in category A} + \text{Students in category B}}$$

Because the graduation rate is a cohort measure, schools should especially be aware that:

1. A school is responsible for students in Category B above if it is the last school of record even if the students were not enrolled in that school in the 2010 school year.
2. A student may be a member of the 2010 cohort because of an enrollment in ninth grade in another school regardless of when the student was considered a ninth grader in her current school.

Safe harbor. If a school demonstrates a two percentage point improvement in its graduation rate from the previous year, it is deemed to have met the performance standard. The growth rate is rounded to the nearest hundredth of a point, e.g.: .005=.01; .004=.00.

Special rules. Safe harbor is not determined for schools with a current-year cohort of less than 40. However, if the school does not meet the goal in the current year, it is considered to have met the goal if the weighted average of the graduation rates over the past three years is greater than 80 percent.

8. Calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress for K-2 Schools

The No Child Left Behind Act requires that a state evaluate *all* schools. Consequently, an alternative methodology for determining AYP had to be developed for schools that do not offer any of the grades in which AIMS is administered. In Arizona, this group consists of schools that offer grades two and below.

Meeting the 95 Percent Tested Requirement and Annual Measurable Objectives

Starting in 2008, K-2 schools are evaluated based on all three of the same criteria as all other schools: whether they meet the annual measurable objectives, percent tested, and attendance rate. Because AIMS is not administered in these schools, the AMO and percent tested evaluations used the data based on the AMO and percent tested determination of the 3rd grade of the school to which it sends the plurality of its students.

Example: Desert Primary School serves grades K-2. It feeds three different schools. Most of its students go to Mountain Elementary School. The AYP evaluation for Desert Primary School is based on the 3rd grade of Mountain Elementary. If Mountain Elementary tests only 93 percent of its 3rd graders, or its 3rd graders fail to meet the AMO, then Desert Primary will also not meet AYP.

Special rules. For the purposes of AYP, a K-2 school may serve grades higher than grade 2; however, the sum of all of the enrollments for all grades above 2 may not be greater than 10.

9. Calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress for Small Schools

The No Child Left Behind Act requires that a state evaluate *all* schools. Consequently, an alternative methodology for determining AYP had to be developed for schools that do not have any grade with 40 or more students enrolled. There are two differences in the calculations for small schools as compared to the calculations for regular schools:

a) Three years of data is used in the calculations;
b) Small schools do not receive the safe harbor portion of the calculations. This is explained in detail below.

Meeting the 95 Percent Tested Requirement in Small Schools

For this calculation, the current year percent tested is calculated as well as the three year average. In the current year, if 95 percent of the students were tested, the school has met the requirement. The formula used to calculate the percent tested in the current year is:

$$\text{Percent Tested} = \frac{\text{\# tested in 2011}}{\text{\# enrolled in 2011}}$$

Data is aggregated across three years to evaluate whether 95 percent of the students were tested in the past three years. The formula used to calculate percent tested across three years is:

$$\text{Percent Tested} = \frac{\text{\# tested in 2009 + \# tested in 2010 + \# tested in 2011}}{\text{\# enrolled in 2009 + \# enrolled in 2010 + \# enrolled in 2011}}$$

Meeting the Annual Measurable Objectives in Small Schools

Annual measurable objectives are calculated by aggregating data for the past three years. The same rules are used for excluding students as with other schools. For small schools, there is no safe harbor because improvement cannot be determined.

The formula to calculate percent passing is:

$$\text{Percent Passing} = \frac{\text{\# passing in 2009 + \# passing in 2010 + \# passing in 2011}}{\text{\# tested in 2009 + \# tested in 2010 + \# tested in 2011}}$$

The upper bound of a 99 percent confidence interval is also calculated for small schools. Please refer to chapter 4 of this document for further details on this calculation.

Meeting the Additional Indicator

Additional indicators for small schools are calculated in the same manner as for other schools, however, due to the above differences, these schools may meet the required percentages either using the most current year's data (2011 for attendance or 2010) for graduation rate) or a three-year average. Please refer to chapter 7 of this document for further details on the three-year average calculations for attendance rate and graduation rate. Please be aware that safe harbor is not used for the additional indicator for small schools.

10. Determining Adequate Yearly Progress for Districts and Charter Holders

The No Child Left Behind Act requires that local education agencies (LEAs), districts and charter holders, be evaluated for AYP. The method for determining AYP for LEAs is analogous to that used for schools with data being aggregated to the LEA level as if the LEA were one large school.[2] The details of the AYP calculation for LEAs are nearly identical to the calculations for schools.

- LEAs are evaluated for percentage of students passing AIMS, percentage of students assessed, and a third indicator.
- Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and the performance goals for percentage of students assessed, attendance rate, and graduation rate are the same for LEAs as they are for schools.
- The applicable subgroups for AYP evaluation are the same for LEAs as they are for schools.
- Confidence intervals, safe harbor provisions, and minimum group size requirements are applied to LEA AYP calculations using the same methodology and parameters as for school AYP calculations.
- The growth model is applied using the same methodology as for schools. However, since the regression used to calculate the predicted scores is calculated separately at the LEA and school levels, the parameters for the growth model differ at the LEA and school levels. Consequently, students' predicted scores and the lower bounds of the predicted scores used for LEAs may vary from those used for schools.
- LEA AYP uses a conjunctive model. To meet AYP, an LEA must meet all the performance standards for all applicable subjects, grades, and subgroups.

Differences Between LEA and School AYP Evaluation Methods

There are three differences between the AYP evaluation method used for LEAs and that used for schools:

1. ***Measure of student mobility.*** NCLB requires that students mobile with respect to an entity are not included in the AMO portion of the AYP evaluation. For a school, this means excluding students who were not continuously enrolled at that school. LEA level mobility is determined by whether the student was continuously enrolled in the LEA, even if the student was enrolled in different schools.
2. ***Limit on the number of students with alternative assessment who count toward meeting the proficiency standard.*** NCLB mandates that the number of students who take an alternative assessment who count as being proficient may not be

[2] All statements in this section apply to both districts and charter holders. For the sake of brevity, we use the term "LEA".

greater than 1 percent of the total number enrolled in the grades tested. For AYP determinations since 2005, students who took the AIMS-A are considered to have taken an alternative assessment. Federal guidance requires that students be treated consistently at all levels of accountability. Therefore, a student who is deemed not proficient because the LEA exceeded the 1 percent cap will be deemed not proficient when determining if the school met AYP as well.

3. ***Graduation/Attendance rates.*** Graduation rate is used as the third indicator required by NCLB for unified and high school LEAs. Attendance rate is used for elementary LEAs.

11. Adequate Yearly Progress Appeals Process

The AYP appeals process developed by the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) provides LEAs and schools the opportunity to appeal their AYP determinations. In accordance with Title I, Section 1116 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the ADE allows LEAs and schools to appeal their respective AYP determinations for statistical and/or substantive reasons.

Procedure and Timeline

Step 1: Data Correction. The first step in completing the AYP appeals process required *all* LEAs and schools to review *all* data in order to confirm its accuracy. Data correction took place from April 27, 2011 through June 30, 2011. It is important to note that LEAs were solely responsible for verifying information. If an entity did not very the information for its LEA and schools through the correction process, the ADE assumed the data available were correct.

Step 2: Substantive Appeal Submission. Administrators choosing to appeal LEA or school AYP determination submitted appeals vial the online appeals application during the specified appeals window. Substantive appeals were accepted from June 15, 2011 through June 30, 2011.

LEAs and schools were able to appeal AYP determinations in two categories: data (statistical) and non-data (substantive) reasons - LEAs and schools were not limited to one category and were able to appeal in both if necessary. Statistical appeals are appeals of the accuracy of the data used in the AYP determination. Given the extensive time allowed to view and correct the data, it is expected that any errors should be corrected by the time preliminary profiles are released. Statistical appeals were not granted unless the underlying data was corrected. Substantive appeals are arguments by LEAs and schools that circumstances outside of the control of the entity negatively affected school performance on any of the AYP indicators.

Administrators that chose to appeal an AYP determination for a school or LEA must have clearly articulated the issues they believe merited an appeal. Administrators must have submitted evidence that the issues they believe merited an appeal directly resulted in a *significant* decrease in student academic achievement as demonstrated on the AIMS and/or a decrease in student participation during the administration of AIMS. The evidence must have been submitted to ADE at the time the appeal was submitted. Failure to provide this evidence resulted in the appeal not being granted. Evidence submitted after the appeal deadline closed was not considered.

NOTE: In order to protect student privacy and the integrity of the appeals process, schools were asked to refer to a specific student only by that student's SAIS ID number.

The SAIS ID number was required so that ADE staff could verify the contentions in the appeal.

The ADE, if necessary, requested that a school or LEA administrator provide additional information or evidence to assist in the appeals process. Only those requests for additional information that were provided during the specified timeframe were included in the appeals process. Unsolicited additional information submitted after the appeal deadline was not accepted.

Both school and LEA AYP determinations were separate and distinct. Schools and LEAs had to submit separate appeals for both if necessary. Appealing the school determination did not have an impact on the LEA determination or vice versa.

Step 3: Appeal Resolution. After all appeals were submitted and the appeals window closed, the ADE began to process the appeals. Appeals were addressed categorically, not necessarily in the order they were received, so the fact that a school or LEA submitted its appeal during the first day of the appeal window did not mean it necessarily received a decision first during the resolution process.

Statistical appeals were resolved only through recalculation of the AYP evaluation by ADE staff using any corrected data submitted by the school. The purpose of a statistical appeal is principally to advise ADE staff that data was in error and has been corrected. Calculations submitted by schools via an appeal were not taken at face value nor used to alter an AYP evaluation if the underlying data was not corrected.

Substantive appeals were resolved in a committee process. Committee members represented a diverse background of ADE staff and school administrators to ensure that appeals were considered from multiple perspectives. Appeals were evaluated using a rubric that evaluated the significance of the argument presented and how the circumstances presented in the argument affected the entity's performance. The committee based its decisions on the following criteria:

1. ***Was the circumstance that affected the entity outside of its control?*** Appeals involving the adverse affect of school or LEA policies, errors made by school or LEA personnel regarding test administration or data entry, or events whose impact could have been foreseen and mitigated by school or LEA action were not considered valid appeals.
2. ***Did the special circumstance actually have an impact on performance?*** Entities must have shown that the adverse circumstance had a real impact on test scores or other performance measures.
3. ***Was this problem one that was recurring and like to happen in the future?*** Appeals regarding recurring events or circumstances, such as student demographics, were not considered valid.

4. ***Was the problem eligible for appeal?*** Arguments that targeted NCLB regulations and ADE policy were not considered valid. For example, schools or LEAs could not argue that the 95 percent tested threshold be lowered for their school or that certain subgroups be excluded from the requirements.
5. ***Did the entity provide compelling evidence of the circumstance?*** Compelling evidence of impact needed to be provided to support all substantive appeals. For example, if the percent of students tested objective was not met, specific details to support the claim needed to be provided with the appeal at the time it was submitted. Simply stating "Students were absent and unable to make up the test" was not compelling; the committee needed to know *why* the students were unable to make up the test such as being extremely ill, suspended, incarcerated, or dealing with a family emergency for the entire test window.

Once all appeals were resolved, notifications were sent to the LEAs and schools that filed appeals. The contact person of record for the entity received an email from Achieve when the appeal had been processed. Entities were notified no later than July 22, 2011 of the outcome of the appeals process. The final public release of the AYP determinations occurred on July 27, 2011. All appeals were final.

12. School Improvement and LEA Improvement Designations

Overview

While all public schools and LEAs participate in Arizona's NCLB-based accountability program, AYP results from entities receiving Title I funds are additionally examined to determine if an entity is required to participate in the ADE School Improvement Program or LEA Improvement Program. Details regarding specific consequences and support may be found on the ADE website: http://www.azed.gov/improvement-intervention/school-improvement/. The rules governing required participation in these programs are distinctive for schools and LEAs and are explained in the following sections.

School Improvement Program Participation

Title I schools identified for participation in the School Improvement Program participate at one of the following sequential levels of support:

- Warning
- Year 1 School Improvement
- Year 2 School Improvement
- Year 3 School Improvement (Corrective Action)
- Year 4 School Improvement (Plan to Restructure)
- Year 5 School Improvement (Implement Restructuring Plan)

When a school initially fails to meet AYP, it is identified as being in Warning Year.

If a school fails to meet one or more identical indicators (i.e., reading[3], mathematics[4], or the additional indicator of attendance or graduation rate) for two consecutive years, the school then advances to the next level of the School Improvement Plan.

If a Title I school does not meet AYP for two consecutive years, yet data indicates that the school has not missed in the same indicator for both years, then the school remains at the previous level of School Improvement and is considered *frozen*.

A school must meet all AYP requirements for two consecutive years in order to no longer be identified for participation in the School Improvement Program.

If a school that is participating in the School Improvement Program at a level of Year 1 School Improvement or beyond meets all AYP requirements, then the school continues to

[3] The reading indicator includes meeting the required percent tested in reading and meeting the reading AMO. Failure to meet either of these will result in the reading indicator not being met.
[4] The mathematics indicator includes meeting the required percent tested in mathematics and meeting the mathematics AMO. Failure to meet either of these will result in the mathematics indicator not being met.

participate in the School Improvement Program at its current level and is considered frozen until AYP is met for two consecutive years.

For schools that have been identified at the Warning level, if the school meets all AYP requirements in the following year, then the school is no longer identified for participation in the School Improvement Program.

Example 1:

Consider the example of Desert Water Elementary that, by 2007, had been identified at the level of Year 1 School Improvement. In 2007, Desert Water Elementary missed the reading and attendance indicators. The AYP data for Desert Water Elementary for 2007 and the following three years were as follows:

Indicator	2007	2008	2009	20010
Reading	not met	not met	met	met
Mathematics	met	met	met	met
Attendance	not met	met	met	met

The 2008 data resulted in Desert Water Elementary advancing to the level of Year 2 School Improvement because the reading indicator had not been met for two consecutive years (2007 and 2008). In 2009, Desert Water Elementary met all indicators and remained frozen at the level of Year 2 School Improvement. The 2010 data resulted in Desert Water Elementary no longer being identified for participation in the School Improvement Program because it had met AYP for two consecutive years.

Example 2:

Watery Desert Elementary was also identified at the level of Year 1 School Improvement by 2007. In 2007, Watery Desert Elementary missed the reading and attendance indicators. The AYP data for Watery Desert Elementary for 2007 and the following three years were as follows:

Indicator	2007	2008	2009	2010
Reading	not met	not met	met	met
Mathematics	met	met	not met	not met
Attendance	not met	met	not met	met

The 2008 data resulted in Watery Desert Elementary advancing to the level of Year 2 School Improvement because the reading indicator had not been met for two consecutive years (2007 and 2008). In 2009, Water Desert Elementary missed the mathematics and attendance indicators but it had not missed any one indicator for two consecutive years. Consequently, Water Desert Elementary remained at the level of Year 2 School Improvement but was additionally identified as being frozen. The 2010 data then led to Watery Desert Elementary advancing to the level of Corrective Action because the mathematics indicator had not been met for two consecutive years.

Example 3:

Spruce High School had been identified at the level of Year 1 School Improvement by 2007. In 2007, Spruce High School missed the reading and graduation rate indicators. The AYP data for Spruce High School for 2007 and the following three years were as follows:

Indicator	2007	2008	2009	2010
Reading	not met	not met	not met	met
Mathematics	met	met	not met	met
Graduation	not met	not met	not met	not met

The 2008 data resulted in Spruce High School advancing to the level of Year 2 School Improvement because the reading and the graduation rate indicators have not been met for two consecutive years (2007 and 2008). Failure to meet either the reading or the graduation rate indicator in 2008 led to Spruce High School entering the Year 2 School Improvement level. In 2009, Spruce High School missed all indicators and advanced to the level of Corrective Action. In 2010, although Spruce High School met both the reading and mathematics indicators, the failure to meet the graduation rate requirement for two consecutive years (2009 and 2010) led to the school being identified for the Plan to Restructure level of the School Improvement Program.

LEA Improvement Program Participation

Title I LEAs identified for participation in the LEA Improvement Program participate at one of the following sequential levels of support:

- Year 1 LEA Improvement
- Year 2 LEA Improvement
- Year 3 LEA Improvement (Corrective Action)

A Title I LEA is identified for LEA Improvement only when it misses AYP in the ***same*** *subject*[5] and in ***all*** *grade spans* for two consecutive years, or the other academic indicator (i.e., attendance or graduation rate) in ***all*** *grade pans* for two consecutive years. Applicable grade spans are K-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

Similarly, a Title I LEA advances to the next level of LEA Improvement only when it misses AYP in the ***same*** *subject* and in ***all*** *grade spans* for two consecutive years, of the other academic indicator (i.e., attendance rate or graduation rate) in ***all*** *grade spans* for two consecutive years.

[5] The assessed subjects are mathematics and reading. Each subject is assessed separately. Each subject requirement includes meeting the required percent tested in the subject *and* meeting the subject AMO. Failing to meet either percent tested or AMO within a subject results in the subject indicator not being met.

For LEAs containing both elementary grades spans and the high school grade span, the additional indicator assessed for LEA Improvement is graduation rate.

Example 4 (X = indicator not met)

	Elem. Reading	Middle Reading	H.S. Reading	Elem. Math	Middle Math	H.S. Math	Elem. attendance	Middle attendance	Grad Rate
Year 1	X	X	X						
Year 2	X	X	X						
In this example, the LEA has missed AYP in the **same** subject (reading) across **all** grade spans for two consecutive years. Thus, the LEA would be identified for improvement.									

Example 5 (X = indicator not met)

	Elem. Reading	Middle Reading	H.S. Reading	Elem. Math	Middle Math	H.S. Math	Elem. attendance	Middle attendance	Grad Rate
Year 1								X	X
Year 2							X		X
In this example, the LEA has missed AYP in the graduation indicator for two consecutive years. Thus, the LEA would be identified for improvement.									

Example 6 (X = indicator not met)

	Elem. Reading	Middle Reading	H.S. Reading	Elem. Math	Middle Math	H.S. Math	Elem. attendance	Middle attendance	Grad Rate
Year 1		X	X	X	X	X			**X**
Year 2	X		X		X			**X**	
In this example, the LEA missed AYP in mathematics across **all** grade spans in Year 1. To be identified for improvement, the LEA would have to miss AYP across **all** grade spans in the **same** subject, mathematics, or again miss graduation rate, in Year 2. While the LEA missed AYP in middle school mathematics, it did not miss the AYP targets across **all** grade spans in mathematics for Year 2. The LEA made the elementary and high school math targets. Additionally, even though the LEA missed the additional indicator in middle attendance, since it contains both elementary and high school grade spans, it would need to have missed grad rate in Year 2 to be identified for improvement in this category. Thus, the LEA is not identified for improvement, but will be reported as missing AYP.									