

MISSOURI

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)

Original Submission: January 31, 2003

Revised: July 27, 2009

Revised: April 9, 2010

Revised: May 4, 2010



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
D. Kent King, Missouri Commissioner of Education**

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

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

Transmittal Instructions

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

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

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

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

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

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

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

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

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

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

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

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

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

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

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

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

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

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

Principle 10: Participation Rate

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

STATUS Legend:

- F – Final policy
- P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval
- 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. State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes. The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2).</p>	<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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Every public school, including public school districts and charter LEAs, are included in Missouri’s accountability system. State schools administered by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) that serve severely disabled, blind and deaf students are required to assess all students on the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP). These schools are evaluated for AYP and school improvement purposes. Data for schools that do not meet the minimum cell size are aggregated over the most recent three years. Data for students in alternative schools and students in special school districts are aggregated to sending schools or schools of residence except for severely disabled students in self-contained buildings in Special School District in St Louis County. Those students are included in their school of attendance for AYP purposes. Charter schools are considered public schools or LEAs and are included in the accountability system for AYP purposes.

Public schools, such as K-2 buildings that do not have grades assessed on the MAP (feeder schools), are linked with and receive AYP determinations on the basis of test results of the schools their students attend in subsequent years. A school that has been assigned a new building code due to the creation of a new facility, change in grade configuration, etc. will be identified for improvement based upon the AYP status of the prior building or buildings serving the students, unless the school meets the “new school” criteria. If the building serves less than 50% of the students it previously served or would have served due to grade promotion, the building is considered new. For example, if a building changes configuration from a 6-7 building to a 6-6 building, and the 6th graders would have attended the building regardless of the grade configuration, the school is not considered new. If the 6-7 building reconfigures to a 6-6 building and the 6th grade students come from buildings not previously served by the 6-7 building, the building is considered new.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?</p>	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>All public schools and districts are evaluated on status or improvement (safe harbor) using the same criteria when making AYP determinations. Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) assessment results and attendance rates are evaluated at the elementary and middle school levels and MAP assessments and graduation rate are evaluated at the high school level. MAP assessments, attendance rate, and graduation rate are evaluated at the district level.</p> <p>The definition and determination of AYP are integrated into our State accountability system on an annual basis through the Annual Performance Report (APR).</p> <p>If Missouri’s growth model proposal is approved, all schools and districts will be evaluated based upon status, safe harbor, and growth.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Missouri's accountability system is based primarily on the results of the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP). MAP is a custom-developed assessment based on Missouri's Show-Me Standards and Grade-Level Expectations. Student performance on Communication Arts and Mathematics MAP assessments for all applicable grade levels is reported in four levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. Cut points were determined using a modified Bookmark Standard-Setting procedure developed by CTB/McGraw-Hill. As directed by Missouri's Senate Bill 1080, the performance standards of the MAP meet, but do not exceed, the performance standards of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) exam. Once cutpoints for each achievement level were identified, achievement level descriptors were developed to define what students are expected to know and be able to do at each achievement level. (Achievement level descriptors may be attached or electronically referenced -- http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/publications.html.)</p> <p>Beginning in the 2008-2009 school year, MAP assessments at the high school level (grade 11 for Communication Arts; grade 10 for Mathematics) will be replaced by end-of-course assessments. These assessments will be incorporated into the accountability system and achievement levels and descriptors that are consistent with MAP achievement levels will be developed.</p> <p>The MAP-Alternate (MAP-A) assessment reports assessment results in the same four achievement levels as the MAP (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced).</p>		

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?</p>	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	<p>Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The MAP is administered during the month of April each year so that students have the benefit of most of the school year before learning is assessed. Districts, buildings and the State receive results for all students and for the disaggregated subgroups required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) from Missouri’s assessment contractor by July 1 of each year. Data are posted via the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) website for districts and buildings to determine whether they made AYP as soon as they receive their data. Districts are instructed to notify parents of children who are in Title I schools that have not made AYP for two consecutive years of their school choice options and alternative school arrangements. DESE uses prior year assessment data and preliminary current year data to notify schools of their improvement status prior to the start of school. While complying with the requirements of their improvement status, districts and schools are instructed to analyze their data and AYP status to determine if statistical or other errors may substantiate an appeal. Preliminary notifications are made prior to the start of school. Schools and districts have 30 days from the preliminary notification to appeal their AYP determinations. Final AYP determinations are made after appeals are processed. Preliminary and final AYP notifications include letters that describe the NCLB requirements based upon the school’s improvement status.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The State of Missouri publishes a report card annually for the state, school districts, and buildings. The information required by NCLB is included in these report cards. DESE includes on its website downloadable, print-ready information that is currently required for districts and buildings. For detailed data used in the Missouri School Report Card, visit DESE’s website (www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/).</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?²</p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	<p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Sanctions: Missouri calculates Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for every public school district and building and includes results in the Annual Performance Report (APR), along with disaggregated detail. Title I districts and buildings, including charter schools and charter LEAs, are subject to the requirements of section 1116 of No Child Left Behind (NCLB).</p> <p>Non-Title I schools and districts must address the areas not making AYP in their Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and may not be eligible for a waiver of the on-site Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) review. The lowest performing schools and districts in the state undergo an intense MSIP review to evaluate compliance and quality of programs and services. Such districts are required to work with a Regional School Improvement Team (RSIT) to develop an accountability plan to address the findings of the MSIP team as related to student achievement.</p> <p>See the attached <u>Understanding Your AYP</u>, Pages 10-19.</p> <p>Rewards: LEAs are recognized for the “Annual Distinction in Performance Award” if specific performance criteria are met, including all Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) performance measures on the most recent APR.</p> <p>Title I and non-Title I buildings are recognized as distinguished if they make AYP for four consecutive years.</p>		

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

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

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

Section 160.011(6) defines “public school” as all elementary and secondary schools operated at public expense. Charter schools may declare LEA status or are considered public schools within the school district of location.

All students enrolled in public schools are required to participate in the MAP. Students are assessed in Communication Arts in grades 3-8 and 11; Mathematics in grades 3-8 and 10; and Science in grades 5, 8 and 11. Appropriate modifications are available for students with disabilities. Students whose cognitive disabilities are so severe that they are unable to participate in regular MAP testing, even with modifications, participate in the MAP-Alternate (MAP-A). Students participating in the MAP-A receive an achievement level score that is consistent with MAP achievement level scores so that all scores may be included in accountability data. Each Missouri public school district must account for all students, including those participating in the MAP-A and those participating in MAP content assessments with appropriate accommodations.

Likewise, appropriate modifications are available for students with limited English proficiency. Students who have been in the United States for less than one year may be exempted from the Communication Arts MAP assessment; however, they must participate in the MAP Mathematics and Science assessments. Beginning in February 2009, Missouri will assess all identified English Language Learners using CTB/McGraw-Hill’s LAS-Links assessment. For the 2009 administration, Missouri will use CTB’s shelf assessment with no customization. Following the first administration of the assessment, Missouri will, in cooperation with CTB, evaluate the degree of alignment between the LAS Links assessment and Missouri’s English Language Proficiency Standards. In addition, Missouri will complete a standard-setting to establish proficiency levels and descriptors that are customized to address Missouri’s English Language Proficiency Standards.

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</p>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

		year is not applied consistently.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Students are considered enrolled for the “full academic year” and are included in AYP calculations if they are enrolled the last Wednesday in September (the state’s official attendance count date) and are enrolled in the same building or district as of the MAP administration, without transferring out of the building or district for one more than half of the eligible days between the two dates.</p>		

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</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</p>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

	<p>district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>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>
--	---	---

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Student profile information is collected from schools each year as part of the administration of the MAP. The student profile includes a designation for “in building less than a year” and “in district less than a year.” Students with this designation are assessed and results are given to schools and parents. However, results for children in building less than a year are not included in building AYP, and students in district less than a year are not included in district AYP data. Children who were enrolled in the district for a full academic year, but not in the same building, are included in district AYP calculations, but not in building AYP calculations.

Beginning with the 2007-2008 test administration, student enrollment and transfer information collected via MOSIS (Missouri Student Information System) will allow us to capture “full academic year” data.

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.

<p>CRITICAL ELEMENT</p>	<p>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>	<p>EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>
<p>3.1 How does the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State’s proficient level of academic</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?	achievement in reading/language arts ³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.	State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

In 2002, Missouri established an AYP timeline that requires all students to meet or exceed the State’s proficiency levels in communication arts and mathematics not later than 2013-2014. Schools and districts must scores at or above the established levels on either the MAP or the MAP-A. AYP calculations are made for all public schools and districts and for all required subgroups in communication arts and mathematics based on status or improvement (Safe Harbor) toward meeting the 100% goal.

Adequate Yearly Progress – Missouri		
Year	Communication Arts	Math
2014*	100	100
2013*	91.8	90.8
2012*	83.7	81.7
2011*	75.5	72.5
2010*	67.4	63.3
2009*	59.2	54.1
2008*	51.0	45.0
2007*	42.9	35.8
2006*	34.7	26.6
2005*	26.6	17.5
2004	20.4	10.3
2003	19.4	9.3
2002	18.4	8.3

*Intermediate Goal.

Growth Model Contingency

Missouri submitted a Growth Model Proposal to ED for 2008-2009. Based upon approval of this proposal, Missouri will maintain the current proficiency targets, but will evaluate AYP calculations based upon status, safe harbor, and growth. High school AYP calculations will only include status and safe harbor.

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

3.2

Through the student profile for the MAP and the Missouri Student Information System (MoSIS), children are identified in all of the appropriate subgroups required for NCLB. Data are disaggregated for all subgroups. The following will be included in calculations for AYP purposes: all students, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, White, free or reduced-price lunch, IEP, and LEP/ELL.

Participation Rates – Enrollment is compared to participation of all students and of disaggregated groups to determine participation rates. School districts and buildings with participation rates of less than 95 percent or with any subgroup with a participation rate of less than 95 percent does not meet the AYP standard, providing that the subgroup meets the minimum cell size. If the subgroup does not meet minimum cell size, then a participation rate of less than 95 percent for that subgroup does not result in failure to meet the AYP standard.

Uniform Averaging Procedure – Missouri aggregates data across grades in a building with groups smaller than 50 to determine the percent proficient and above. The calculation is done separately for communication arts and mathematics. In addition, scores are aggregated for the most recent three years. These data are compared to the most recent year and the highest score is used for AYP purposes. This approach minimizes the possibility of falsely inferring that a building or district does not make AYP. It also has the potential of rewarding districts and buildings for efforts that result in strong, single-year achievement gains.

Safe Harbor Provisions – If a school or district does **not** meet the Annual Proficiency Target for each subgroup, a provision called Safe Harbor allows another opportunity for the school or district to make AYP. If the school or district or subgroup meets the participation requirement, AND the school or district or subgroup meets the additional attendance/graduation rate indicator targets, AND the school or district or subgroup decreases the percentage of students scoring below the proficient level by 10 percent, AYP can be met using Safe Harbor.

Confidence Intervals – Missouri applies the $>.99$ confidence interval band for each group in buildings and LEAs that meet the cell size of 50 requirement. This is done to provide additional validity and reliability to the data and therefore to decisions made based upon that data. Confidence intervals are applied to performance data for AYP at the .99 level and for Safe Harbor at the .75 level. They are not applied to attendance, graduation or participation data.

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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

3.2a

Starting points were calculated as prescribed by NCLB, using 2002 data. Buildings at the 20th percentile for enrollment were higher performing in both communication arts and math than the lowest-performing subgroup. The starting point for communication arts was 18.4, and the starting point for math was 8.3.

The same starting point was used for all districts and for all buildings, regardless of the level.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Annual targets have been established separately for communication arts and mathematics that are consistent with the intermediate goals and that identify the percent required for proficient or above for each year from 2002-2014. Meeting these annual objectives will result in having 100 percent of our students proficient by 2014. The annual objectives are the same for every district, building, and subgroup in the state.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. • Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Missouri has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments until 100 percent of students are proficient by 2014. Intermediate goals occur in 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014.</p> <p>See page 16 for a chart of annual AYP targets.</p>		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>AYP is not met at the school or district level if the participation rate, proficiency target, or additional indicator(s) is not met for any subgroup or the total. Safe harbor calculations are applied if the participation rate and additional indicator(s) are met and the percent of students scoring not proficient decreases by ten percent from the previous year. MAP data for all children and for disaggregated groups are received from the assessment contractor every August. An AYP grid is available via our Website, at http://dese.mo.gov/planning/profile/apr/ayp0141294080.html. AYP decisions are indicated on each building and district grid. The grid also indicates if a building or district will be in improvement for the coming school year. School improvement decisions for buildings are based on not meeting the AYP annual objective in the same content area (communication arts or mathematics) or the additional indicator for two consecutive years. District improvement decisions are based on not meeting the AYP annual objective in the same content area (communication arts or mathematics) or an additional indicator for two consecutive years. Attendance rate and graduation rate serve as the additional indicators for districts regarding district improvement decisions.</p>		

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The AYP portion of the Annual Performance Report (APR) indicates which subgroups make AYP, as well as whether or not all students make AYP. Subgroups included in AYP decisions are Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Black, Indian/Alaskan Native, White, IEP, LEP/ELL, and free- and reduced-price lunch. Data have been available for subgroups since the 1994 requirements of IASA were implemented. The student profile that is part of the MAP administration defines the subgroups and collects the data for subgroup use in AYP.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.</p>	<p>State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Missouri requires that buildings and districts report student race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and economic status. Disaggregated data are provided to districts and to the State. The State uses these data to publish the state report card and to determine AYP for subgroups.</p> <p>For each building and LEA, the State determines, for each group/subgroup of sufficient size, whether or not the annual objective was made or, if not, whether the group met the “safe harbor” provision, met the 95% participation rate criteria, and made progress on the “additional indicator.”</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>All students with IEPs are included in Missouri's definition of Adequate Yearly Progress in one of the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Students' disabilities are such that they are able to take the MAP or end-of-course assessments without accommodations, and receive a score that is valid and reliable. 2) Students take the MAP or end-of-course assessments with approved accommodations. (A list of accommodations is available at http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/Compliance/PDF/MAP-Changes.pdf.) 3) Students whose cognitive disabilities are too severe for them to participate in regular MAP subject area assessments, even with accommodations, are assessed using the MAP-A. MAP-A assessments are available in all content areas and grade levels assessed by the MAP (all NCLB-required grade levels and content areas). The MAP-A is aligned to the Show-Me Standards and the Alternate Grade-Level Expectations which are drawn from Missouri's Grade-Level Expectations. Resulting scores are reported in achievement levels that correspond to MAP achievement levels, which allows them to be aggregated with MAP scores for accountability purposes. When high school MAP assessments are replaced by end-of-course assessments in 2008-2009, Missouri will continue to use the MAP-A to assess high school students who are eligible due to their severe cognitive disabilities. <p>Missouri is able to determine via MOSIS if a student has received special education services within the previous two years. Districts may appeal to have the scores of such students included in AYP calculations for the "Students with Disabilities" subgroup for up to two years after exiting the program.</p>

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All Limited English Proficient students that have been in the United States for more than one year participate in the MAP, with appropriate accommodations if necessary. Students who have been in the country for less than one year participate in the Mathematics MAP assessment, with accommodations if necessary; however, the Communication Arts assessment is optional for these students, and neither score will be included in AYP calculations. All identified ELL students take the Missouri English Language Learning Assessment (MAC II), which is aligned to Missouri’s English Language Proficiency Standards and designed to measure language and content acquisition. A revised assessment with achievement levels that are consistent with those of the MAP will be implemented in 2008-2009. Beginning in February 2009, all identified ELL students in Missouri will take CTB/McGraw-Hill’s LAS Links assessment. Following the February 2009 administration, Missouri will, in cooperation with CTB, evaluate the alignment of the LAS Links assessment to Missouri’s English Language Proficiency Standards and determine achievement levels that are consistent with MAP and EOC assessments. Only LEP students that have not been enrolled in the building for a “full academic year” are excluded from accountability determinations for AYP purposes. LEP students who exit LEP status are included in AYP LEP subgroup accountability for two years after exiting LEP status.

Missouri defines an LEP student as an individual:

- (A) who is aged 3 through 21;
- (B) who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school;
- (C)(i) who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English;
 - (ii)(I) who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; and
 - (II) who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual's level of English language proficiency; or
 - (iii) who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and
- (D) whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual —
 - (i) the ability to meet the State's proficient level of achievement on State assessments described in section 1111(b)(3);
 - (ii) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or
 - (iii) the opportunity to participate fully in society.

Students exit LEP status once they attain English language proficiency as determined by the state’s English language proficiency exam. After these students exit, they are in monitoring status, and continue to be included in AYP accountability for the LEP subgroup for up to two years.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p>	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Missouri recently updated its policy on minimum group size in accordance with revised Title I regulations issued on April 9, 2007. Missouri now uses 30 as the minimum number of students in a subgroup for reporting purposes. This number is considered large enough to include valid data about significant subgroups being reported to the community and yet protects the privacy of individual children.</p> <p>Missouri previously used a minimum group size of 30 for subgroups other than those subgroups including students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities, which used a minimum group size of 50</p>		
CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

Subgroup size for public reporting is a minimum of 30 for all subgroups. However, any group that has 0 percent, 100 percent, or five or fewer students in a category will not be reported in order to keep individual students from being identified.

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

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.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Missouri's AYP decisions are based initially on the percent of students scoring at or above the proficiency target on MAP and MAP-A communication arts and mathematics assessments, at the state, district, school, and subgroup level. At all levels, the participation rate and additional indicator(s) must also be met. The uniform averaging procedure and safe harbor provision are also employed under certain conditions.</p> <p>Following the 2008-2009 school year, end-of-course assessments will be incorporated into accountability determinations, as well.</p> <p>Beginning with the 2007-2008 school year MAP science assessments at grade 5, 8, and 11 will be mandatory for all public school districts. While science assessment scores will not impact AYP calculations, the data will be evaluated as part of Missouri's Annual Performance Report (APR) for the classification of public school districts.</p>		

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).

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

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

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Graduation Rate:

Missouri uses the definition of graduation rate from the National Center for Education Statistics.

“Graduation rate,” the quotient of the number of graduates in the current year as of June thirtieth divided by the sum of the number of graduates in the current year as of June thirtieth plus the number of twelfth-graders who dropped out in the current year plus the number of eleventh-graders who dropped out in the preceding year plus the number of tenth-graders who dropped out in the second preceding year plus the number of ninth-graders who dropped out in the third preceding year. Students who obtain a GED are counted as dropouts in this calculation.

The graduation rate goal for all Missouri high schools is 85% to meet the Adequate Yearly Progress additional indicator. High schools with graduation rates between 75-85% are expected to demonstrate improvement of at least 2 percentage points per year. High schools with graduation rates of less than 75% are expected to improve at least 5 percentage points per year.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional state or locally administered assessments not included in the state assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Missouri uses attendance as the additional indicator for elementary and middle schools. The attendance rate is calculated as follows:</p> $\frac{\text{\# of hours attended}}{\text{\# of hours enrolled}}$ <p>For AYP or safe harbor purposes, districts, buildings, groups, and subgroups, meet the indicator if the rate increases over the previous year. Once a building or district has reached 93 percent on the additional indicator of attendance, it is expected to at least maintain that level in order to make AYP or Safe Harbor.</p>		

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>		
<p>Both graduation and attendance data are reported electronically by districts through DESE's Core Data Collection System. Both are subject to local audit and verification at the state level.</p> <p>The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education reviews data submitted by school districts and identifies data that represent a substantial change from past performance. DESE staff contact districts to verify data that represent a substantial change from the preceding year. These audits are conducted by the school finance office for attendance since those data affects funding. The Core Data staff monitor graduation and dropout data.</p>		

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Both the MAP and the MAP-A include separate assessments for mathematics and communication arts. Score reports include unique data for buildings, districts, and the State across all required subgroups for each content area. AYP calculations consider separately the proportion of students proficient in each content area for buildings, districts, and the State for all required subgroups, in all required grade levels. Missouri also examines separately the participation rates for each content area in each building and district for each subgroup.</p> <p>Likewise, when end-of-course assessments are implemented in 2008-2009, Algebra I and English II will be administered as separate assessments. Scores will be incorporated into mathematics and communication arts AYP calculations for buildings, districts, the State, and required subgroups.</p>		

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Missouri uses three years of data to increase reliability. The comparison of three years of data to the most recent year's performance increases consistency of decisions about AYP and the validity of inferences drawn. The use of Safe Harbor allows schools and districts to receive credit for strong gains in areas where annual objectives are not met to decrease invalid identification. Predicating decisions on not making AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area allows for more consistent decisions. If DESE's growth model proposal is approved, this will also increase the consistency and validity of AYP decisions.

Missouri's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), as well as its assessment contractors (CTB/McGraw-Hill, Riverside Publishing Company, and Measured Progress) work together to ensure that statewide assessments used for accountability determinations produce scores that are valid and reliable according to the technical standards defined by *The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, published jointly in 1999 by the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education. In addition, all assessments include an appeals process for parents and/or districts if they feel that assessment data may not be correct.

Missouri has considered questions suggested in "Making Valid and Reliable Decisions In Determining Adequate Yearly Progress" in determining validity, reliability, policy, and practicability in its accountability system.

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 an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>DESE has established appeal processes for parents, buildings, and districts who believe there is a statistical or calculation error in the data used to make AYP determinations or in the inferences made on the basis of that data. In such cases, data and decisions are reviewed by appropriate DESE staff and a final resolution is made within 30 days of the receipt of the appeal. DESE also allows an opportunity for district's to review accountability data prior to the release of preliminary AYP calculations.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p>	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes, e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p><u>2008-2009 End-of-Course Assessments</u></p> <p>Missouri plans to incorporate scores End-of Course (EOC) assessments into AYP calculations beginning in 2008-2009. Missouri aggregates assessment results across grades in a building and district, and end-of-course assessment achievement levels will parallel MAP achievement levels. Therefore, it will be possible to interchange end-of-course scores and MAP scores, or to add end-of-course scores to AYP calculations. Achievement levels for EOC assessments in Algebra I, English II, and Biology (to be administered for the first time in 2008-2009) will be determined in a standard-setting session in June 2009. Additional End-of-Course assessments that may be used for accountability purposes will be field tested in 2008-2009, with administration to occur in 2009-2010. These assessments include Algebra II, Integrated Mathematics II, Integrated Mathematics III, and Geometry. End-of-course data will replace high school MAP data in AYP calculations at that time. Consequently, it may be necessary to re-define AYP targets to ensure that all Missouri students are proficient in Communication Arts and Mathematics by 2014.</p>		

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

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The State does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Participation rates for the MAP have been calculated and reported on the score report since 1997. Enrollment data (disaggregated) and participation data (disaggregated) are gathered as a part of the MAP administration. Participation rate is calculated as follows:</p> $\frac{\text{\# of students with test results}}{\text{\# of students enrolled}}$ <p>Starting in 2006, alternate results are reported using the same achievement levels as the MAP and are included in the numerator of the calculation.</p> <p>Participation rates are calculated for districts, buildings, the State, and subgroups at each level. The 95 percent requirement is applied to all AYP decisions. Missouri uses the additional flexibility that allows participation rate to be averaged over two or three years including the current year if the building or LEA does not meet the 95% requirement for the current year alone.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?</p>	<p>State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.</p>	<p>State does not have a procedure for making this determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The 95 percent requirement is considered in all AYP determinations. School buildings, districts, and subgroups with at least 95 percent participation meet that part of the AYP requirement. Buildings, districts, and subgroups with participation rates of less than 95 percent meet AYP unless the subgroup does not meet the minimum cell size. Then a participation rate of less than 95 percent will not result in failure to meet the AYP standard.</p>		