

Commonwealth of Massachusetts Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

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

DUE: JANUARY 31, 2003

REVISED SUBMISSION: AUGUST 12, 2004

AMENDED ELEMENTS: 1.1; 1.2; 2.1; 3.1; 3.2b; 5.3; 5.5; 7.1; 9.1; 10.1

REVISED SUBMISSION: JUNE 29, 2005

AMENDED ELEMENT: 5.3

REVISED SUBMISSION: JUNE 9, 2006

AMENDED ELEMENTS: 3.1; 3.2; 3.2b; 3.2c; 4.1; 5.2; 5.3; 9.3

REVISED SUBMISSION: JULY 11, 2007

AMENDED ELEMENTS: 1.1; 3.2; 3.2b; 3.2c; 4.1; 5.3; 5.5; 6.1; 7.1; 9.1; 9.3

REVISED SUBMISSION: AUGUST 12, 2008

AMENDED ELEMENTS: 3.2b; 3.2c; 5.1; 5.3, 5.5; 7.1

REVISED SUBMISSION: June 8, 2009

AMENDED ELEMENTS: 3.2b; 3.2c; 5.3

REVISED SUBMISSION: April 8, 2010

AMENDED ELEMENTS: 3.2b; 3.2c; 5.3



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

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

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

Transmittal Instructions

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

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

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

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

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

STATUS Legend:

- F – Final state policy
- P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval
- W – Working to formulate policy

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

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

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

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

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

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

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

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

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

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

Principle 10: Participation Rate

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

STATUS Legend:

- F – Final policy
- P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval
- W– Working to formulate policy

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

Instructions

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

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

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

State law and regulations establish an accountability system that includes all public schools and districts in the state.

Beginning in Cycle III (school years 2002/03 and 2003/04), K-2 schools with no MCAS results will be rated based on the grade 3 MCAS results of the schools their “graduates” attend. Other schools that lack reliable, comparable MCAS data as a result of small sample size (fewer than 20 students per year assessed in ELA or mathematics), or special circumstances (e.g., alternative schools that provide short-term educational services or provide services for excluded students, returning dropouts, or other special populations) may have AYP determinations based on data from sending or receiving schools to which enrolled students are linked or composite data reflecting district-wide results. MADOE shall determine, on a case by case basis, which score attribution method will result in AYP determinations that most accurately and reliably reflect the schools’ performance, and shall use that method.

When schools split, merge, or otherwise undergo changes to student enrollment or grade configuration, the Massachusetts Department of Education will assign the Adequate Yearly Progress history and most advanced current accountability status of the pre-existing school(s) to the reconfigured school(s). (E.g., if a school identified for improvement and a school identified for corrective action merge, the Department will assign the newly-established school corrective action status. Similarly, if a school in restructuring status splits into two schools, both newly-established schools will remain in restructuring status.) Exceptions to this rule only occur when, as a result of major reconfiguration to the school’s student enrollment, grades served, faculty, and, in certain cases, programs offered, the Department can establish no meaningful way to attribute prior year accountability determinations to the new school.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

When schools undergo grade reconfiguration or are newly established, as in the case of a new charter school, to the extent feasible the Department will use existing data to establish baseline performance against which improvement/safe harbor can be measured. (*E.g.*, if a school serving students in grades 3-8 in 2006 serves students only in grades 3-5 in 2007, the Department will recreate the school's 2006 baseline performance data to reflect the new grade configuration and thus measure improvement/safe harbor by comparing 2007 grade 3-5 performance data against 2006 grade 3-5 performance data.)

Evidence: Statute and regulations; Cycle II State Summary Report; Cycle II notice to K-2 schools; Commissioner's memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?</p>	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

All schools and school districts are judged on the basis of the same criteria and receive annual AYP determinations based on those criteria. Student assessment results in ELA/Reading and mathematics on standard MCAS tests and MCAS-Alt Assessments are used to calculate a composite performance index for each school and district for students in the aggregate and for student subgroups. Beginning with Cycle III (years 2003 and 2004), attendance and graduation rate criteria have also been established and incorporated into the state's AYP definition. The definition and determination of AYP is fully integrated into our state accountability system.

Evidence: Statute and regulations; Cycle II explanatory materials (transmittal folder / power-point slides); Cycle III Mid-cycle explanatory materials.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

The Massachusetts School and District Accountability System holds schools and districts accountable for student performance on Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) results. MCAS is a custom designed assessment program based on MA student learning standards set out in State Curriculum Frameworks. MCAS assessments report student results in four performance categories: *Advanced*, *Proficient*, *Needs Improvement*, *Failing* (HS) / *Warning* (elementary and middle grades). Our performance levels are similar to those used in reporting NAEP results.

Evidence: MCAS explanatory materials posted on MADOE website.

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

MCAS tests are administered in the spring (April and May) to permit assessment of the full year of student attainment at the tested grade level. Tests include essay, open response and multiple-choice items. Open response items are scored over the summer, with teachers participating in the scoring process. The timeline for reporting MCAS results to schools, parents and the public has been accelerated over past two years by more than 60 days, from late November to mid-September. Beginning in 2004, the Massachusetts Department of Education will render preliminary AYP determinations and notify schools and districts of those determinations before the end of August of each year. We will require districts, upon receipt of this notice, to notify the parents of all students who are assigned to a school that has been preliminarily identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring of their school choice option. Parent notification will, under this plan, take place no later than the first week of each school year, in time for alternative school assignments to be arranged if requested.

Final school and district accountability reports and AYP determinations will be issued within 60 days after test results are returned. Once final accountability ratings and AYP determinations are issued we will revise the list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring to reflect any additions or deletions resulting from analysis of the final determinations. Districts, upon receipt of final accountability results, will notify parents of the final results and make mid-year choice available in any cases where the preliminary AYP finding did not identify a school that, based on final results, is identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring. In cases where a school was preliminarily identified but does not appear on the final list of schools identified for improvement, the school and its district will be so informed and the school will be relieved of prospective requirements. Any school choice commitments (i.e., transportation costs) that were made based on the preliminary identification will be honored for the balance of the school year.

Evidence: MCAS release schedule 2002; SDAS Press release 2002 announcing accountability system results.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

On an annual basis we publish a state profile, a state report card featuring detailed assessment data that meets all NCLB requirements, and a state AYP report. These documents are available on our website at <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state.htm>.

We also publish, on an annual basis, school and district MCAS reports as well as individual student MCAS reports. Extensive information, including aggregate and disaggregated student assessment results and school and district performance ratings for every MA school and district is reported on DOE website as part of our state, district and school profiles. The SEA provides downloadable, print-ready LEA school report card data to LEAs on an annual basis for publication in locally produced district and school report cards.

Beginning in 2003, student subgroup information, as well as aggregate information, is included in all school and district report cards, as well as in the MA state report card. Teacher data has been compiled locally for inclusion in 2003 and 2004 district and school report cards. MADOE is planning the development of a new teacher data warehouse. By 2006 we plan to have the data collection and storage systems in place to permit reliable State reporting of all teacher data we are required by federal law to include in annual state, district and school report cards.

Evidence: Sample MCAS reports; Sample Web-version school and district profiles; mock-up of new report card format

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs? ²	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

State law provides for sanctions when schools or districts are determined to be under-performing. Sanctions range from required improvement planning with State oversight, to removal of school principal and reassignment of staff for schools and district receivership when under- performance is chronic. Recognition and rewards are also part of the MA school and district accountability system. Schools with exemplary improvement may be named Compass Schools. Compass schools receive \$10,000 to assist with ongoing improvement initiatives and cover costs related to participation in effective practice dissemination activities. Privately funded cash awards are also given each year to principals of the most improved schools.

Evidence: G.L. c. 69, sec. 1J an 1K; 603 CMR 2.00 Regulations on Underperforming Schools and Districts; 2002 Pathways To Improved Student Performance report (listing 2001 and 2002 Compass Schools)

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

All students enrolled in public schools and those being educated in private schools at public expense are required to participate in the MCAS. Most students participate by taking the standard form of MCAS tests. Make up sessions are given for students absent from school on scheduled testing dates. A variety of accommodations are available to permit most students with disabilities to participate in the standard form of the test. Students with severe and complex disabilities for whom participation in the standard form of the MCAS tests is not feasible or educationally appropriate participate in the MCAS Alternate Assessment program.

Effective for 2004, we have adopted the new rule recently announced by USDOE for limited English proficient students who are enrolled in their first year in U.S. schools (“first-year LEP students”). First year LEP students are required to participate in state-mandated language proficiency assessments (MELA-O, LAS-R and LAS-W) and in MCAS mathematics tests. First year LEP students have the option but are not required to participate in standard ELA MCAS tests. MCAS mathematics and ELA test results (if any) for first-year LEP students will not be included when calculating a school, district, or state composite performance index for students in the aggregate or any student subgroup for Cycle III and subsequent review periods.

In school year 2004/2005, we will begin administering the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA), an alternative form of the MCAS ELA test specially designed to assess the level of ELA skills and knowledge of students with limited English proficiency. The MEPA test will assess performance on the same standards that are assessed through standard-form MCAS ELA tests. The MEPA, however, is designed to allow for more discriminating assessment of the development of English language skills with reference to the stages of knowledge and skill acquisition set forth in the Massachusetts *English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes for English Language Learners*. Baseline MEPA performance data for individual students will be collected during a special MEPA administration in the fall of 2004.

Evidence: MCAS and SDAS explanatory materials; Memo from Commissioner re: LEP testing and RFR for new ELP test design and administration

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p>	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

In October 2001, the MADOE began collecting individual student data from local districts through our electronic Student Information Management System (“SIMS”). Districts are required to report student enrollment as of October 1 of each year. For purposes of the school and district accountability system, a student is considered to be enrolled in a school for a full year if he or she is enrolled as of October 1 of any school year and remains enrolled at that school up to and including the dates of MCAS test administration in the spring of that school year.

Evidence: MCAS and SDAS explanatory materials

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

From 1998 – 2002, test results for all students who took the MCAS tests at a particular school were included in determining the accountability system ratings and AYP determinations for that school.

Effective for Cycle III (2003 and 2004 MCAS administrations), schools will only be accountable for the spring MCAS test results of students who, according to SIMS records, were enrolled in their school on October 1 of that school year. District accountability results will reflect performance of ALL students who took the MCAS tests while enrolled in the district’s schools, regardless of enrollment date in the district. Effective in 2004, MCAS ELA/reading and mathematics assessment results for limited English proficient student who are enrolled for the first year in U.S. schools will not be included in calculating the composite performance index values on which AYP determinations are based.

Evidence: Law and regulations; Memo from Director of Data Collection, Analysis and Reporting

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State’s proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

MA has established as a state goal having all students, in all schools, attain proficiency in ELA/reading and mathematics on or before the year 2014. Our accountability system is calibrated to measure annual performance toward the achievement of this objective.

All MA public schools and school districts receive AYP determinations annually. The annual performance of each school and district for students in the aggregate and student subgroups that meet minimum size requirements is measured against MA performance targets derived from Massachusetts’ NCLB “starting points” (additional detail in Elements 3.2(a) and 3.2(c) of this document). The sequence of biennial performance targets for the years 2002 - 2014 together are referred to as our “State Line.” The state line expresses the state’s performance expectations for each year, against which AYP determinations are made. Performance targets are raised in equal increments in each two-year cycle until the 2013-14 school year, by which time all students are expected to demonstrate proficiency in ELA/reading and mathematics. The performance of each school, district and the state is assessed by calculating a composite performance index (CPI). The CPI is a measure of the extent to which students have achieved or are progressing toward proficiency. Separate determinations are made for English language arts/reading and for mathematics. Assessment results for students in all grades within a school are combined to calculate the school’s CPI for a given subject, group and time period. Since 2006, we issue district-level CPI calculations separately for the elementary, middle, and high school grade-spans (comprising grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12).

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

Our AYP determination methodology was revised in 2002 to incorporate the new NCLB target timeline. Beginning with Cycle III (2003-2004) AYP is determined for students in the aggregate and for each student subgroup that meet minimum sample size requirements. AYP determinations are made separately for English language arts/reading and for mathematics, for students in the aggregate and for student subgroups that meet the minimum size requirements.

We first take into consideration the student group's rate of participation in MCAS for the year under review. Failure to meet the 95% participation requirement results in a negative AYP determination.

If the 95% participation requirement is met, we next determine whether MCAS performance in English language arts/reading and in mathematics is at or above the state's performance targets (intermediate goal) for those subjects for the year under review.

When a group meets the 95% participation requirement and performs at or above the state target we next review the group's performance on the applicable additional indicator. For all student groups within all schools and districts, performance and/or improvement on the applicable "additional indicator" (attendance for K-8 schools; graduation rate for high schools) is measured against the intermediate State targets that have been established for those indicators. A finding as to whether the applicable target was met by each student group is reported on school and district AYP reports.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

A student group that met or exceeded 95% participation and performed at or above the state targets for a given year receives an affirmative AYP determination in that subject for that group as long as the group has met its target on the applicable additional indicator (K-8: attendance; 9-12: graduation rate). In 2004 and future years MADOE will render a negative AYP determination when a student group fails to meet the applicable additional indicator target notwithstanding the fact that it meets or exceeds the applicable participation and performance targets. [Note: MADOE did not elect to make the required additional indicator an independent AYP variable for groups that meet participation and performance targets, but has been directed by USDOE to adopt this rule to comply with USDOE regulations.]

When students in the aggregate or any student subgroup meet the assessment participation requirement in ELA or mathematics, but perform below the state target for that subject for the review period in question, we determine whether the NCLB safe-harbor provision applies. We measure the extent to which the school or district's performance in that subject for that student group improved relative to its "baseline" performance in the previous year. We determine whether the group, although performing below the applicable state target, has either a) decreased the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; or b) has demonstrated a rate of improvement that is closing its performance gap at a rate that places it "on track" to achieving the goal of 100% of students in that group attaining proficiency by the year 2014 (our USDOE-approved method for implementing the NCLB "safe-harbor" rule.)

A student group that has performed below the state target but demonstrated sufficient improvement to qualify for "safe-harbor" must also meet the state's performance or improvement target on the applicable additional indicator in order to receive an affirmative AYP determination.

Beginning with 2006-07 AYP reporting, we base annual school and district performance calculations on a single year of assessment data and improvement/safe harbor calculations on one year of data as compared to the previous year.

Since 2006, we issue district-level AYP determinations separately for English language arts/ reading and mathematics for the elementary, middle, and high school grade-spans (comprising grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12). For a district to enter Improvement Status, the district must fail to make AYP in the same subject area (English language arts/reading or mathematics) in all three grade-spans for students in the aggregate or any subgroup for two consecutive years.

School-level AYP determinations for English language arts/reading and math will continue to be based on all grades assessed in the school.

Evidence: Cycle III informational handout and workshop presentation materials (PowerPoint slides); Commissioner's memo and minutes of June 2005 Board meeting; Commissioner's memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

We calculated our starting points for ELA and math using NCLB prescribed methodology (rank ordered lists for ELA and mathematics with determination of performance level of school representing 20th percentile of state enrollment. 20th percentile schools were higher performing in both ELA and mathematics than our lowest performing subgroup).

Our State starting point for ELA was 39.7% proficient and advanced, which equates to a composite performance index of 70.7. For mathematics our starting point was 19.5% proficient and advanced, which equates to a composite performance index of 53. We used our State's NCLB "starting points" as our Cycle II targets for determining AYP for the years 2001 and 2002.

NOTE: For Cycle III, we revised our terminology to express our performance targets as "Composite Performance Index" or "CPI", rather than "proficiency index" targets. This change in terminology was

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

made to reflect our inclusion, beginning with Cycle III, of MCAS Alternate Assessment results in the indexing system on which our accountability determinations are based.

Evidence: State Starting Point Determination slides; Cycle II explanatory materials. Cycle III informational handouts and Power Point slides.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

We have established State targets for ELA and math performance for each two-year period from 2002 – 2014. Our annual measurable objectives are for schools and districts to meet these targets. The targets progress in equal increments from our state starting points for ELA (CPI of 70.7) and Mathematics (CPI of 53.0) to our goals, by 2014, of having all students performing at proficient and advanced levels in these subjects (CPI of 100 in both subjects). We have published and widely distributed our “State line,” which show the progression of specific performance targets for ELA/reading and mathematics that are in effect for each year from 2002 – 2014.

To make AYP districts, schools, and subgroups must demonstrate student performance above the State target for that time period. If performance is below the state line a negative AYP determination is issued unless that school or district qualifies for “safe harbor” based on its rate of improvement (i.e., improvement at a rate that, projected forward, puts the school “on target” for getting all student to proficiency or above by 2014.)

The minimum amount of improvement that a school and district is required to demonstrate to satisfy the safe harbor criteria can be calculated by dividing its performance gap for a particular subject and group (current CPI compared to CPI of 100), by the number of years remaining until 2014 when it is expected to have met the 100% proficiency goal.

Specific annual performance objectives for our additional indicators (attendance and graduation rate) were first set by the MA Board of Education in the spring of 2002 after consultation and review by practitioners and the public. The attendance target for elementary and middle schools is performance at

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

or above 92% or improvement of 1 percentage point or greater compared to the prior year. The grade 12 competency determination rate (an interim graduation rate measure adopted by the MA Board of Education in 2002) target for high schools was 70%.

In 2007, for the first time, we had the data required to calculate a 4-year cohort graduation rate. After reviewing data for the 2006 graduation cohort, the Board adopted a 55 percent minimum graduation rate for use in rendering 2007 AYP determinations. In 2008, the Board raised the minimum graduation rate standard for 2008 AYP purposes to 60 percent. With data available for two graduation cohorts, the Board also adopted as an “improvement” measure a 2 percentage point increase in the 4-year cohort graduation rate. In 2009 the Board raised the four-year graduation rate standard for 2009 AYP purposes to 65 percent, implemented a five-year graduation rate standard for 2009 AYP purposes of 70 percent, and maintained the 2 percentage point increase in the four-year graduation as a measure of improvement.

In accordance with the federal requirement that states set a single graduation rate goal and annual targets [73 FR 64436 (Oct. 29, 2008), in December 2009 the Board adopted a single, statewide graduation rate goal of 95 percent (four-year rate) by the 2018-19 school year, and annual targets toward that goal beginning with the 2009-10 school year. For 2010 AYP determinations, a school not meeting the 95 percent goal may make AYP by meeting a four-year graduation rate of 70 percent applied to the 2009 graduation cohort, a two percentage point increase in the four-year graduation rate from the 2008 cohort to 2009 cohort, or a five-year graduation rate of 75 percent applied to the 2008 graduation cohort. The four-year graduation rate target increases to 75 percent for 2011 and 2012 AYP determinations, 80 percent for 2013 and 2014 AYP determinations, and so on up to 95 percent for 2019 AYP determinations, as shown in the table below. The five-year graduation rate target increases to 80 percent for 2011 and 2012 AYP determinations, 85 percent for 2013 and 2014 AYP determinations, and so on up to 100 percent for 2019 AYP determinations, as shown in the table below.

Massachusetts Graduation Rate Goals and Targets, 2010-2019

<u>AYP Determinations</u>	<u>Four-Year Rate</u>	<u>Five-Year Rate</u>
2009-10	70	75
2010-11	75	80
2011-12	75	80
2012-13	80	85
2013-14	80	85
2014-15	85	90
2015-16	85	90
2016-17	90	95
2017-18	90	95
2018-19	95	100

The Board voted to apply the two percentage point improvement component to 2009-10 and 2010-11 AYP determinations, and will reconsider the improvement component prior to 2011-12 AYP determinations, based on the trajectory of graduation rate improvement.

Evidence: State Starting Point Determination slides; Commissioner’s memo to Board of Ed 12/10/02. Memo from Commissioner Driscoll to MA Board of Education June 18, 2003 and minutes of June Board meeting documenting approval of proposed indicators and targets; Commissioner’s memo and minutes of June 2005 Board meeting; Commissioner’s memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting; Commissioner’s memo and minutes of January 2008 Board meeting; Commissioner’s memo and minutes of March 2009 Board meeting; December 4, 2009 Commissioner’s memo and minutes of December 2009 Board meeting; January 2009 graduation rate peer review evidence submitted to U.S. Department of Education.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. •Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

We have established intermediate State targets for MCAS ELA and math performance that apply to all schools and districts. We have set targets, expressed as composite performance index (“CPI”) values, for each two-year period from 2002 – 2014. A composite performance index of 100 indicates that 100% of students are performing at proficient or advanced levels.

The MA “intermediate goals” for performance on MCAS assessments for 2004 - 2014 are:

	YEAR					
	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014
CPI						
ELA	75.6	80.5	85.4	90.2	95.1	100
Mathematics	60.8	68.7	76.5	84.3	92.2	100

When a school or district fails to perform at or above the state target for the review period, the adequacy of a school’s improvement during the review period (safe harbor calculation) is assessed by comparing the rate of actual performance gain to the rate of improvement needed to meet the 2014 all students proficient goal.

We have also established intermediate performance targets for our additional indicators.

The performance targets for attendance are average attendance of 92% or 1 percentage point increase in the attendance rate compared to the prior year. Prior to 2006-07, we established an interim graduation rate target of 70 percent of high school seniors receiving a competency determination. In 2007, with the data available to reliably calculate a four-year cohort graduation rate, but no data yet available with which to measure five-year high school completion rates or to measure improvement, the State set 55 percent as the initial minimum 4-year graduation rate for AYP determinations for the 2006-07 school year only. In 2008, with graduation rate data available for two graduation cohorts, the State set as the minimum graduation rate standard for 2008 AYP purposes only a 60 percent 4-year rate or 2 percentage point increase in the 4-year rate. In 2009, the State set as the minimum graduation rate standard for 2009 AYP purposes only a 65 percent four-year rate, applied to all student groups meeting minimum group size

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

requirements in schools serving grade 12 and district high school grade-spans. A student group not meeting the four-year standard could make AYP in 2009 by meeting a 70 percent standard applied to the group's five-year cohort graduation rate or by increasing by 2 percentage points the group's four-year graduation rate as compared to the four-year graduation rate for the previous year.

In accordance with the federal requirement that states set a single graduation rate goal and annual targets [73 FR 64436 (Oct. 29, 2008)], in December 2009 the Board adopted a single, statewide graduation rate goal of 95 percent (four-year rate) by the 2018-19 school year, and annual targets toward that goal beginning with the 2009-10 school year. For 2010 AYP determinations, a school not meeting the 95 percent goal may make AYP by meeting a four-year graduation rate of 70 percent applied to the 2009 graduation cohort, a two percentage point increase in the four-year graduation rate from the 2008 cohort to 2009 cohort, or a five-year graduation rate of 75 percent applied to the 2008 graduation cohort. The four-year graduation rate target increases to 75 percent for 2011 and 2012 AYP determinations, 80 percent for 2013 and 2014 AYP determinations, and so on up to 95 percent for 2019 AYP determinations, as shown in the table below. The five-year graduation rate target increases to 80 percent for 2011 and 2012 AYP determinations, 85 percent for 2013 and 2014 AYP determinations, and so on up to 100 percent for 2019 AYP determinations, as shown in the table contained in Element 3.2b.

The Board voted to apply the two percentage point improvement component to 2009-10 and 2010-11 AYP determinations, and will reconsider the improvement component prior to 2011-12 AYP determinations, based on the trajectory of graduation rate improvement.

Evidence: State Starting Point Determination slides; Commissioner's memo to Board of Ed 12/10/02; Commissioner's memo to Board and Board minutes, June 2003 and June 2005; Commissioner's memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting; Commissioner's memo and minutes of March 2009 Board meeting; December 4, 2009 Commissioner's memo and minutes of December 2009 Board meeting; January 2009 graduation rate peer review evidence submitted to U.S. Department of Education.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

In 2003, we began publishing AYP determinations for all schools and districts on an annual basis. Those results are included in annual state, district and school level report cards. On an annual basis schools and districts that have failed to make AYP for two or more consecutive years are notified of the sanctions/requirements to which they are subject as a result of their identification for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.

Beginning in 1999 Massachusetts instituted a two-year cycle approach to issuing school and district accountability determinations. We combined two years of student assessment results in even-numbered years to mitigate the potential for error arising out of small sample sizes, thereby increasing the reliability of school and district accountability determinations.

In 2006 we began testing English language arts/reading and mathematics at all grades between 3 and 8, and at grade 10. This change greatly increased the number of student assessment results included in annual accountability determinations, and thus reduced the potential for sampling error. With the significantly increased number of test-takers per school now participating in annual Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) tests, we are now able to calculate single year, annual performance and improvement/safe harbor calculations for the majority of schools and districts with a measure of reliability similar to that previously obtained by combining two years of data. Beginning with 2007 AYP reporting we will discontinue the practice of combining two years of data in even-numbered years. Discontinuing the use of two-year averaging will both simplify the process for calculating AYP and increase the transparency of AYP performance and improvement/safe harbor calculations. Instead, we will issue annual AYP performance calculations that are based on a single year of data and improvement/safe harbor calculations that are based on one year of data as compared to the previous year of data.

Since 2006, we issue district-level AYP determinations separately for English language arts/ reading and mathematics for the elementary, middle, and high school grade-spans (comprising grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12). School-level AYP determinations for English language arts/reading and math are based on the combined MCAS results for all students in assessed grades in the school.

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Evidence: Planned SDAS Changes for Cycle III, Associate Commissioner Dow; Memo to Superintendents re: mid-cycle Supplemental Services requirements; Cycle III Power-point presentation 9-29-03; Commissioner's memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting.

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

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

Since 2001 we have reported subgroup results on MCAS tests. Using our Student Information Management System, we are able to match student data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups. Beginning in 2003, we issue subgroup AYP determinations for special education students, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, and students in the following racial and ethnic minority groups whenever there is a subgroup that meets our minimum sample size requirements: African American/Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Native American, and White. Subgroup AYP determinations are reflected in school and district and state accountability system reports beginning in 2003.

In 2006 we changed our collection of student race and ethnicity data to meet revised federal reporting standards and began reporting MCAS results for two additional student groups: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and Multi-Race/Non-Hispanic. On AYP reports, we continue to report students who are identified as Native Hawaiian in the Asian or Pacific Islander subgroup. We assign students who are identified as non-Hispanic and having two or more races to the aggregate group for AYP purposes.

Evidence: Sample MCAS reports; Memo from General Counsel confirming Board vote 12/18/02; 2003 MCAS results posted on MADOE website at www.doe.mass.edu/mcas; Sample Cycle III AYP Determination reports; Sample 2007 AYP Determination reports

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.</p>	<p>State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

Using our new Student Information Management System, we are able to match student data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups. For each school and district and for the state as a whole, subgroup AYP determinations are issued using the same decision and reporting rules that apply to AYP determinations for students in the aggregate.

As described in Elements 3.1, 3.2, and 4.1, beginning in 2006 we will make district-level AYP determinations separately in English language arts/ reading and mathematics for the elementary, middle, and high school grade-spans (comprising grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12) for students in the aggregate and all subgroups. For a district to enter Improvement Status, the district must fail to make AYP in the same subject area (English language arts/reading or mathematics) in all three grade-spans for students in the aggregate or any subgroup for two consecutive years.

Evidence: Sample MCAS reports; Memo from General Counsel confirming Board vote 12/18/02

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

Most students with disabilities participate in MCAS testing, with accommodations if required. MCAS results for all disabled students who take standard MCAS tests are included in the calculation of a school or district composite performance index for students in the aggregate and each subgroup to which a student with disabilities belongs. Students with severe and complex disabilities, including students with significant intellectual/cognitive impairments for whom the standard MCAS test is not appropriate participate in the MCAS Alternate Assessment program (MCAS-Alt). Since 2003, we have included MCAS-Alt results in the accountability system as part of our composite performance index. With the expiration of the interim 2% flexibility rule that we implemented between 2005 and 2009, Massachusetts has modified the way it assigns composite performance index points to certain students with disabilities, as described in Section B below.

Implementing a 1.0 Percent Statewide Cap on Alternate Assessment Results that are Treated as if Proficient in AYP Determinations (2010):

In accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 200.13(c) and with the expiration of the transitional flexibility granted under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(g) regarding modified academic achievement standards, for 2009-10 AYP determinations and beyond Massachusetts will limit the number of alternate assessment results based on alternate achievement standards and included as if proficient in AYP determinations to a maximum of 1.0 percent of all assessment results statewide.

Section A (Background)

Massachusetts renders AYP determinations by calculating a Composite Performance Index (CPI) to assess the performance of schools, districts, and the state. The CPI is a 100-point index derived from Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) scaled score results that measure the extent to which students have achieved or are progressing toward proficiency. A CPI of 100 represents proficient or advanced performance. Separate determinations are made for English language arts/reading and for mathematics. Assessment results for students in all grades within a school are combined to calculate the school's CPI for a given subject, group and time period. We issue district-level CPI calculations separately for the elementary, middle, and high school grade-spans (comprising grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12).

Since the 2000-01 school year we have used the MCAS Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt), a portfolio review process, to assess the attainment of students who are not able to participate in the standard MCAS testing program. The MCAS-Alt is designed to assess both students who have significant cognitive impairments and are engaged with learning objectives distinct from those of age/grade level peers, as well as the academic performance and progress of students whose disabilities do not impair cognitive functioning and are working toward attainment of grade-level proficiency.

MCAS-Alt results for students with significant cognitive disabilities are reported according to four performance levels: *Progressing, Emerging, Awareness, or Incomplete*. Results for students approaching or attaining grade-level proficiency are reported using the same performance level categories as the standard MCAS: *Needs Improvement, Proficient, and Advanced*.

Since 2002-03 we have awarded CPI points to students assessed on MCAS and MCAS-Alt based on their performance levels, as in the table below.

<u>MCAS Performance Level</u>	<u>MCAS-Alt Performance Level</u>	<u>CPI Points Awarded</u>
Proficient and Advanced	Progressing	100
Needs Improvement - High	Emerging	75
Needs Improvement - Low	Awareness	50
Warning / Failing - High	Portfolio Incomplete	25
Warning / Failing - Low	Portfolio Not Submitted	0

Massachusetts began collecting individual student data from local districts through our electronic Student Information Management System (SIMS) in October 2001. We collect these data three times a year, in October, March, and June. As part of the SIMS data collection a district must provide information on each student with a disability, including the nature of the student's primary disability and his or her level of need for special education services.

Section B (Details)

Beginning with AYP determinations based on assessments from the 2009-10 school year, we will change the way we assign CPI points to students with disabilities who were assessed in relation to alternate

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

assessment standards using the MCAS-Alt, and limit the number of students assessed in relation to alternate standards who are treated as if proficient for AYP determinations to 1.0 percent of the total number of students assessed statewide. Specifically, we will:

1. Assign 100 CPI points only to students scoring *Progressing* on the MCAS-Alt who have been identified through SIMS as having the following disability types: *Intellectual, Sensory/Deaf and Blind, Multiple Disabilities, Autism, and Developmental Delay*. If the number of students with those primary disability types scoring *Progressing* on the MCAS-Alt exceeds 1.0 percent of all students assessed statewide, we will prioritize amongst those students based on their reported level of need for special education services. In such a case, we will assign 100 CPI points first to students whose level of need was reported as being *High*, then to students reported as having a *Moderate* level of need. If necessary, we will further prioritize amongst these students based on disability type and/or composite level of complexity score on the MCAS-Alt.
2. Assign 75 CPI points to any student scoring *Progressing* on the MCAS-Alt who was reported as having the following primary disability types: *Sensory/Hard of Hearing or Deaf, Communication, Sensory/Vision Impairment or Blind, Emotional, Physical, Health, Specific Learning Disabilities, Neurological*. As necessary, we will assign 75 CPI points to any student scoring *Progressing* on the MCAS-Alt who was reported as having any of the primary disability types listed in #1 above and as having a *Low* level of need for special education services.
3. For students not scoring in the *Progressing* range, assign CPI points to all other students with disabilities assessed using the MCAS-Alt in accordance with prior year procedures. Students scoring in the *Emerging* range will receive 75 CPI points, *Awareness* 50 CPI points, *Portfolio Incomplete* 25 CPI points, and *Portfolio Not Submitted* 0 CPI points.

If the statewide number of students assessed in relation to alternate standards on the MCAS-Alt exceeds 1.0 percent, but the number of students scoring *Progressing* on the MCAS-Alt and having a primary disability type of *Intellectual, Sensory/Deaf and Blind, Multiple Disabilities, Autism, or Developmental Delay* is less than 1.0 percent of all students assessed, we will assign 100 CPI points to students scoring *Progressing* who have other disability types (*Sensory/Hard of Hearing or Deaf, Communication, Sensory/Vision Impairment or Blind, Emotional, Physical, Health, Specific Learning Disabilities, and/or Neurological*) and a *High* or *Moderate* level of need for special education services.

Evidence: April 2010 letter from Commissioner Chester to U.S. Department of Education.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All LEP students participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

In 2003, all LEP students were required to participate in the MCAS assessment program, either by taking the standard form of the test or, in the case of LEP students with disabilities, the MCAS-Alt, with limited exceptions made for LEP students who entered US schools for the first time after October 1, 2002 and lack a sufficient command of English to engage with the MCAS test material.

For the 2004 MCAS administration, we have revised our test participation requirements in accordance with recently announced USDOE rule changes. For 2004 and subsequent years, LEP students in their first year in US schools are required to participate in our state language acquisition tests and in MCAS mathematics and science assessments, and are permitted but not required to participate in MCAS English language arts/reading tests. The performance of LEP students in their first year in US schools is not included in calculating a school or district's CPI for ELA/reading or mathematics. All first year LEP students are, however, considered as participants for the purpose of determining whether a group met its 95% participation target.

During 2002-03 and 2003-04 LEP students who are not in their first year in US schools are participating in MCAS by taking standard form MCAS tests in English. Beginning in 2004-2005, LEP students will instead take the new MEPA test, a version of the ELA test specifically designed to measure language and content acquisition by students with limited English composite performance. Results from this test will be included in school and district accountability determinations beginning in Cycle IV (2004-05 and 2005-06).

Evidence: MCAS explanatory materials; 11/19/02 Memo from Commissioner Driscoll to Board of Education re: plans for testing LEP students; 2003 MCAS participation guidelines posted on MADOE website; Cycle III informational materials.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
------------------	-----------------------------------	---

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

<p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p>	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
---	---	--

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

To achieve reliability, consistency and validity of accountability decisions, our minimum sample size rules for issuing performance ratings and AYP determinations for students in the aggregate and for student subgroups are as follows:

Since 2004, we issue aggregate school and district AYP determinations whenever the aggregate number of students included in the performance calculation (exclusive of any LEP students who were in their first year in US schools and, in the case of schools, any students enrolled after October 1st of that school year) is forty (40) or greater in each year for which performance data is being analyzed.

When the aggregate number of students assessed per year is fewer than 40 MADOE will determine, on a case-by-case basis, the most reliable, consistent and valid method to render an AYP determination for the school or district. Where no more statistically reliable method exists, MADOE may render a school or district aggregate AYP determination on a sample size of not fewer than twenty (20) students.

Beginning in 2007, we issue annual AYP performance calculations based on a single year of data and improvement/safe harbor calculations based on one year of data as compared to the previous year of data. School and district AYP determinations for student subgroups will be issued whenever (1) there are 40 or more subgroup members, AND (2) the number of subgroup members is at least five percent (5%) of students whose assessment results are included in the school's or district's aggregate AYP calculation OR (3) the number of subgroup members is 200 or more.

When determining the extent of improvement demonstrated (for purposes of applying the safe-harbor rule) we apply an error band of 2.5 points when school groups are composed of 100 or more students. This represents a typical 95% confidence interval for groups of that size. For groups with fewer than 100, but more than 20 students, we determine the actual 95% confidence interval for that group, up to a maximum of 4.5 CPI points.

For districts with fewer than 100 students in an identified group, the error band rules used for school calculations apply. When district sample size is 100 or more but fewer than 400, a 2.5 point error band is applied when determining the adequacy of improvement for purposes of applying the safe-harbor rule. When sample size is 400 to 799, a 2.0 point error band is used. An error band of 1.5 points are applied to district groups with 800 or more students; a 1.0 point error band is used for groups larger than 1,200.

Evidence: Cycle II and Cycle III explanatory materials. Commissioner's memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting.

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

To ensure confidentiality of individual student information we do not report results for groups less than 10.

Evidence: MCAS explanatory materials.

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments. ⁷ Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

For Cycles I and II, the MA school and district accountability system had student performance results on state MCAS tests as its only indicators. In conformance with NCLB, additional indicators have been added [graduation rate for High Schools and attendance at elementary and middle school levels].

Evidence: SDAS Framework and Cycle II explanatory materials; Cycle III informational handout and PowerPoint slides.

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

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

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

Beginning with 2006-07 AYP determinations for high schools, we apply a minimum four-year graduation rate standard that all reportable student groups must meet in order for the school to make AYP. The AYP graduation rate standard replaced the interim “Competency Determination” (CD) rate that Massachusetts used between 2003 and 2006 in making high school AYP determinations.

To ensure data quality and to include students who graduate late in the summer, we use graduation rate data for the previous year’s graduating class (e.g., 2006-07 AYP determinations for high schools incorporate graduation rates for the graduating class of 2006). The four-year cohort graduation rate replaced the Competency Determination rate, our previous U.S. Department of Education-approved

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

graduation rate proxy measure. We apply the graduation rate standard to each student group that meets minimum reporting size requirements. To make AYP in 2007 and beyond, a high school group is required to meet the 95 percent participation requirement, either the State's performance requirement or safe harbor, and the minimum graduation rate standard.

Massachusetts calculated the four-year graduation rate for the graduating class of 2006 as follows:

$$\frac{[\# \text{ of } 1^{\text{st}}\text{-time entering } 9^{\text{th}} \text{ graders in } 2002\text{-}03 - \text{transfers out/deaths} + \text{transfers in that graduated in 4 years or less}]}{[\# \text{ of } 1^{\text{st}}\text{-time entering } 9^{\text{th}} \text{ graders in } 2002\text{-}03 - \text{transfers out/deaths} + \text{transfers in}]}$$

The same formula is applied to each year's graduation cohort.

Evidence: Graduation rate project overview posted to MADOE Web site; November 2006 PowerPoint presentation on calculating graduation rates; Commissioner's memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

At its December 2002 meeting the MA Board of Education approved modification of the MA SDAS to include attendance as an additional indicator for elementary and middle schools. After public consultation and Board discussion the decision was made to adopt average attendance, and improvement in average attendance as the additional indicator for elementary and middle schools. The performance target for this indicator is 92%; improvement target for those below 92% is 1 percentage point per year. Medically fragile students and students undergoing extended medical treatment as a result of serious illness or injury may, at the request of the LEA with supporting documentation, be excluded from the calculation of a school or district's average attendance.

Evidence: Memo from General Counsel confirming Board vote. June 2003 Board memo and minutes

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.3 Are the State’s academic indicators valid and reliable?</p>	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

Beginning in 2001, we now collect student data on an individual basis through the MA Student Information Management System (SIMS). The reliability of data reporting has been greatly enhanced through implementation of this system.

Evidence: SIMS Data Standards Handbook (excerpt)

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

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

Yes. During Cycle I we reported results separately for ELA, math, and science, then combined data to create an “Overall” rating. For Cycle II, we dropped the overall ratings and only reported subject specific ratings and AYP determinations. In 2003 and going forward, we will issue separate ratings and AYP determinations for ELA and mathematics.

Evidence: Cycle II explanatory material

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g.; it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

In 2001 we introduced a proficiency index measurement, and further enhanced the definition of that measure in 2003. The use of our “composite performance index” or “CPI” has increased the reliability of decisions compared to our earlier use of simple scaled score criteria to render AYP decisions.

The CPI determinations, because they are based on increments that permit us to measure more discrete gradients of performance and track movement toward proficiency as well as attainment of proficiency, are also more stable than findings based simply on the percent proficient and advanced.

Through 2006 we used two years of combined performance data to increase reliability during end of cycle determinations. In 2006 we began testing English language arts/reading and mathematics at all grades between 3 and 8, and at grade 10. In 2007, we will begin using MCAS data from all tested grades to make AYP determinations. The greatly increased number of student assessment results now included in annual accountability determinations reduces the potential for sampling error. With the significantly increased number of test-takers per school participating in annual Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) tests, we are now able to calculate single year, annual performance and improvement/safe harbor calculations for the majority of schools and districts with a measure of reliability similar to that previously obtained by combining two years of data. Discontinuing the use of two-year averaging will both simplify the process for calculating AYP and increase the transparency of AYP performance and improvement/safe harbor calculations.

The Department has invested considerable resources to develop our state's student level data collection and management system (“SIMS”). This system has greatly enhanced our capacity to ensure that

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

demographic data used to define subgroups is consistently reported and accurate. The enrollment information used in the accountability system is now directly connected to the MA school finance system, a change that has sharpened LEA attention to accuracy and timeliness in the reporting of student data.

Evidence: Cycle II explanatory materials; SIMS information posted on DOE web-site; Commissioner's memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

Our assessment system results have been validated using comparisons with other standardized tests and review of alignment with State standards. These results are the primary indicators on which AYP determinations are made. We use minimum sample size rules to ensure the reliability of AYP findings. We look at both absolute performance and improvement to ensure that valid judgement are being rendered with respect to the adequacy of progress by a school toward achieving state and federal student performance goals.

Evidence: MCAS technical documents and Achieve report published on DOE MCAS website

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p>	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

The composite performance index system allows us to incorporate results from new test administrations without disruption of accountability decisions. Our composite performance index allows us to combine results from standard MCAS tests with results from the MCAS-Alt measuring the educational progress of students with significant cognitive/intellectual impairments.

In spring 2006 we implemented additional MCAS tests in English language arts and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and 10 to meet the assessment requirements of NCLB.

<i>Grade</i>	<i>English language arts</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>
3	Ongoing	New in 2006
4	Ongoing	Ongoing
5	New in 2006	New in 2006
6	New in 2006	Ongoing
7	Ongoing	New in 2006
8	New in 2006	Ongoing
10	Ongoing	Ongoing

Through 2006, Massachusetts averaged two years of performance data when making AYP determinations in End-of-Cycle (even-numbered) years. As such, 2006 AYP CPI calculations only included the results of those assessments that were also given during the 2004-05 school year.

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

In 2006 we began testing English language arts/reading and mathematics at all grades between 3 and 8, and at grade 10. This change greatly increased the number of student assessment results included in annual accountability determinations, and thus reduced the potential for sampling error. With the significantly increased number of test-takers per school now participating in annual Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) tests, we are now able to calculate single year, annual performance and improvement/safe harbor calculations for the majority of schools and districts with a measure of reliability similar to that previously obtained by combining two years of data. Beginning with 2007 AYP reporting we will discontinue the practice of combining two years of data in even-numbered years. Discontinuing the use of two-year averaging will both simplify the process for calculating AYP and increase the transparency of AYP performance and improvement/safe harbor calculations. Instead, we will issue annual AYP performance calculations that are based on a single year of data and improvement/safe harbor calculations that are based on one year of data as compared to the previous year of data. We will incorporate the results from all English language arts and mathematics assessments, in grades 3 through 8 and 10, beginning with 2007 AYP calculations.

Evidence: Cycle II explanatory materials; Cycle III explanatory materials; MCAS explanatory materials; Commissioner's memo and minutes of February 2007 Board meeting.

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

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

We have reliable enrollment data from our student information system (SIMS). We cross match this data with MCAS testing program data. We routinely calculate and report participation rates in MCAS testing program. We began reporting participation rates on Cycle II accountability system reports. We have adjusted our methods for calculating participation to conform to NCLB rules. Students who do not participate in MCAS tests because of absence, whether excused or unexcused, are not considered to have participated, with the exception, beginning in 2004, of LEP students in their first year in US schools.

Beginning in 2004, participation rates on the MCAS are being calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{\# of students assessed} + \text{\# LEP students enrolled in US schools for the first time}}{\text{\# of students enrolled throughout the test administration window}}$$

Students who submit alternate assessment portfolios are included in the numerator and denominator. Students absent, but not medically excused, are in the denominator but not the numerator.

In the event that a school or district, in a given year, fails to meet the 95% participation rate as a result of the unavailability of one or more students who were absent at the time of testing or unable to participate in the MCAS Alt Assessment by reason of a documented medical emergency occasioned by accident, illness or disability MADOE will review the matter on appeal and may recalculate the rate exclusive of those students medically unable to participate in the MCAS assessments.

Evidence: MCAS reports; 2003 Mid-cycle AYP reports; accountability system technical documentation.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

In Cycle II we began reporting participation rates on school rating reports. For Cycle III the 95% participation rate rule was applied in making all AYP determinations for students in the aggregate and student subgroups.

Evidence: 2003 Mid-Cycle AYP Reports (posted on MADOE website).

Appendix A

Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

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