

**District of Columbia
Consolidated State Application
Accountability Workbook**

**Plan Submitted
to U.S. Department of Education
March 2, 2009**

**District of Columbia
Office of the
State Superintendent of
Education**

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

The District of Columbia’s Consolidated State Accountability Workbook submitted on May 1, 2003 and revised in June 2003, August 2006, February 2008, and February 2009 details the policies and procedures relating to the educational assessment and accountability policies of the District of Columbia. It includes the development, implementation and monitoring of a comprehensive accountability system for all public schools in the District of Columbia, including those in the District’s geographic LEA, the District of Columbia Public Schools, and public charter schools.

All students are held to the same challenging academic standards and participate in a State assessment aligned to the State academic standards. Assessment data are made public to inform parents and community members about student achievement by school, Local Education Agency (LEA), and the State Education Agency (SEA). The Workbook complies with all local and federal requirements and regulations associated with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Federal Guidance published by the U.S. Department of Education on the critical elements of an assessment system can be found at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/saaprguidance.doc>.

Principle 1: All Schools

| | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 1.1 | The accountability system includes all public schools and LEAs in the state. |
| F | 1.2 | The accountability system holds all schools and campuses to the same criteria. |
| F | 1.3 | The accountability system aligns the District’s academic achievement standards, academic content standards and assessments. |
| F | 1.4 | The accountability system provides information in a timely manner. |
| F | 1.5 | The accountability system includes report cards. |
| F | 1.6 | The accountability system includes rewards and sanctions. |

Principle 2: All Students

| | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 2.1 | The accountability system includes all students. |
| F | 2.2 | The accountability system has a consistent definition of full academic year. |
| F | 2.3 | The accountability system properly includes mobile students. |

Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations

| | | |
|---|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 3.1 | The accountability system expects all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14. |
| F | 3.2 | The accountability system has a method for determining whether student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress. |

5/18/2009

- | | | |
|---|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 3.2a | The accountability system establishes a starting point. |
| F | 3.2b | The accountability system establishes statewide annual measurable objectives. |
| F | 3.2c | The accountability system establishes intermediate goals. |

Principle 4: Annual Decisions

- | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 4.1 | The accountability system determines annually the progress of schools and districts. |
|---|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

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

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 6.1 | The accountability system is based primarily on academic assessments. |
|---|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

- | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 7.1 | The accountability system includes graduation rate for high schools. |
| F | 7.2 | The accountability system includes an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools. |
| F | 7.3 | The additional indicators are valid and reliable. |

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

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 8.1 | The accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for reading/language arts and mathematics. |
|---|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F | 9.1 | The accountability system produces reliable decisions. |
| F | 9.2 | The accountability system produces valid decisions. |
| F | 9.3 | The State has a plan for addressing changes in assessment and student population. |

5/18/2009

Principle 10: Participation Rate

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

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

Principle 1: All Schools

1.1 The accountability system includes all public schools and LEAs in the District of Columbia.

With the passage of the District of Columbia's Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007 (D.C. Law 17-9), state-level education functions previously performed by the DC Public Schools under the DC Board of Education, were consolidated under the authority of the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE). The OSSE serves as the state education agency and performs the functions of a state education agency for the District of Columbia under applicable federal law, including grant-making, oversight, and state educational agency functions for standards, assessments, and federal accountability requirements for elementary and secondary education. The Act launched the OSSE on October 1, 2007 and reconstituted the former DC Board of Education as the State Board of Education. The Board has approval authority over state academic standards, high school graduation requirements, the state accountability plan, the categories and format of the NCLB report card, the state definitions for NCLB purposes of "Adequate Yearly Progress," proficiency ," and "highly qualified teachers" and other select state-level rules and standards.

The OSSE holds every public school and LEA in the District of Columbia accountable under NCLB standards. Students in public charter schools are fully included in the state assessment program and their schools are subject to the same accountability determinations. This means that all public schools and public charter schools participate in the standardized state assessment system and all schools will be held to the same AYP measures. The OSSE identifies the progress of all schools and LEAs in meeting performance objectives for the required populations on the District's state report card.

[List reports of data for all DC public schools are presented at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/schools.asp>. Follow the "School Data" link at the top of the page.]

The definition of a "school" for purposes of the District's accountability system incorporates two criteria: first, the school demonstrates a unique student membership of District residents verifiable in the official enrollment counts; and second, the school program has been assigned a unique code jointly by the state and LEA. For accountability purposes, each campus of a multi-campus public charter school LEA is treated as an individual elementary or secondary school that has distinct accountability targets (see Appendix B).

Consolidated Schools

LEAs in the District of Columbia may, from time to time, consolidate schools or campuses. For the purposes of calculating AYP, the OSSE defines a "consolidated school" as a school or campus that receives students from a sending school or campus

that has merged or closed. OSSE has determined that the receiving school's accountability status (school improvement, corrective action or restructuring) is the default status when two schools are consolidated. For example, if the receiving school is in the first year of school improvement, that designation becomes the default baseline status of the consolidated school. In addition, the consolidated school's safe harbor targets will be calculated based on the scores of the pre-consolidation population of the school or campus (e.g. safe harbor targets are based on receiving school population only).

Petition for recalculating safe harbor targets

If the consolidated school experiences a change in student population of at least forty [40] percent, LEAs may petition the SEA for safe harbor targets in the receiving school to be recalculated based upon the consolidated population's re-rostered scores from the prior testing year. For example, the LEA may be permitted to recalculate safe harbor targets for a receiving school that combines prior year student achievement scores from the applicable students in the sending school with those in the receiving schools to set a baseline in calculating safe harbor targets.

Petition to be treated as a new school

If fifty [50] percent or more of the grade spans or population have changed in the receiving school, the LEA can petition for a school to be considered a "new school" for school improvement purposes. If the SEA approves the petition, the new school's accountability status will be restarted with a baseline established by the first year of testing in the consolidated "new" school. If the petition is not approved, the consolidated school will receive an AYP decision as originally scheduled based on the default receiving school's status from the prior year's testing.

Criteria

The SEA will review all appropriate evidence to ensure the change was not requested so as to avoid accountability. The SEA will consider the following criteria in its review:

- Whether granting the petition would better assist and bring resources to improve educational services to students who are not making adequate yearly progress;
- Whether granting the petition would better reflect the testing results, educational environment or needs of the combined population of students in the consolidated school;
- Whether the new designation would avoid the consequences of a failure to make adequate yearly progress or otherwise thwart the intent of the accountability system under NCLB; and
- In the case of a petition to be designated a new school, whether there is a significant change in staff or other operational aspects of the consolidated school.

Non-Public Placement Programs

In accordance with Section 300.401(b) of the IDEA regulations, students with disabilities who are placed as a result of the Individual Education Plan (IEP) process in a private school (Non-Public Placement) as a means for providing special education and related services are entitled to an education that meets the State's standards as they apply to students still resident in a District LEA. The State's academic standards apply to these students, and these students must participate in the State's academic assessment system.

Each student in a Non-Public Placement must participate in the District of Columbia statewide assessment program. The LEA out of which the student was placed in the Non-Public school is responsible under IDEA for ensuring that the student in Non-Public Placement is assessed at a testing site approved by the originating local education agency assessment coordinator, under the SEA's test security guidance as applied in the LEA. The assessment scores for a student in a Non-Public Placement are used in determining AYP for the LEAs out of which the IEP Team placed the student into the private school or facility.

The participation and performance scores for students in out-of-state Non-Public Placements are aggregated in the results of the LEA out of which the student was placed (i.e., the LEA in which the student was last enrolled when the IEP Team placed the student in a Non-Public Placement).¹

Alternative and Correctional/Juvenile Detention Facilities

All eligible public school students who attend an alternative school or are in residential correctional facilities are required to participate in the District of Columbia statewide assessment program. These students are assessed at the location where they receive instruction. Such students' assessment scores are used in determining AYP for the LEAs in which they are currently or most recently enrolled and the facility where they receive instruction.²

¹ Under District law, a public charter school may elect to have DCPS serve as its LEA for purposes of IDEA. The results of students placed out of charter schools that have elected to have DCPS serve as its LEA for IDEA purposes are used to determine AYP for DCPS. If a charter school elects to serve as its own LEA for IDEA purposes the charter school must participate in the placement decision and is held accountable for the student's performance in the Non-Public Placement.

² Young adults attending the Oak Hill Academy are attributed to the state for purposes of accountability.

1.2 The accountability system holds all schools to the same criteria.

All public schools and LEAs are subject to the same performance system. The SEA makes no distinction between schools based on grade level, size of school, poverty status or other disaggregating factor. The local schools and LEAs all administer the same assessments under the statewide DCCAS system and the results from those examinations comprise the data from which AYP decisions are made.

[Definitions of terms and descriptions of programming “business rules” are presented in the FAQ section of the state reports at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. School, district, and state adequate yearly progress (AYP) data are presented for Reading and Math at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. The “Percent Tested” is presented on all “AYP Reports” at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/reportcards.asp>.]

Under District law, each public school in the District of Columbia is considered a local education agency (LEA) as defined in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by NCLB. In addition, each chartered entity is a “school” under local law. If the public charter school has multiple campuses, the District treats each campus as a school and the combined multi-campus charter school as an LEA for accountability reporting purposes. A single school charter LEA receives identical reporting results as both a school and an LEA for NCLB reporting purposes.

For “small” schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, school data are aggregating for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.

All AYP calculations are determined by the OSSE. These determinations are then shared with schools and LEA’s. Schools and LEAs have a 30 days appeal window to appeal the accuracy of the state data. Determinations are then finalized and reported publicly.

5/18/2009

1.3 The accountability system incorporates, at a minimum, a definition of *basic, proficient, and advanced* student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Beginning in 2005-2006, the state reported four achievement levels for AYP determination:

1. Advanced
2. Proficient
3. Basic
4. Below Basic

[Reading, Math, and Science achievement data for all student subgroups are presented on school, district, and state “AYP Reports” and “Report Cards” at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>.]

The four performance levels are reported for the general and alternate assessments in reading, science and mathematics tests. Both the general and alternate assessments are based on the approved state content standards. For the DC CAS-Alternate, linking standards are identified so that the grade level content standards are accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities. To make AYP, schools must meet 1) required percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced levels, 2) required participation rates, and 3) targets for the additional academic indicators.

Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general reading and math assessments were approved by the State Board of Education in July 2006. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state alternate assessment were approved by the State Board of Education in October 2007. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general and alternate science assessments were approved in October 2008

Standard-setting for the new science assessments was conducted in August 2008 after the first operational administration. With the exception of high school Biology, the performance of all students is measured in relation to their grade levels and out-of-grade testing is not permitted. Grade level science tests were administered in grades 5 and 8 in April 2008. High school Biology tests were administered for the first time in April 2008.

State municipal regulations were amended in the first half of 2009 to require all students to take the biology test at least once during high school. A further amendment will require that one of the three required laboratory science courses for graduation from a DC public school be an approved biology course. These new requirements will take effect for the class of 2012 although complete cohort data will be reported for 11th graders in SY2010-2011.

Biology results will be banked at the 11th grade level though students may take the Biology test in 9th, 10th, 11th or 12th grade. Since a complete high school data cycle for students at the 11th grade level will not be available until SY2009-2010, the state will implement a transitional reporting plan to maximize the data available to schools and the public.

1.4 The accountability system provides information in a timely manner.

The OSSE makes annual AYP determinations approximately 30 days prior to the beginning of the school year. Below is a generic summary of the SEA activities and deliverables. Dates provided are for School Year 2008-09 and approximate the schedule in subsequent years.

- **August 25:** First day of school; implement Statewide System of Support
- **October 5:** Collect and audit enrollment data
- **April 6:** Testing begins: collect and verify enrollment including all NCLB subgroup data
- **April 8:** DC CAS-Alt data collection ends
- **May 14:** All DC CAS test materials received by test vendor
- **June 11:** SEA receives preliminary DC CAS and final DC CAS-Alt data from the test vendor and conducts quality assurance reviews
- **June 23:** Final DC CAS file received from vendor
- **July 6:** AYP determinations are sent to LEAs for review
- **July 20:** Public release of AYP data
- **July-August:** Respond to appeals by schools and LEA's, disseminate state/district report cards
- **August 3:** LEAs mail letter to parents

The OSSE is implementing the second phase of a new state longitudinal data system (SLED) which will ultimately produce all required NCLB reports. The SLED system now collects student-level demographic data from all LEAs, allowing for reports to be disaggregated by various subgroups once assessment data are available in the system. For SY 2009-2010, the SLED is expected to provide a unique student identifier for all public school students, track daily attendance, and publish all required NCLB reports.

5/18/2009

1.5 The accountability system includes report cards for public schools and LEAs.

Each year, the SEA produces a state, LEA and school report cards, made available on the OSSE website at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/> and at school offices and libraries throughout the District. School, LEA and SEA report cards were first implemented in SY2002-2003 and have been published in July or August of each subsequent year. In 2006-2007, revisions were also made to include longitudinal data on the report cards and science scores (see Critical Element 1.3).

1.6 The accountability system includes rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs.

SEA policy provides for the establishment of one system of rewards and sanctions. On April 16, 2003 the DC Board of Education, sitting as a state board, first approved the DC Consolidated State Accountability Workbook to implement the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This plan represents a unified accountability system – uniformly applicable across all schools – and includes recognitions and rewards for incentive schools, and interventions and sanctions for schools that fail to achieve AYP for either two or three years, respectively. The plan was subsequently revised in June 2003, August 2006, and February 2008.

Incentive Schools

Incentive Schools are identified as schools that achieve Adequate Yearly Progress under NCLB and are recognized and rewarded with increased flexibility and autonomy. For example, schools may be given grants to support and maintain best practices; create Demonstration Models, modeling a best practice at each school that would become a resource to assist low performing schools; develop and maintain high performing teachers and administrators by supporting professional growth through professional development; and ensure teacher development and job-embedded professional development in the areas of English/language arts and/or mathematics.

The District of Columbia's accountability system is fully aligned with the requirements of NCLB. Interventions and sanctions include:

- Schools in Need of Improvement – Year One have not achieved AYP for two consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Provide parents of eligible children the opportunity to transfer to a school not identified as in need of improvement.
 - Complete a written School Improvement Plan identifying issues hindering school improvement and addressing these issues with specific research-based improvement strategies.

- Schools in Need of Improvement – Year Two have not achieved AYP for three consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for Year One schools; and
 - Provide the opportunity for parents of eligible children to select from a state approved list of Supplemental Educational Service providers.

- Schools in Need of Corrective Action – have not achieved AYP for four consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for Year Two schools; and
 - Implement at least one of the following strategies or actions:
 - Replace staff relevant to the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Change curriculum in the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Be permitted less local school management authority
 - Appoint an outside expert to advise the school
 - Extend the school day or school year

- Restructure the internal organization of the school
- Schools in Need of Restructuring – Year One/Planning have not achieved AYP for five consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for corrective action schools; and
 - Plan for an alternative governance structure to take effect in the following school year that includes at least one of the following actions:
 - Replace staff relevant to the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Reopen the school as a Public Charter School
 - Enter into a private management contract for the school
 - Enter into an agreement to permit the SEA to operate the school
 - Other restructuring actions that significantly alter the governance.
- Schools in Need of Restructuring – Year Two have not achieved AYP for six consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for Restructuring – Year One schools; and
 - Reopen in accordance with the restructuring plan.

Exiting School Improvement

Schools in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring that achieve AYP for two consecutive years will be removed from this designation.

PRINCIPLE 2. All Students

2.1 The accountability system includes all students.

The State Accountability System includes students in general education, special education, special education centers, alternative education and non-public private day/residential placements and requires all public school students to participate in the standardized state assessment. Accountability criteria related to the participation rate are detailed in Critical Elements 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, and 10.1. For “small” schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, data are aggregated for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.

The following state guidelines are disseminated statewide to guide the assessment of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners.

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities are identified by their IEP team and verified through automated special education data systems where available. When appropriate, an alternate assessment is available for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Students with a 504 plan are included in calculations like all other students, but they are not included as students with disabilities.

[Participation in the alternate assessment is indicated on school, district, and state Report Cards (e.g., http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/dccas_reportcards.asp). Summary DC CAS-Alt participation reports are also published (e.g., <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/schools.asp>)]

The state recently entered into a formal agreement with USDE to ensure that read-aloud accommodations on the statewide assessment are reduced. Guidance was issued to LEAs in January, 2009.

English Language Learners

Students that are deemed to be English Language Learners participate fully in the State Accountability system. Service levels for English language learners are identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. Students that score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test are classified as LEP or NEP. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test. The exit criterion for the LEP students is a 5.0 on the ACCESS test. Appendix C provides the state’s definition of “Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Population” and the criteria for “Exiting the Bilingual/ESL Program.”

[In 2007-2008, 98.68 percent of DC students enrolled in LEP/NEP programs participated in the state assessments - see State Summary Report Cards/All Students at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/dccas_reportcards.asp.]

2.2 The accountability system has a consistent definition of full academic year.

A 'full academic year' is defined as enrollment in a public school on the official state (fall) enrollment date in October of each year and the first day of testing (typically in late April). The official enrollment count from October will be compared to the enrollment in April. The scores of students that participate in the assessment but have not been enrolled for a Fully Academic Year will be reported at the LEA level only.

To count towards a school or LEA's accountability determination, students must also be "continuously enrolled". Continuous enrollment is defined as being enrolled for at least 85% of the Full Academic Year. Students that are not continuously enrolled will be assessed but the scores will not count towards the school's accountability determination.

The following details how the scores of transfer students will be applied for accountability purposes.

- If a student enrolls in more than one school within the same LEA, the student's achievement scores will apply to the LEA and SEA.
- If a student enrolls in schools in multiple LEAs, the student's achievement will apply to the SEA only.

For most students in the state, the dates of enrollment are identified using automated student databases that are updated in real time by staff at the school level. For the few public charter schools that are not part of this student information system, these data are provided to the state on a weekly basis using excel files that are created for this purpose.

[Definitions related to "Full Academic Year" and other terms are provided in the FAQ section of the state reports at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>.]

5/18/2009

2.3 The accountability system determines which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year.

The OSSE has launched a Statewide Longitudinal Data Warehouse (SLED) to serve as the single integration point of education data for students in the District of Columbia. The SLED's first component includes unique identifiers for all students, which will significantly improve the student tracking process. In addition, it will provide the ability to track daily attendance for all students by linking attendance records from each school's student information system to the unique student identifier. This data will come through either a nightly extract using a school's interoperability framework technology or via a manual file upload that will take place on a weekly basis.

[The DC NCLB reporting system provides full summary data for both students enrolled a Full Academic Year (AYP Reports) and all students enrolled in April when the state assessments are administered (Report Cards). "AYP Reports" and the "Report Cards" are presented at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>.]

PRINCIPLE 3: Method of AYP Determinations

3.1 The accountability system expects all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14.

The charts for *Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives* are presented in Appendix B that show the progression from the 2001-2002 starting points to 100% proficiency by 2013-2014. These charts were revised in 2005-2006 to incorporate changes in the state reading and math assessments (e.g., establishing new starting points and intermediate steps).

The methodology was the same as that used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003 as prescribed by NCLB and described in Critical Element 3.2a. The goals and objectives clearly state that 100% of students in the SEA are expected to achieve ‘proficient’ or better by 2013-2014. For accountability purposes, all schools are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have separate accountability targets (see Appendix B).

[Reading, Math, and Science achievement data for all student subgroups are presented on school, district, and state “AYP Reports” and “Report Cards” at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. The state annual measurable objectives are presented in a footnote on all school, district, and state AYP Reports. For the 2007-2008 reports the footnote states “AYP reading target = 60.53%, AYP math target = 55.21%.”]

3.2 The accountability system has a method for determining whether student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, they must meet three requirements. First, a school or LEA must achieve 95 % participation on the state assessments for all subgroups. Second, each subgroup (e.g., whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable achievement objectives in both reading and mathematics. Third, each school and LEA must meet the applicable additional academic indicator – attendance for elementary schools and graduation rate for secondary schools. A school, LEA, or the state may also achieve the academic targets by meeting the safe harbor provisions outlined below.

A school or LEA can achieve the ‘Safe Harbor Provision’ of NCLB by meeting all of the following criteria:

- 95% participation rate on state assessment (see Critical Element 10.1)
- The percent of students in each subgroup that score at basic or below must decrease by at least 10% compared to the prior year.
- All subgroups must show improvement on the additional academic indicators (attendance or graduation rate), as specified in Elements 7.1 and 7.2.

For a subgroup to fail to make AYP, the school or LEA must fail to achieve AYP in the same content area or component (i.e., reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) for two consecutive years.

[Definitions of terms and descriptions of programming “business rules” are presented in the FAQ section of the state reports at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. School, district, and state adequate yearly progress data are presented for Reading, Mathematics, and Science at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>.]

3.2a The accountability system establishes a starting point.

The state measures achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP. Data are combined across grades for determining AYP using a weighted proportion. Separate cut scores were determined for each grade level and subject and approved the State Board of Education. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general reading and mathematics assessments were approved by the State Board of Education in July 2006. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state alternate assessment were approved by the State Board of Education in October 2007. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general and alternate science assessments were approved in October 2008.

From SY2002-SY2005, the following grade-spans were included in the AYP determinations:

- Elementary: Grades 2-5
- Secondary (to include Middle and Junior High): Grades 6-12
- For schools that include both elementary and secondary grades, separate targets were applied level and a weighted proportion is then calculated.

Commencing in SY2006, the following definitions of elementary and secondary schools were instituted:

Elementary - schools with a 3rd, 4th and/or 5th grades that do not meet the criteria for secondary schools

Secondary - schools with no 3rd and/or 4th grades and a grade above 6th grade.

These definitions are reflected in the following examples:

| Elementary | Secondary |
|-------------|-------------|
| Grades 2-5 | Grades 6-8 |
| Grades 2-6 | Grades 7-9 |
| Grades 2-8 | Grades 6-12 |
| Grades 2-12 | Grades 9-12 |

For SY2002-SY2005, the starting points were calculated using the percent proficient in the school enrolling the 20th percentile of students of the State’s total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level. This method was applied to all schools in the Elementary and Secondary grade-spans. The starting points were calculated using data from the SY2001-02 school year. The starting points were the same for all schools in the Elementary grade-span and in the Secondary grade-span. Schools with un-graded or age-based groupings were identified according to the closest grade that would apply.

For SY2006-2014, the state recalculated the starting points based on the results of the first administration of the new state tests, DC CAS, using the same method outlined above. The starting points, annual objectives, and intermediate goals for the new assessment are presented in Appendix B.

5/18/2009

Note: Several K-12 schools in the District of Columbia are considered elementary schools based upon the definition above; the additional academic indicator for these schools is attendance rate. The teachers in grades k-6 are held to the elementary school standards for highly qualified teachers and the teachers in grades 7-12 are held to the secondary school standards, though the specifics may be determined by the curricular model employed in the grade level in question. For example, if the grade 6 teachers are “self-contained” and teach all subjects, they are considered elementary school teachers. If they work in a junior high school model where the students move from class to class and teaching is subject specific, then, the teacher are held to the secondary school criteria for highly qualified teachers.

5/18/2009

3.2b The accountability system establishes statewide annual measurable objectives.

The charts for *Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives* are presented in Appendix B and show the progression from the 2001-2002 starting points to 100% proficiency by 2013-2014.

To establish these new intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, the state employed the 2005-2006 DC CAS results and the same methodology used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003 as prescribed by NCLB and described in Critical Element 3.2a. 100 percent of students in the SEA are expected to achieve the 'proficient' or advanced achievement level by SY2013-2014.

[The state annual measurable objectives are presented in a footnote on all school, district, and state AYP Reports. For the 2007-2008 reports the footnote states "AYP reading target = 60.53%, AYP math target = 55.21%."]

5/18/2009

3.2c The accountability system establishes intermediate goals.

The charts for *Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives* are presented in Appendix B and show the progression from the 2001-2002 starting points to 100% proficiency by 2013-2014. The baseline year for NCLB was 2001-2002. The first increase in the state's achievement targets (i.e., intermediate goals) was in SY2003-2004. Each subsequent increase occurs every two years and is equal incrementally except the last step where there is only a one-year interval

The state recalculated the annual objectives and intermediate goals in 2005-2006 based on the results of the first administration of the new state tests, DC CAS, and the new performance levels (see Critical Element 1.4).

[The state annual measurable objectives are presented in a footnote on all school, district, and state AYP Reports. For the 2007-2008 reports the footnote states "AYP reading target = 60.53%, AYP math target = 55.21%."]

PRINCIPLE 4: Annual Decisions

4.1 The accountability system determines annually the progress of schools and LEAs.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, each subgroup (whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and all major racial/ethnic groups) must have at least 95 % participation rate on the state assessment and meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives (AMO).

If a subgroup fails to make the AMO in any subject area, the school fails to achieve AYP.

To move into school improvement status, the school must fail to meet the AMO for two years in a row in the same subject area. For example, if the school fails to meet the reading AMO in year 1 and mathematics AMO in year 2 its status does not change. Please note that each subgroup must achieve the AMO each year. That is, if African American students fail to meet the reading AMO in year 1 and White students fail to do so in year 2, the school's status moves to the next level of improvement.

Once the school is in improvement, to move from year 1 to year 2, the school must fail to meet AYP in either of the next two years. For example, if a school in Year 1 School Improvement meets AYP in the following year it remains in the School Improvement Year 1. If the same school fails to meet AYP in the 3rd or 4th year, it enters School Improvement 2.

If any school meets all of the applicable criteria, they can still make AYP under the 'Safe Harbor Provision' described in Element 3.2.

The rules as stated above apply for all local education agencies as well.

The OSSE makes annual AYP determinations approximately 30 days prior to the beginning of the school year.

[The AYP status for all schools, districts, and states are presented at the top of all Report Cards that are provided at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>]

PRINCIPLE 5: Subgroup Accountability

5.1 The accountability system includes all the required student subgroups.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, each subgroup (whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and from all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives and have at least 95% participation rate in state assessment. For each subgroup to fail to make AYP, the school or LEA must fail to achieve AYP in the same content area/component for two consecutive years.

Students with disabilities are identified by their IEP and verified through SEDS, an automated special education data system. 504 students are included in calculations like all other students, but they are not included as students with disabilities. Economically disadvantaged students are identified through their application for free/reduced lunch. Major racial and ethnic groups, which include: African-American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, White and other are identified through the official enrollment process.

Students that are deemed to be English Language Learners participate fully in the State Accountability system. Service levels for English language learners are identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. LEP and NEP student (now referred to as English language learners) are those students who score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test. The exit criterion for the LEP students is a score of 5.0 on the ACCESS test.

[Reading, Math, and Science achievement data for all student subgroups are presented on school, district, and state “AYP Reports” and “Report Cards” at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>.]

5.1 The accountability system holds schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, they must meet three requirements. First, each subgroup (see below) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable achievement objectives in both reading and mathematics. Second, each school and LEA, and the state, must meet the applicable additional academic indicator – i.e., attendance for elementary schools and graduation rate for secondary schools. Third, a school, LEA, or the state must achieve 95 % participation on the state assessments for all subgroups. A school, LEA, or the state may also achieve the academic targets by meeting the safe harbor provisions outlined in Critical Element 3.2.

Subgroups include the whole school, economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students. LEAs are required to collect and report all required data to allow the State to disaggregate data consistent with the regulations of NCLB. Scores for students that were classified as limited English or non-English proficient, but become fully English proficient, are included in the school, district, and state LEP/NEP subgroup summaries for 2 years after the students exit the LEP/NEP program.

The state is currently implementing the second phase of a new state longitudinal data system (SLED). By August 2009, all required NCLB reports will be produced by the SLED. The SLED system now collects student-level demographic data from all LEAs as of February 2009 which allows for reports to be disaggregated by various subgroups once assessment data are available. For SY 2009-2010, the SLED will provide a unique student identifier (USI) for all public school students in DC. In addition, it will provide the ability to track daily attendance for all students by linking attendance records from each school's student information system to the USI. These data will come through either a nightly extract using a school's interoperability framework technology or via a manual file upload that will take place on a weekly basis.

5.3 The accountability system includes students with disabilities.

Students with disabilities participate in the statewide assessment consistent with the accommodations outlined in the students' IEPs. All state accommodations fall in one of four categories: setting, timing/scheduling, presentation, and response.

The state expects that most students with disabilities will participate in the regular statewide assessment; however, a limited number of students with significant cognitive disabilities may be eligible for participation on the alternate assessment. Students who meet the state's eligibility criteria and all participation guidelines may prepare a portfolio for review through the state alternate assessment which is based on grade level content standards and uses alternate academic achievement standards. The criteria for participation in the DC CAS-Alternate are outlined in Appendix A. In accordance with federal regulations, the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or above levels statewide must not exceed 1 percent.

The state entered into a formal agreement with the United States Department of Education to ensure the Read Aloud accommodation for the state-wide reading assessment is applied to the appropriate population in the District of Columbia. Pursuant to guidance issued in January 2009, the state has set aggressive reduction targets for its local educational agencies. In addition, the OSSE is providing technical assistance and verifying that LEAs are reducing the use of the read aloud accommodation by 50% in SY2008-09 and 100% in SY2009-10.

[In 2007-2008, 94.91 percent of DC students with disabilities participated in the regular state assessment. The data are presented on the State Summary Report Cards at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/dccas_reportcards.asp.]

5.4 The accountability system includes limited English proficient students.

All LEP/NEP students are included in the State's definition of AYP and the vast majority participate in the general assessment with accommodations (unless they are eligible to participate in the alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities).

In accordance with NCLB guidance, scores for LEP/NEP students who have enrolled in schools in the United States within the previous 12 months are not be required to participate in the reading portion of the state assessment and will be counted as participants for AYP if they participated in the state language proficiency assessments. The state report card reports the prevalence of this population. These same students must, however, take the mathematics assessment (with accommodations as appropriate). Although mathematics test participation is required, the scores are not counted in calculating AYP. If students do not take the mathematics test, they are counted as non-participants. DC CAS reading scores are also not counted in calculating AYP even if the tests are taken.

Scores for students who were classified as limited English or non-English proficient, but become fully English proficient, are included in the school, district, and state LEP/NEP subgroup summaries for 2 years after the students exit the LEP/NEP program.

Service levels for NEP/LEP students is identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. LEP and NEP student are those students who score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test. State guidance prescribes how students with disabilities and English language learners are assessed in regard to testing accommodations (see Appendix C).

[In 2007-2008, 98.68 percent of DC students enrolled in LEP/NEP programs participated in the state assessments. The data are presented on the State Summary Report Cards at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/dccas_reportcards.asp.]

5/18/2009

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.

The following table details the minimum number of students for reporting and accountability for all subgroups. For small schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, data are aggregated across years. School data are aggregating for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.

| <i>Minimum-N</i> | <i>Number</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| For reporting (privacy) | 10 |
| For AYP determination (reliability) | 25 (academic proficiency) and 40 (participation rate) |

[The state minimum group size for achievement data is presented in a footnote on all school, district, and state AYP Reports presented at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. For the 2007-2008 reports the footnote states that “No data are displayed for groups with less than 25 students.”]

5/18/2009

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.

Confidentiality is assured by the state policy of not reporting results for groups of less than 10. In cases where all students in a group score at the same performance level and confidentiality is compromised, the state is examining the feasibility of reporting the results as ranges of performance rather than exact percentages.

[The state minimum group size for achievement data is presented in a footnote on all school, district, and state Report Cards presented at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. For the 2007-2008 reports the footnote states that “No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.”]

PRINCIPLE 6: Academic Assessments

6.1 The accountability system is based primarily on academic assessments.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, they must meet three requirements. First, a school or LEA must achieve 95 % participation on the state assessments for all subgroups. Second, each subgroup (e.g., whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable achievement objectives in both reading and mathematics. Third, each school and LEA must meet the applicable additional academic indicator – attendance for elementary schools and graduation rate for secondary schools. A school, LEA, or the state may also achieve the academic targets by meeting the safe harbor provisions outlined in Critical Element 3.2.

[Definitions of terms and descriptions of programming “business rules” are presented in the FAQ section of the state reports at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. School, district, and state adequate yearly progress (AYP) data are presented for Reading and Math at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. The “Percent Tested” is presented on all “AYP Reports” at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/reportcards.asp>. The state annual measurable objectives are presented in a footnote on all school, district, and state AYP Reports. For the 2007-2008 reports the footnote states “AYP reading target = 60.53%, AYP math target = 55.21%.”]

PRINCIPLE 7: ADDITIONAL INDICATORS

7.1 The accountability system includes graduation rate for high schools.

Graduation rate is the additional academic indicator for determining AYP at the high school level. DC currently employs the Common Core of Data: Graduate Leaver Indicator. This formulation defines graduation rate as the total number of graduates in a given year with a regular diploma divided by the sum of the number of graduates (for that year) and dropouts for the current year and the three preceding years. The definition of diploma excludes GED, certificates of completion, certificates of attendance, or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards.

For schools below the baseline state average, AYP can only be achieved if the school graduation rate increases each year by one percentage point until they reach the baseline state average. Dropouts are defined based on the criterion established by the National Center for Educational Statistics and as reported in the Common Core of Data.

As a result of a change in USDE regulations, the District of Columbia has begun to collect data needed to calculate the graduate rate using the new required student cohort method. Complete four-year data using the new method will be publicly reported for the first time for the class of 2010-2011.

DC has conducted an analysis, including an examination of other state practices and local impact data, to establish, as outlined in Section B of the new guidance [34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(3)], “(a) a single graduation rate goal that represents the rate the State expects all high schools in the State to meet, and (b) annual graduation rate targets that reflect continuous and substantial improvement from the prior year toward meeting or exceeding the State's graduation rate goal.”

[AYP determinations for the graduation rate are presented on all NCLB high school Report Cards presented at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp> (following the school links on the left side of the page). District and State summary graduation rate data are presented at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/schools.asp>.]

5/18/2009

7.2 The accountability system includes an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

Attendance is the additional academic indicator for all elementary and middle schools (e.g., schools without grade 12). Attendance is calculated by dividing the total daily attendance over the complete academic year by the total daily enrollment taken over the same period. Schools will be required to record and report both daily attendance and enrollment.

For the purposes of determining accountability, “attendance” excludes those students whose absence is due to valid excused absence as defined in Title 5 DCMR Chapter 2101.2. This means that the student’s absence during this time will not count against a school’s total daily enrollment.

The state’s implementation of its longitudinal data warehouse will facilitate a more accurate integration of education data, including attendance. The data warehouse will significantly improve the attendance and enrollment tracking process. For SY 2009-2010, the SLED will provide a unique student identifier (USI) for all public school students in DC. In addition, it will provide the ability to track daily attendance for all students by linking attendance records from each school’s student information system to the USI. This data will come through either a nightly extract using schools interoperability framework technology or via a manual file upload that will take place on a weekly basis.

To make the attendance AYP indicator, a school must meet the following:

- A school will have 90% daily attendance.
- A school with less than 90% attendance must show annual improvement of at least 1 percentage point.

[AYP determinations for the attendance rate are presented on all NCLB elementary, junior high school, and middle school Report Cards presented at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp> (following the school links on the left side of the page). District and State summary attendance rate data are presented at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/schools.asp>.]

7.3 The additional indicators are valid and reliable.

The Office of the State Superintendent of Education, District of Columbia Public Charter School Board, and the District of Columbia Public Schools collaborate to implement systems that permit the state to monitor and report state level data. The District of Columbia Public Schools uses an automated student information system that requires schools to take attendance daily.

Public charter schools must report attendance weekly with the majority now able to report on a daily basis. Appropriate data collection strategies and quality control measures are being applied to the attendance, enrollment, and graduation rate data to ensure graduation rate and attendance data are valid and reliable. All DCPS schools undergo an internal enrollment audit. Moreover, all schools within the District of Columbia, including charter schools, fully participate in an external census audit of enrollment, special education and bilingual service participation, and attendance conducted by the OSSE with the assistance of an outside auditor.

The SLED system will be used at the state level to monitor attendance. All daily attendance data will be populated into the SLED directly from the source systems at the LEAs. This will allow for report generation and comparisons between LEAs and schools. The state produces annual technical reports assessing the reliability and validity of state assessments that are reviewed by the state's Technical Advisory Committee. Technical reports examining the general and alternate reading and mathematics assessments support the alignment, reliability and validity of the test design. Similarly, the studies of science demonstrate the general and alternate assessments are valid, reliable and aligned to the state science content standards.

PRINCIPLE 8: SEPARATE DECISIONS FOR READING/LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

8.1 The accountability system holds schools and districts separately accountable for reading/language arts and mathematics.

The State AYP determination for all students separately measure reading and mathematics in the aggregate and for each identified subgroup.

For accountability purposes, all schools are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have separate accountability targets (see Appendix B). All grade level performance percentages within a category (e.g., elementary) are compared to the same annual measurable objective (see Critical Element 3.2.a). For a school, the AYP status is determined by the subject area with the “lowest level.” For example, if a school achieves AYP in math but fails to achieve AYP in reading for two consecutive years, the school is classified as “in need of improvement, year 1.”

For LEAs and the SEA, the AYP (and school improvement) status is also determined by the “lowest level.” For example, if an LEA achieves AYP at the elementary level but fails to achieve AYP for two consecutive years at the secondary level, the LEA is classified as “in need of improvement, year 1.”

[Definitions of terms and descriptions of programming “business rules” are presented in the FAQ section of the state reports at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. School, district, and state adequate yearly progress data are presented for Reading and Math at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>.]

5/18/2009

PRINCIPLE 9: SYSTEM VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

9.1 The accountability system produces reliable decisions.

The state periodically commissions studies of the reliability of AYP determinations. Reliability is calculated by comparing AYP determinations across years by schools and subgroups. These studies focus on the reliability of the classifications (e.g., the probability of Type I and II classification errors). The state has completed annual technical reports for the 2006 and 2007 general assessment and alternate assessments.

The initial technical report for the state science assessments was completed in January 2009. The state has also completed alignment studies, strand validity studies, and convergent/divergent validity studies. For science, these studies were submitted to USDE with the 2009 Peer Review documentation.

9.2 The accountability system produces valid decisions.

The state periodically commissions external analyses to examine the reliability of AYP determinations (see Critical Element 9.1). Moreover, the state has worked closely with LEAs to develop parallel analytic systems so that LEAs are able to validate all state determinations. Towards this end, the State has established an appeal process for all LEAs to appeal an accountability decision and schools are provided 30 days to appeal AYP decisions.

The state is currently implementing the second phase of a new state longitudinal data system (SLED) with the goal of further improving the reliability of AYP determinations. By August 2009, all required NCLB reports will be produced by the SLED. The SLED system began collecting student-level demographic data from all LEAs on February 28, 2009, allowing for reports to be disaggregated by various subgroups once assessment data is included. For SY 2009-2010, the SLED will provide a unique student identifier (USI) for all public school students in DC. In addition, it will provide the ability to track daily attendance for all students by linking attendance records from each school's student information system to the USI. This data will come through either a nightly extract using a school's interoperability framework technology or via a manual file upload that will take place on a weekly basis.

5/18/2009

9.3 The State has a plan for addressing changes in assessment and student population.

Currently, the state does not plan to change either the reading or mathematics assessments. As noted in Critical Elements 9.1 and 9.2, the state will continue to periodically examine the decision accuracy of the accountability system including an examination of the reliability of AYP determinations.

PRINCIPLE 10: PARTICIPATION RATE

10.1 The accountability system has the means for calculating the rate of participation in the statewide assessment.

The State Accountability System holds LEAs accountable for reaching the 95% participation rate for assessment. The accountability for participation will be separate from that for proficiency and the other academic indicators.

When a group does not have 95% tested for the AYP Report for the current year their percent tested are averaged across the current and previous 2 years. If the average is at least 95%, the group is credited with meeting the percent tested target.

The State defines the Full Academic Year as described in Element 2.2, and then calculates the 95% rate of participation in both the aggregate and by subgroup. The participation rate corresponds to the population reported on the mandated state, LEA, and school report cards – i.e., the student population on first day of testing. Participants or test takers are students that complete the reading and mathematics subtests. The participation rates are determined for the total school and all subgroups by dividing the number of test-takers by the full academic year enrollment for each group. The rules for including LEP/NEP students who have moved to the United States in the past 12 months are applied so that they are counted as participants if they have completed the state’s language proficiency test, ACCESS for ELL (see Critical Element 5.4).

[Definitions of terms and descriptions of programming “business rules” are presented in the FAQ section of the state reports at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. School, district, and state adequate yearly progress (AYP) data are presented for Reading and Math at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. The “Percent Tested” is presented on all “AYP Reports” at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/reportcards.asp>.]

5/18/2009

10.2 The accountability system has a means of applying the 95 percent assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.

The State Accountability System ensures that the 95% participation requirement is applied when the group size is statistically significant according to State definitions and regulations. The minimum group size for participation is 40.

[Definitions of terms and descriptions of programming “business rules” are presented in the FAQ section of the state reports at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. School, district, and state adequate yearly progress (AYP) data are presented for Reading and Math at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/index.asp>. The “Percent Tested” is presented on all “AYP Reports” at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/reportcards.asp>.]

APPENDIX A
CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION IN DCCAS ALT

The full criteria for participation can be found at: <http://www.ihdi.uky.edu/ilssa/dc-cas-alt/administrationGuide/20082009TeacherManual/chapter3.pdf>

Participation Guidelines

Instructions: 1) Answer all of the following statements and 2) select the Performance Dimension based on the descriptors provided.

Part 1:

- Does the student need extensive prioritization within grade-level content due to significant cognitive disabilities?
 - i.e., due to the student's memory or ability to transfer learning, is there a need to limit and/or give precedence to what the student will learn within grade level content?
- Does the student need systematic instruction to learn essential and prioritized skills?
 - i.e., is the student's access to grade-level content achieved by significantly changing the complexity or cognitive demand of the material? (i.e. instruction focuses on the critical essence of content)
- Does the student need systematic instruction in order to generalize performance?
 - i.e., does the student require direct instruction to acquire, maintain, and generalize skills?
- Does the student require extensive supports to **access text**? (e.g., simplified symbol system, assistive technology, highly prioritized learning objectives, modeling, etc.)
 - i.e., does the student **access text** primarily through key words, memorized sight words, pictures, tactile objects, and/or auditory cues?

Please Note: If the IEP Team answers all of the above questions with yes, then the student is eligible for the CAS Alternate Assessment.

Part 2:

The IEP team must select one of the following:

Performance Dimension A: Attainment should be chosen if the student's communication is best described by the following indicators:

- Student uses verbal or written words, signs, Braille, or language-based augmentative systems to request, initiate, and respond to questions, describe things or events, and express refusal.

OR

- Student uses intentional communication, but not at a symbolic language level: Student uses understandable communication through such modes as gestures, pictures, objects/textures, points, etc., to clearly express a variety of intentions.

Performance Dimension B: Progress should be chosen if the student's communication is best described by the following indicators:

5/18/2009

- Student communicates primarily through cries, facial expressions, change in muscle tone but no clear use of objects/textures, regularized gestures, pictures, signs, etc., to communicate.
- Student alerts to sensory input from another person (auditory, visual, touch, movement) BUT requires actual physical assistance to follow simple directions. Or the student's response to sensory stimuli (e.g., sound/voice; sight/gesture; touch; movement; smell) is unclear.

Part 3:

Learner Characteristic Inventory Summary

Once a student has been identified as being eligible for the Revised CAS-Alt, please complete the Learner Characteristic Inventory. A summary of the Learner Characteristic Inventory will be included in the student's portfolio. For more information see the Fall training materials or visit <http://www.ihdi.uky.edu/ilssa/dc-cas-alt/>.

NCLB TARGETS: 2002-2014

Secondary Reading (Grades 7-11) – Annual Targets and (Six) Intermediate Goals for SY2002-2014 (Percentage Scoring at the Proficient or Above Level)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | 85.90 | 85.90 | |
| | | | | | | | | | 71.79 | 71.79 | | | |
| | | | | | | 57.69 | 57.69 | | | | | | |
| | | | | 43.58 | 43.58 | | | | | | | | |
| | | 29.48 | 29.48 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15.38 | 15.38 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | |
| 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | |

Secondary Mathematics (Grades 7-11) – Annual Targets and (Six) Intermediate Goals for SY2002-2014 (Percentage Scoring at the Proficient or Above Level)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100 |
| | | | | | | | | | | 85.14 | 85.14 | | |
| | | | | | | | | 70.27 | 70.27 | | | | |
| | | | | | | 55.41 | 55.41 | | | | | | |
| | | | | 40.54 | 40.54 | | | | | | | | |
| | | 25.68 | 25.68 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.81 | 10.81 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | |
| 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | |

APPENDIX C

Definition of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Population

Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Student - a student who understands or speaks a language other than English which was learned from his/her family background or a student with a family background where a language other than English is spoken in the home. Students who were born in other countries where English Creole, Patois, or Pidgin may be spoken are also assessed in the District of Columbia for English language proficiency (Chapter 31, Board of Education *Rules*) and are considered linguistically and culturally diverse.

English Language Learner (ELL)⁴ Student - a linguistically and culturally diverse student with an English language proficiency level that does not allow the student to participate in the general program of the school without alternative language services (Chapter 31, Board of Education *Rules*).

Exiting the Bilingual/ESL Program - Exiting from bilingual/ESL program services occurs when a student attains fluency in English language proficiency as measured by the *ACCESS for ELLs*TM.

Local schools will ensure that parents are notified of the school's intent to exit students from bilingual/ESL services. Parents may respond in writing regarding their agreement or disapproval of their children's exit from the program. If parents disapprove of exit, students may remain in a program when space permits.

The *Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Student Enrollment Report* will indicate the date students attained English Proficiency Level 5.0 or above. At the beginning of the school year immediately following that date, students will enter the general education program and will receive monitoring services for two years.

⁴ ELL students are referred to as LEP students in the federal definition