

NEVADA

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)

Submitted May 8, 2009



**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 state 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.

References

All references to Nevada Adequate Yearly Progress may be accessed at <http://nde.doe.nv.gov/AYP.htm>

All references to Nevada Revised Statutes for 2007 may be accessed at <http://leg.state.nv.us/NRSIndex/>

All references to Nevada Administrative Code for 2008 may be accessed at <http://leg.state.nv.us/indexes/NAC/>

More information about the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program may be accessed at http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Assessment_NPEP_Resources.htm

The *Nevada Accountability Report Card* may be accessed at <http://www.nevadareportcard.com/>

The Nevada School and District Annual Reports of Accountability Handbook http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Assessment/08_09_Accountability%20Handbook.pdf

The 2008 SAGE School Improvement Guidebook may be accessed at http://sage.doe.nv.gov/PDFs/2008_SAGE_Guidebook_full.pdf

The Nevada Content and Achievement Standards may be accessed at <http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Standards.html>

The Nevada Consolidated Plan for the Implementation of the "No Child Left Behind Act" (June 2002) may be accessed at <http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Accountability/NCLB/NCLBplan.doc>

The 2008-2009 Procedures for the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program may be accessed at http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Assessment/NPEP/NPEP_0809_all_sections.pdf

PRINCIPLE 1. All schools are included in the State Accountability System.

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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Every public school and school district is included in a single statewide accountability system as defined in Nevada Revised Statutes ([NRS 385.3455](#) through [NRS 385.3774](#), and [NRS 385.3891](#)); and held to the same accountability criteria as described in [NRS 385.361](#). Public Schools are defined as “all kindergartens and elementary schools, junior high schools and middle schools, high schools, charter schools and any other schools, classes and educational programs which receive their support through public taxation and, except for charter schools, whose textbooks and courses of study are under the control of the State Board” ([NRS 385.007](#)).

Local Educational Agencies are Nevada’s 17 school districts, which are organized by county, as well as state-sponsored charter schools and state-sponsored youth detention facilities ([NRS 385.017](#) to [385.0265](#) inclusive, and [NRS 385.007](#), [NRS 386.500](#) through [NRS 386.610](#)).

Test administration and security procedures are distributed to all schools and school districts in the state to ensure secure and standardized administrations of assessments in all schools ([Procedures for the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program](#)). Additionally, trainings for all school principals, test coordinators, and district testing staff are conducted annually throughout the state prior to the start of testing season.

K-2 schools are held accountable for adequate yearly progress of the 3rd grade students who are enrolled in the schools to which their students matriculate. ([Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual](#)).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	<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>	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Nevada’s accountability system includes an AYP determination for every public school and public school district. The single, statewide accountability system is applied to all public schools, including state-sponsored charter schools and state-sponsored youth detention facilities (NRS 385.361).</p> <p>NRS 385.361 requires that the Nevada Department of Education make AYP decisions based upon the measurement of progress of pupils administered pursuant to NRS 389.550 or the High School Proficiency examination (NRS 389.015), as applicable.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
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?	State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i> , <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> . 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.	Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Nevada has four levels of student achievement on the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program (NPEP) assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school in reading and mathematics; grades 5, 8 and high school in writing and science; and grades 3-8, and high school on the *Nevada Alternate Scales of Academic Achievement - Revised (NASAA-R)* in English Language Arts, and Mathematics (also Science in grades 5, 8, and high school). The State has adopted the four achievement levels: *Exceeds Standard*, *Meets Standard*, *Approaches Standard*, and *Developing/Emergent*. Proficient levels of achievement include *Meets Standard* and *Exceeds Standard*, while *Approaches Standard* and *Developing/Emergent* are non-proficient ([Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual](#)). The achievement levels used in Nevada are designed to align to and connote the same meaning implied by the achievement levels described in NCLB. A crosswalk is provided below.

NCLB	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Nevada	Developing/Emergent	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds

Achievement standards for the reading and mathematics CRT were determined for grades 3, 5, and 8 in 2005 using a bookmark standard setting. In 2006, cut scores for all grades 3–8 were validated using a modified bookmark procedure.

A bookmark procedure was used in 2002 to set the proficient cut for the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE). Achievement standards were finalized in 2003, which resulted in the adoption of the four achievement levels in Reading and Mathematics. Achievement standards for HSPE science were set in 2008 using a bookmark approach.

In 2002, NDE also conducted a standard setting on the 8th grade writing test using a modified bookmark procedure. In 2006, standard setting occurred with the 5th grade writing assessment using the same scoring protocol as grade 8.

The Nevada Proficiency Examination Program CRT and HSPE scale scores for reading, math, and science are reported on a scale ranging from 100 to 500. The scores for writing are reported on a scale ranging from 0 (zero) to 20 for 5th and 8th grade, and from 0 (zero) to 12 for high school. A table of adopted cut scores can be found on page 6 of the [Introduction and Overview of the Procedures for the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program](#). Item response theory is used for scaling and equating of all CRTs and the HSPE in Reading, Math, and Science.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	<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>	Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Preliminary school AYP profiles are issued annually on or before June 15 for traditional 9 month schools and on or before June 30 for public schools operating on a schedule other than the traditional 9 months. District AYP profiles are issued annually on or before July 1. These profiles contain AYP accountability designations and supporting data about district, school, and subgroup achievement based on the state assessments that were administered during the preceding school year. ([NRS 385.3613](#), [NRS 385.3762](#)).

Upon release of the preliminary profiles, LEAs engage in a review and appeal process with NDE staff. The final school AYP determinations are released to the public by August 1. This provides time for districts and schools to plan improvements, and to notify parents of any sanctions from NCLB or state law prior to the beginning of the school year.

On August 1 with the release of final AYP profiles including designations and relevant achievement data, schools designated as in Need of Improvement move to the next level of sanctions as required by NCLB and Nevada law. Choice letters are distributed by districts no later than August 1 ([NRS 385.3661](#) through [NRS 385.3721](#) inclusive, [NRS 385.382](#)). Supplemental services are provided in accordance with 20 U.S.C.&6316(b)1. For Title I schools designated In Need of Improvement, the consequences for failing to make adequate yearly progress are consistent with NCLB requirements and are regulated by NRS ([NRS 385.362](#), [NRS 385.3661](#), [NRS 385.372](#), [NRS 385.3743](#), [NRS 385.3746](#), [NRS 385.3761](#)).

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>Nevada produces the web-based Nevada Report Card on August 15 of each year. School district and school summary reports are also made available to the public through distribution to students, ground mail, newspaper excerpts, and in school buildings and school district and state administrative offices. As needed, depending upon student population demographics, individual school report cards are also produced in Spanish. A full listing of the data elements included in the Nevada Report Card (which include, and significantly exceed, those required under NCLB) can be found in NRS 385.3469.</p>		

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? ¹	State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are: <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

Nevada highly values an accountability system that supports continuous improvement of student achievement through a system of rewards and consequences. As outlined in Appendix A and Appendix B, Nevada’s system of sanctions and rewards promotes support for continuous improvement of all public schools and districts ([NRS 385.361](#) and [NRS 385.3611](#) through [NRS 385.3774 inclusive](#)). The structure of the system ensures full compliance with NCLB requirements and sets forth consequences for Title I schools. Each district and public school is assigned a designation based upon current and past accountability decisions. All schools and school districts will be eligible for recognition as exemplary or high achieving schools/school districts. The table in Appendix A reflects the consequences that take effect when a school fails to make AYP, and the table in Appendix B describes the recognition for schools that do make AYP. Description of the criteria for determining all school designations can be found in the [Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual](#).

In accordance with [NRS 385.357](#), all schools, regardless of designation or Title I status, must complete a school improvement Plan using the [SAGE School Improvement Guidebook](#). This plan is due to the district on or before November 1 and to the NDE by December 15.

As indicated in the table in Appendix A, Title I schools can be considered for restructuring beginning with the third year of designation as In Need of Improvement. A school shall be considered a new school if 60% or more of the assessed students are new to the school once the school has been restructured; or it is the first year of operation of the newly constructed school; or it is the first year of operation of a charter school; or 2 or more grade levels in which the state AYP assessments are administered have been added to the school or the charter school’s charter.

Operational definition for AYP determinations for new schools: newly constructed schools begin the AYP timeline at the beginning. The first year all schools are given a designation and the second year provides the two-year comparison data. Restructured schools in which the restructured school meets the above requirements will begin the AYP timeline anew.

¹ The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?</p>	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	<p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>As specified generally in federal code (20 U.S.C. § 6311(b)(3)) and specifically in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS 389.015 and NRS 389.550), all students enrolled in a state public or charter school are required to participate in the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program and are therefore, included in the accountability system. All students served in special programs such as court-ordered detention programs, special education magnet programs, and those students attending other alternative school sites are also included in the accountability system. These requirements are further reiterated in the Procedures for the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program on page 4 of the <i>Introduction and Overview</i>.</p> <p>All students enrolled in grades 3-8 and high school in Nevada public and charter schools are required to be assessed in the subjects of reading and mathematics, and in science and writing in grades 5, 8, and high school. For those whom the general assessment is inappropriate, an alternate assessment (<i>NASAA-R</i>) is administered; and the results are fully included in the accountability system and AYP calculations.</p> <p>NRS 389.560 states that the results of the examinations must be reported for each regular school, charter school, school district and the state, as follows: “...<i>the percentage of pupils who have demonstrated proficiency, as defined by the Department, and took the examinations under regular testing conditions; and the percentage of pupils who have demonstrated proficiency, as defined by the Department, and took the examinations with modifications or accommodations, if such reporting does not violate the confidentiality of the test scores of any individual pupil.</i>”</p> <p>NRS 389.560 further provides for an accounting of student participation in the mandated assessments. Section 5 states that “<i>the superintendent of schools of each school district and the governing body of each charter school shall certify that the number of pupils who took the examinations is equal to the number of pupils who are enrolled in each school in the school district or in the charter school who are required to take the examinations</i>”.</p> <p>Proficiency calculations for schools and districts are based only on those students having been enrolled for a full academic year; although all students are included in participation calculations and are reported in the accountability tables documenting student participation rates.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p>	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Students enrolled in a school on the state’s official enrollment count day (the fourth Friday after the beginning of the school’s academic calendar) and who remain continuously enrolled in the same school up to and during each of the spring testing windows are considered to have been in school for a full academic year. The same business rules apply to enrollment within the school district. Therefore, a student that is continuously enrolled in a school district from count day through each of the testing windows, regardless of movement between schools within the district, is considered to have been in the district for a full academic year. This is also described in the Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual.</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 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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

[NRS 385.3613](#) specifies that school and school district accountability must be based only upon the information and data for those pupils who are enrolled in the school for a full academic year. The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) policy requires that a test answer document be completed for every student enrolled in a school, special, or alternative educational program during the testing window. Included on the answer document or PreID file are two elements to be completed or validated by authorized school or school district personnel for each student. For the vast majority of students, coding of these two elements (year in school and year in district) is based on information extracted and calculated from the NDE student information system. When no PreID label is available for a student, authorized school or school district personnel must code whether or not the student has been continuously enrolled in the school and school district since the beginning of the school year.

The Assessment Audit Protocol in Appendix C describes the process by which NDE personnel audit schools to ensure compliance with these expectations.

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 <i>NOT</i> 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 arts² and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives have been set separately for English language arts and for mathematics. In both content areas, Nevada’s definition of AYP requires that all students meet or exceed proficiency as measured by the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program no later than 2013-2014. All schools and districts are evaluated based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding proficiency in relation to the target performance, which increases over time.</p> <p>Proficiency determinations for mathematics are based upon the CRT mathematics tests in 3-8 and the high school proficiency examination (HSPE) in high school. Proficiency determinations for English language arts are based upon the CRT reading tests for grades 3, 4, 6, and 7. In grades 5, 8, and high school, ELA proficiency is based upon an equal weighting of the CRT (or HSPE) reading tests and the writing tests. The specific process used in these calculations can be found in the Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual.</p>		

² 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.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY 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

In order for a school or district grade level configuration (elementary, middle school, and high school) to meet AYP, the aggregate student population and each subgroup of students (with $n \geq 25$) must meet or exceed the target for percent proficient in English language arts and mathematics. To meet the expectation for participation, 95% of the students as an aggregate and within each subgroup must participate in the state assessments in English language arts and in mathematics. (Groups of students with $n < 20$, are held to a participation target of $n - 1$). The school or district grade level configuration must also meet the target or show progress for the other academic indicator.

The same analysis sequence is carried out for each school district with decisions made separately for each grade level configuration for English language arts and mathematics.

If a school or district grade level configuration fails to meet the target for percent proficient for a given subgroup or for the schools in aggregate (using a confidence interval of 95%), safe harbor provisions will be examined for that population. Safe harbor will be used when the number of non-proficient students decreases by at least 10% when compared with the previous year's data (using a 75% confidence interval) and the subgroup meets the target or shows progress on the other academic indicator.

The full process for determining AYP is described in the [Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual](#); and profiles for all schools and school districts can be found at http://nde.doe.nv.gov/AYP_Results.htm.

A school that does not meet AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (English language arts or mathematics) or other indicator (average daily attendance for elementary and middle school, and graduation rate for high school) is classified as "In Need of Improvement" ([NRS 385.361](#)).

A district will make AYP in a particular content area (English language arts, mathematics, or the other indicator) if at least one of the grade configurations (elementary, middle, or high school) makes AYP in that content area. ([NRS 385.3762](#)). Using these criteria, if a district fails to make AYP in the same content area or other indicator for two consecutive years, the district is identified as "In Need of Improvement".

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...).</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Based on English language arts (ELA) and mathematics performance among students in grades 3-8 and high school, baseline proficiency levels were originally determined for the three grade-level configurations: elementary, middle and high school. For each school configuration level, baseline performance was established separately in the 2001-2002 school year for English language arts and mathematics using the school percentile method outlined as one of two options in the NCLB Act. This specific process used in Nevada is described in the Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual.</p> <p>Beginning with the 2006-2007 school year, the trajectories for the elementary and middle school grade configurations were slightly reconfigured to reflect the same targets. This was done to eliminate difficulties in AYP determinations for Nevada schools with varying grade configurations across the grade span of K-8.</p> <p>The State baselines were used to set the trajectory for the 12 year timeline and to establish the annual "status" targets. The targets apply to all schools with students enrolled in the applicable grade level spans.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	<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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

See responses for Critical Elements 3.2a and 3.2c. Per [NRS 385.361](#), all Nevada public schools, LEAs, and subgroups of students are held to the same accountability requirements. Following is the chart of annual measurable objectives used for determining adequate yearly progress.

Annual Measurable Objectives through the 2013-14 School Year

School year	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
2002-2003	30.0%	36.0%	37.00%	32.00%	73.50%	42.80%
2003-2004	27.50%	34.50%	37.00%	32.00%	73.50%	42.80%
2004-05, 2005-06	39.6%	45.4%	43.3%	43.30%	77.90%	52.30%
2006-2007	39.6%	43.3%	39.6%	43.30%	77.90%	52.30%
2007-08, 2008-09	51.7%	54.6%	51.7%	54.6%	82.3%	61.8%
2009-10, 2010-11	63.8%	65.9%	63.8%	65.9%	86.7%	71.3%
2011-12	75.9%	77.2%	75.9%	77.2%	91.1%	80.8%
2012-13	88%	88.5%	88%	88.5%	95.5%	90.3%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

The State chose to use intermediate proficiency goals with six equal distant increases. The baseline estimates were used as annual targets for two years with the first increase occurring in the 2004-2005 school year. The subsequent increases occur in the 2007-2008, 2009-2010, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years.

As described in Critical Element 3.2a, beginning with the 2006-2007 school year, the trajectories for the elementary and middle school grade configurations were slightly reconfigured to reflect the same targets. This was done to eliminate difficulties in AYP determinations for Nevada schools with varying grade configurations across the grade span of K-8.

The following chart shows the annual measurable objectives for AYP proficiency in ELA and in mathematics over time. The annual measurable objectives are the same for all schools, districts, and subgroups of students.

Annual Measurable Objectives through the 2013-14 School Year

School year	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
2002-2003	30.0%	36.0%	37.00%	32.00%	73.50%	42.80%
2003-2004	27.50%	34.50%	37.00%	32.00%	73.50%	42.80%
2004-05, 2005-06	39.6%	45.4%	43.3%	43.30%	77.90%	52.30%
2006-2007	39.6%	43.3%	39.6%	43.30%	77.90%	52.30%
2007-08, 2008-09	51.7%	54.6%	51.7%	54.6%	82.3%	61.8%
2009-10, 2010-11	63.8%	65.9%	63.8%	65.9%	86.7%	71.3%
2011-12	75.9%	77.2%	75.9%	77.2%	91.1%	80.8%
2012-13	88%	88.5%	88%	88.5%	95.5%	90.3%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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
<p>4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?</p>	<p>AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually.³</p>	<p>AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>AYP decisions for each public school and for each LEA (district) are reported to the public by August 1 of each year (NRS 385.3613, NRS 385.3771). Individual school and district profiles dating back to the 2002-2003 school year can be found at http://nde.doe.nv.gov/AYP_Results.htm.</p> <p>The Nevada Report Card is published annually by August 15 (NRS 385.3469) and contains additional information including assessment, discipline, and teacher qualification information, etc.</p>		

³ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	<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>	State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The measurement of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for each school and school district is specified in statutes ([NRS 385.361](#)) and complies with 20 U.S.C. § 6311(b)(2). The NRS requires that the AYP measurement be designed to ensure that all pupils will meet or exceed the minimum level of proficiency set by the State Board and further requires that the AYP measurement be reported for pupils from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, students from economically disadvantaged families, and those who are limited English proficient.

Subpopulation comparisons for groups with an n-size of at least 25 students will be made for five ethnicities (American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, African American, and White), economically disadvantaged students, students with limited English proficiency, and students with disabilities.

PreID files for each test administration are generated from the Statewide Student Information System (SSIS) and are provided to school district personnel prior to and during the testing windows for validation. This SSIS includes nightly uploads of school district student data directly from the local student information systems. Definitions for each of the subgroups used in AYP analyses are contained in the System of Accountability Information in Nevada (SAIN) Data Dictionary, and are also included in Test Administrator Manuals for students whose answer documents must be hand-coded. These can be found on the NDE website at the following locations:

http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Assessment_CRT.htm

http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Assessment_WA.htm

http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Assessment_HSPE.htm

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>		
<p>Nevada statutes (NRS 385.3613) specify that the NDE shall determine that a public school has failed to make adequate yearly progress if any group or subpopulation does not satisfy the annual measurable objectives established by the State Board.</p> <p>Each subpopulation as described in Critical Element 5.1 is held accountable for the AYP calculations described in Critical Element 3.2. Profiles are developed for each school and school district in the state and contain specific accountability information for each subpopulation. These can be found at http://nde.doe.nv.gov/AYP_Results.htm.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<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

Federal (20 U.S.C. § 6311(b)(3)) and Nevada Revised Statutes ([NRS 389.015](#) and [NRS 389.550](#)), require that all students (including those receiving special educational services) enrolled in a state public or charter school are required to participate in the annual assessments forming the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program.

Nevada statutes ([NRS 389.0115](#)) specifies that a pupil with a disability may take an examination administered pursuant to [NRS 389.015](#) or [NRS 389.550](#) with modifications and accommodations that the pupil's individualized education program (IEP) team sets forth in the pupil's IEP, in consultation with the Department and in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 et seq., and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. §§ 6301 et seq., as necessary to measure the progress of the pupil. The results of each pupil with a disability who takes an examination with modifications or accommodations is reported and included in the determination of whether the school and the school district makes AYP. Students who receive modifications while taking the examination are counted as in the lowest achievement level and are counted as non-participants when calculating the participation rate. Guidelines for the participation of students with disabilities on state-mandated assessments can be found in the *Students with Special Needs* section of the [Procedures for the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program](#).

Students who were formerly classified as students with a disability will be included in the students with disabilities subgroup for two additional years for purposes of calculating AYP.

Subsection 2 of [NRS 389.0115](#) provides for an alternate examination, the *Nevada Alternate Scales of Academic Achievement - Revised (NASAA-R)* based on State Board adopted academic standards for administration to any pupil with a severe cognitive disability provided the pupil's IEP team determines, in consultation with the Department, that the pupil cannot participate in all or a portion of an examination administered pursuant to [NRS 389.015](#) or [NRS 389.550](#) even with modifications and accommodations. Students participating in the alternate assessment are assigned to one of the four achievement levels for English/Language Arts and mathematics described in Critical Element 1.3. Less than 1% of Nevada's students meet the strict criteria to participate in this assessment.

Guidelines for students participating on the NASAA, including the criteria for participation can be found in the *Alternate Assessment* section of the [Procedures for the Nevada Proficiency Examination Program](#). Additional information on the NASAA is on the NDE website at http://nde.doe.nv.gov/Assessment_NASAA.htm.

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>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Students are classified as having limited English proficiency (LEP) based on a home language survey and the results of annual assessment in English proficiency. This home language test meets the Title III testing requirements. Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS 389.011) specifies that each student who is limited English proficient and is enrolled in the school district or a charter school must participate (with or without accommodations) in the achievement and proficiency examinations administered pursuant to NRS 389.550 and NRS 389.015.</p> <p>Unless an LEP student is “newly arrived in the United States”, each student’s results must be included within the appropriate subpopulations in the determination of whether the school and the school district have made adequate yearly progress. In Nevada, a “newly arrived...” student is called “New in Country” (NIC) and is defined as “an immigrant student identified as LEP who is enrolled in a U.S. school during the current academic year for the first time”.</p> <p>Students who were formerly classified as LEP will be included in the students with limited English proficiency category for purposes of calculating AYP.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT 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.⁴</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

For the purpose of reporting for any subgroup, the state will continue to use existing policy which sets the minimum at 10 students ([NRS 385.347](#)). In making AYP determinations proficiency calculations will be conducted on any subgroup with at least 25 students.

In making AYP calculations for any group of 25 or more students, a statistical test will be conducted to determine if a threshold level of performance (status) has been met. The statistical test will be a one-tailed comparison to determine if the upper-boundary of observed performance meets or exceeds the predetermined status threshold. The level of confidence for these comparisons will be controlled at 0.95. For annual “status” comparisons (step 2 in the AYP comparison sequence), the standard error of the proportion with a z-score transformation will be used in defining the controlled one-tailed 95% confidence limit rate. For relative growth comparisons (step 3 in the sequence), the standard error of the difference between proportions will be used. In making these comparisons, a z-score transformation controlling the one-tailed 75% confidence limit will be used.

For schools with fewer than 25 students in the school calculation, multiple-year (up to three years) calculations will be performed in order to determine whether or not the school achieved the proficiency target.

⁴ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁵	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS 389.560 and NRS 389.017) specify that the results of the examinations administered pursuant to NRS 389.550 and NRS 389.015 be reported in a manner that does not violate the confidentiality of the test scores of an individual pupil. The minimum reporting subgroup size (n = 10) should, in almost all instances, protect the privacy of individual students.</p>		

⁵ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student’s parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student’s education record.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁶</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>Nevada law mandates the use of these assessments in a single statewide accountability system for determining Adequate Yearly Progress (NRS 385.361, NRS 385.3455 through NRS.385.774, NRS 385.3891). All students in grades 3 through 8 participate in the Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) for reading, mathematics, and science, and grades 5 and 8 participate in the Analytic Writing Assessment. In high school, 10th and 11th graders participate in the High School Proficiency Examination (HSPE) in reading, math, and science, and 11th graders participate in the HSPE Writing Assessment. Students with disabilities who meet strict requirements are assessed by <i>the Nevada Alternate Scales of Academic Achievement – Revised (NASAA-R)</i>.</p> <p>AYP decisions in English language arts are based on the CRT scores for grades 3, 4, and 7, and on the combined scores for CRT reading and for writing for grades 5, 8. At the high school level, AYP decisions in English language arts are based on the combined scores for HSPE reading and writing for grade 11. Mathematics decisions are based upon scores for CRT mathematics for grades 3-8 and grade 11.</p> <p>The <i>NASAA-R</i> is the state assessment of alternate achievement standards. Students who are identified as requiring the specialized instruction and related services for special education must have a current Individualized Educational Program (IEP) that includes a determination about whether the student will participate in state assessments through either the general education assessment or the <i>NASAA-R</i>. <i>NASAA-R</i> achievement scores in grades 3-8 and 11 for proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics are used as the alternate assessment for the state’s Criterion-Referenced Tests (CRT), the State Analytic Writing Assessments, and the Nevada High School Proficiency Examinations (HSPE).</p>		

⁶ 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 NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	<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 clause⁷ to make AYP.</p>	State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

To determine graduation rates in Nevada as per [NRS 385.3469](#), the NCES definition of completion rate which incorporates completers and dropouts was adapted. “Completers” include standard and advanced diploma recipients, adjusted diploma recipients, and certificate of attendance recipients. Graduation rate only counts diploma recipient completers in the numerator excluding adjusted diploma recipients. The denominator includes all diploma recipients, certificate of attendance recipients, dropouts (9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th), and GED recipients.

The graduation rate is calculated using the following formula:

$$\frac{(\# \text{ St D} + \# \text{ Ad D} + \text{Adv D})}{(\# \text{ Comp} + \text{DO 12 Y} + \text{DO 11 Y-1} + \text{DO 10 Y-2} + \text{DO 9 Y-3})} \times 100$$

Where:

- # St D = Number of Standard Diplomas
- # Ad D = Number of Adult Diplomas
- # Adv D = Advanced Diplomas
- # Comp = Completers (Standard, Advanced, Adult, Adjusted, Certificates of Attendance)
- DO 12 Y= Number of 12th Grade Dropouts from Current Year
- DO 11 Y-1 = Number of 11th Grade Dropouts from Year Previous
- DO 10 Y-2 = Number of 10th Grade Dropouts from 2 Years Previous
- DO 9 Y-3 = Number of 9th Grade Dropouts from 3 Years Previous

Graduation rate for a school year can only be established several months after the completion of the school year. This means that for the 2008-2009 AYP designations, graduation rates from the 2007-2008 school year are used. Graduation rates are calculated for the school as a whole, as well as subpopulations. Graduation rate for the school as a whole is used as the “other indicator” for high school AYP calculations, as well as for subpopulations when analyzing safe harbor.

The State, through the State Board of Education, established a graduation rate baseline. To develop the baseline, the Department of Education used the rules specified in NCLB for creating test score baselines (e.g. 20th percentile school). For AYP comparisons, schools currently have to demonstrate that they have met the annual target rate of 50% or improved toward the threshold in comparison to the previous school year ([NRS 385.347](#)). Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year (and used in the 2011-2012 AYP analyses), Nevada will be utilizing the cohort graduation rate in place of the current graduation rate formula.

⁷ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

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.⁸</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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

For elementary and middle schools, the State uses average daily attendance rate (ADA) for the school as a whole as the “other indicator” for elementary and middle school AYP calculations, as well as for subpopulations when analyzing safe harbor. ([NRS 385.347](#))

In order to allow ADA rates to be reflective of the same school year as the AYP analyses, Nevada has chosen to calculate ADA as of the 100th day of instruction. To calculate average daily attendance for the school/program and for the district, sum (or aggregate) the total days present for each student in the school/program (or district) and divide this amount by the sum of total days present for each student and the sum of total days absent for each student. Round the resulting figure to the nearest one-tenth of one percent. All days in the formula below are as of the first 100 days of instruction:

$$\frac{\text{Aggregate Days Present}}{\text{Aggregate Days Present} + \text{Aggregate Days Absent}} \times 100$$

For example, in a school with 100 students who were present for a total (aggregated over all 100 students) of 9,000 days during the first 100 days of instruction and were absent for a total (aggregated over all 100 students) of 1000 days over the first 100 days of instruction, the average daily attendance rate would be:

$$\frac{9000}{9000+1000} \times 100 = 90.00\%$$

The State, through the State Board of Education, has confirmed an average attendance rate target of 90% as stipulated in [NRS 385.347](#).

⁸ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	<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>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Data for the graduation rate and average daily attendance comparisons are based upon information collected in the state and school district student information systems. Auditing and quality assurance procedures are operationalized to better ensure the accuracy of collected data.</p> <p>The Accountability Handbook has been written by NDE staff and distributed to school district personnel to ensure consistency and accuracy of all data elements used in the Nevada accountability system and reported to the Nevada Report Card.</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.⁹</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>English language arts (ELA) and mathematics are measured separately against the State content standards in each area. AYP determinations are based on the Nevada Proficiency Examinations (Criterion Referenced Tests, writing assessments, and High School Proficiency Examination) given annually (NRS 389.015 and NRS 389.550). Proficiency determinations for English language arts are based upon the CRT reading tests for grades 3, 4, 6, and 7. In grades 5, 8, and high school, ELA proficiency is based upon an equal weighting of the CRT reading tests and the writing tests. The specific process used in these calculations can be found in the Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual.</p> <p>School and district AYP profiles showing separate ELA and mathematics proficiency and participation levels for the school as a whole, and all of the subgroups can be found at http://nde.doe.nv.gov/AYP_Results.htm.</p>		

⁹ 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

Nevada’s standards for acceptable reliability for AYP determinations are based on reliability of (a) student identification data, (b) scores, and (c) AYP determinations themselves.

Reliable AYP decisions in Nevada start with the quality of the student and school data collected. Nevada uses a statewide student information system and a process of data verification to ensure that student information is reliable. This system allows for daily uploads of student demographic data from school sites. Pre-identification data and assessment results are presented iteratively to the district offices for verification; and errors are corrected prior to AYP reporting. Weekly communication regarding data quality with district representatives is facilitated by phone and through the secure [Bighorn portal website](#). Trainings on AYP add to the reliability of determinations and provide appropriate district staff practice with computing assessment data, evaluating their schools’ AYP status, and preparing appropriate appeals.

The reliability of the assessments themselves is reported publicly and evaluated. The NPEP Technical Reports provide details of score reliability (i.e., Cronbach α , Stratified α , Standard Error of Measurement in scale score units) by subgroups and subcategories of item types and content strands, as well as inter-rater reliability of constructed-response item scoring. Reliability of classification to achievement levels (i.e., decision consistency and accuracy) is also reported publicly. These criteria are evaluated to inform changes to the test development.

Finally, the biggest threat to evaluation of cohort-to-cohort change is instability of aggregate scores from measurement error, sampling error, and one-time events. Sample size contributes to sampling error since reliability is highly dependent on n-count. Therefore, the state evaluates error rates within a 95% confidence limit. Error controls are in place to ensure appropriate, high-stakes classifications despite random error. First, NDE uses a compensatory model. Second, confidence intervals are used in the determination of status comparisons: schools or districts meet AYP targets by meeting the actual target, or by meeting the target with a one-tailed confidence interval added to ensure that misclassification error does not penalize schools or subgroups unduly. Safe harbor improvement decisions (using a 75% confidence interval) are used and are relative improvement status (i.e., a reduction of at least 10% in the non-proficient group). Finally, uniform averaging is used when necessary to ensure that schools are not unduly penalized for sampling error or one-time events that interrupt a trend of improvement over a two or three year period. NDE combines performance across grade levels as another control to random error; the combination of data across grades contributes to the stability of performance estimates for a given school or district. Nevada uses these controls to ensure reliable decision making and AYP determination.

AYP technical quality is discussed in more detail in the [Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual](#).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The Nevada AYP system uses a status model to provide annual accountability for schools, district, and the state. The system is designed to provide a snapshot of student proficiency levels for subgroups and schools at one point in time. This annual outcome provides the basis for appropriate but delimited score interpretations. The validity of the AYP reports rests on the assumption that the model is a valuable component for providing information to school improvement efforts. Therefore, multiple measures are taken to ensure that – from measurement, policy, and professional practice standpoints – the determinations themselves are valid. To this end, NDE, experts and stakeholders participate in the validation process through annual appeals, annual system evaluation, and consultation with independent experts in school improvement.</p> <p>First, the validity of AYP determinations depends on valid and reliable assessment instruments, administered appropriately, and results reported to parents, schools, and districts. The <i>Nevada Technical Reports for the CRT and HSPE</i> document validity evidence related to the quality of the assessments, administrations, and reporting. Also, validity is dependent on sound rationale for specific AYP determinations. Nevada’s Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual documents the rationale and evidence of specific logic and theoretical bases applied in AYP determinations. This document is developed by NDE and used by district and school representatives across the state to clarify procedural and interpretive guidelines and to ensure appropriate interpretations of AYP outcomes.</p> <p>To support AYP interpretations further, districts and schools are provided a 30-day appeal period following the preliminary release of school designations. Appeals are designed to allow school districts, acting on behalf of the schools, to present information that is relevant to the school or district AYP determination. Appeal evaluation criteria were developed collaboratively with local education agencies.</p> <p>As a secondary support, the state evaluates the AYP determination process through (a) systematic, annual review of a sample of school and district profiles, (b) routine data system reviews and audits, (c) use of AYP results in reporting and external studies (e.g., EDEN, independent research), (d) evaluation of patterns of other indicators of school improvement, and (e) piloting a growth model as a separate and complementary measure of growth in 2009-2010.</p> <p>NDE uses a national technical advisory committee (TAC) of experts in educational measurement, school accountability, and educational policy to assist it with its testing programs. The TAC meets approximately three times a year with ongoing communication, thereby providing NDE important recommendations related to accountability issues. In this way, the TAC plays a critical, evaluative role in the validity of the Nevada’s accountability system.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	<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.¹⁰</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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Due to assessment construct and content validity issues, the assessment system will include new test designs and test scales in mathematics and science in 2010, and reading in 2011. With the development of adjusted test constructs and scale scores, the subject-area assessments will also incorporate new achievement levels. Such changes make year-to-year score comparisons inappropriate. Therefore, empirical linking procedures will be conducted to evaluate improvement, determine Safe Harbor and Uniform Averaging results, and provide longitudinal data for growth analyses. (Growth analyses are not used in the calculation of AYP.)

The recalculation of annual thresholds, changes to new assessment designs, and development of new scales will not affect the 100% proficiency expectation for the 2013-2014 school year. These changes may, however, affect the intermediate goals in years prior to the 2013-2014 school year.

A school shall be considered a new school if 60% or more of the assessed students are new to the school once the school has been restructured; or it is the first year of operation of the newly constructed school; or it is the first year of operation of a charter school; or 2 or more grade levels in which the state AYP assessments are administered have been added to the school or the charter school's charter.

Operational definition for AYP determinations for new schools: newly constructed schools begin the AYP timeline at the beginning. The first year all schools are given a designation and the second year provides the two-year comparison data. Restructured schools in which the restructured school meets the above requirements will begin the AYP timeline anew.

New schools are recognized in Nevada each year prior to the start of the school year. Since they must be assigned a school number and incorporated into the statewide student information system, staff are able to make the necessary programmatic changes to incorporate them into the AYP analyses.

¹⁰ 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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

For all state tests, Nevada employs a methodology of requiring the submission of a test answer document for every student enrolled during the testing window. The returned answer documents are scanned, scored, and included in a data file used in the AYP analyses. Student records are then assigned a participation value of 0 or 1 for each of the content areas based upon student responses and other coding on the student answer document. Students are counted as having participated so long as they attempt to take the test. An attempt is defined as a returned answer document which includes valid responses. Students with disabilities who test under modified testing conditions are not counted as having participated on the assessment.

For grades 3-8, the number of students in the data file with a participation credit of 1 in a particular content area (for the district or school as a whole and each subgroup) are divided by the total number of students in the file for that district, school or subgroup.

An assessment auditing protocol has been developed for the purpose of monitoring student test participation at the school level. Nevada's testing contractor creates a two-part alert file that lists students who tested but were not in the barcode file and those students who were in the barcode file but for which an answer document was not returned. Each school district is provided with a list of students that the NDE believes to be non-participants and the district has the opportunity to identify legitimate non-participants, such as those transferring out of state shortly before the testing window.

For AYP at the high school level, students enrolled in grade 11 during the week of the spring (March or April) administration of the HSPE are pulled from the statewide student information system, then matched against any current or previous participation on the High School Proficiency Examination. The "best" result is used as the student's score for purposes of AYP. In order to receive participation credit, the student must have either passed the HSPE in a particular subject area prior to the spring of 11th grade or have participated in the spring test administration of their 11th grade.

All public schools and districts (LEAs) are held accountable to the 95% participation rate. ([NRS 385.3613](#)).

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		
<p>For schools or subgroups with 20 or more students, participation rate percentages will be compared against the 95% threshold. For schools or subgroups with fewer than 20 students, Nevada compares the number of students tested with the number enrolled and uses participation target of “N – 1”. Therefore, in these comparisons, the school or subgroup must test all but one of the enrolled students in order to have met the AYP target for participation.</p>		

Appendix A: Consequences for Schools and Districts Failing AYP

Watch List	Year 1 & Year 1 Hold	Year 2 & Year 2 Hold	Year 3 & Year 3 Hold	Year 4 & Year 4 Hold	Year 5 & Year 5 Hold
	Needs Improvement Status	Needs Improvement Status	Needs Improvement Status	Needs Improvement Status	Needs Improvement Status
LEA Technical Assistance	Continue LEA Technical Assistance	Continue LEA Technical Assistance	Continue LEA Technical Assistance	Continue LEA Technical Assistance	Continue LEA Technical Assistance
	School Choice (Title I only)	School Choice (Title I only)	School Choice (Title I only)	School Choice (Title I only)	School Choice (Title I only)
		Supplemental Services (Title I only)	Supplemental Services (Title I only)	Supplemental Services (Title I only)	Supplemental Services (Title I only)
			School Support Team	School Support Team	School Support Team
			<p>Corrective Action:</p> <p>New curriculum (& PD to support it)</p> <p>~ Decrease number of managerial duty employees</p> <p>~ Extend school year or day</p> <p>And for Title I –</p> <p>~ Replace staff</p> <p>~ Decrease management authority at school</p> <p>~ Outside expert</p> <p>~ Restructure internal organization of school</p>	<p>Corrective Action:</p> <p>New curriculum (& PD to support it)</p> <p>~ Decrease number of managerial duty employees</p> <p>~ Extend school year or day</p> <p>And for Title I –</p> <p>~ Replace staff</p> <p>~ Decrease management authority at school</p> <p>~ Outside expert</p> <p>~ Restructure internal organization of school</p>	<p>Corrective Action:</p> <p>New curriculum (& PD to support it)</p> <p>~ Decrease number of managerial duty employees</p> <p>~ Extend school year or day</p> <p>And for Title I –</p> <p>~ Replace staff</p> <p>~ Decrease management authority at school</p> <p>~ Outside expert</p> <p>~ Restructure internal organization of school</p>

Appendix B: Recognition for Schools & Districts Making AYP

Status Requirement	Designation	Recognition Qualifications
Made AYP for current year and is not In Need of Improvement	Adequate	Met AMO targets for all three achievement indicators
Made AYP for current year and is not In Need of Improvement	High Achieving-Status	District or school must include at least one special population group besides district or school as a whole. Each special population group must exhibit achievement significantly above the target (AMO) in English language arts and in mathematics.
Made AYP for current year and is not In Need of Improvement	High Achieving-Growth	District or school as a whole exhibits a rate of change minus its Confidence Interval that is at least 10% for English language arts and mathematics.
Made AYP for current year and is not In Need of Improvement	Exemplary	District or school meets requirements for both High Achieving –Status and for High Achieving – Growth; or has met the requirements for Exemplary in the prior year and has demonstrated no significant increase in non-proficient students.
Made AYP for current year and is not In Need of Improvement	Exemplary Turnaround	Within three years of being designated In Need of Improvement, the district or school attained Exemplary or High Achieving designation.

Appendix C

Assessment Auditing Protocol

Prepared by: Andrew J. Parr, Evaluation Consultant
Nevada Department of Education

The State of Nevada's policy is to test all students. The assessment auditing protocol for grades 3 to 8 that is described below is based upon two basic notions. First, the audit must account for the assessment participation for every student in grades three to eight. Second, the burden of work for completing the audit should primarily fall on the NDE and testing contractors rather than Nevada's districts or schools. The revised assessment auditing protocol is listed below in chronological order.

1. The NDE will produce PreID files and districts will edit those files.
2. PreID labels will be sent directly to the district or school.
3. When a PreID student is not enrolled on the school's test date, the PreID label will be destroyed by the school.
4. After testing is complete, each school shall:
 - a. Return all student completed PreID answer documents to the assessment contractor (MP)
 - b. Return all hand-bubbled student completed answer documents to the assessment contractor (MP)
5. The assessment contractor shall provide an assessment data file to the NDE with student scores.
6. After all CRT data files are processed by MP, the assessment contractor shall provide the NDE with an "Alert File", which will contain two lists.
 - a. A list of students in the PreID file but for which no answer document was returned.
 - b. A list of students submitting an answer document but were not included in the PreID file.
 - c. Each list will contain student identifiers, school and district codes, and other demography necessary to establish student enrollment status.
7. The NDE shall process the file and load into the NDE student information system in order to establish enrollment status for each student on the Alert list as of March 24.
8. The NDE shall remediate and produce a file listing all students who the NDE identifies as nonparticipants or non-test takers.
9. The NDE shall provide the list of identified non-participants for each school district to examine and have the opportunity to identify legitimate non-participants.
 - a. Students transferring from a school on a year-around schedule to a school to a traditional schedule
 - b. Out of state student transfers during the testing window
10. After district review, the NDE shall prepare a summary report which will include the number and percentages of non-participants from each district and each school and other related data.

The assessment auditing process for the HSPE Program is somewhat different and no revisions are being proposed at this time.

1. The NDE creates the 11th Grade AYP Cohort from the Nevada student information system (SAIN) in April based on enrollment status as of the Wednesday of the March Administration testing window, which is March 18 for the current testing year.
2. The composition of or inclusion of individual students in 11th Grade AYP Cohort is validated by each school district.
3. After the 11th grade AYP Cohort is established, SAIN identifies the highest valid reading, math, and writing score for each cohort member from previous HSPE administrations up to and including the March HSPE administration.

4. If the highest valid reading, math, and writing HSPE scores are passing for any student in the 11th Grade AYP Cohort, the student is considered to have participated in the 11th grade testing (March administration) for AYP purposes regardless of the HSPE administration date.
5. If any of the highest valid reading, math, or writing HSPE scores is not passing, SAIN determines whether or not the student participated in the March HSPE administration through the identification of a valid score in the specified content area(s) not yet passed.
 - a. If a valid score is identified for the content area not yet passed, the student is considered a participant for the purpose of AYP analyses.
 - b. If no valid score is identified for the content area not yet passed, the student is considered a non-participant for the purpose of AYP analyses.
6. Nevada school districts are afforded the opportunity to review the participation status for those in the 11th Grade AYP Cohort for accuracy and notify the NDE as to any discrepancies.