

Understanding Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)



This brochure is designed for Educators within the
Carson City School District
2008-09

Produced by the
Educational Services Department
 1402 West King St.
 Carson City, NV 89702
 (775)283-2110

On January 9th, 2002, President Bush signed into law HR 1, the Federal “No Child Left Behind” Act (NCLB). This reauthorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and its sweeping reforms has impacted every state including Nevada. In response to the new federal law, the Nevada Legislature significantly revised its own accountability statutes through passage of Senate Bill 1 during the 19th Special Session (June, 2003).

At the heart of both statutes is a school, school district, and state accountability model working under the auspice of guaranteeing all students the opportunity for, and access to, a challenging and meaningful educational experience. School districts and the state as a whole are judged against a set of adequate yearly progress (AYP) criteria.

The judgment of success is based mainly on student performance during standardized tests which are aligned to state content standards. These tests are administered on an annual basis, and include the performance of different subpopulations of students.

NCLB requires states to develop and implement tests in grades 3 through 8, and in at least one grade at the high school level, in English Language Arts (ELA) and math. These tests were fully implemented by the 2005-06 school year. Additionally, by 2007-08 science tests were administered in at least one grade in three separate grade ranges (3-5, 6-8, 9-12).

State assessments used in the AYP process involve multiple-question formats. Criterion-referenced tests include both multiple choice and constructed-response items. Criterion-referenced tests (CRT) are utilized in reading and math at grades 3 through 8 as well as in the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) program. The State also employs performance based writing assessments for grades 5, 8, and 11. (While not used for AYP purposes, Nevada also administers Science assessments in grades 5, 8 and 10.)

Tests used in the AYP process must align with state achievement standards. In essence, this means that the tests must enable a distinction to be drawn between students who are below proficient, proficient, and advanced.

In Nevada, four achievement levels are used. Levels 1 and 2 identify student performances that are below meeting standards or less than proficient.

Nevada Student Achievement Levels
Level 1: Developing/Emergent
Level 2: Approaching Standard
Level 3: Meets Standard
Level 4: Exceeds Standard

States are given the responsibility of determining what level of performance (“cut” score) on state tests are indicative of proficiency.

Nevada Proficiency “Cut” Scores			
Test	Grade	Reading	Math
CRT	3 rd – 8 th	300	300
HSPE	10 th – 12 th	251	304
Writing	5 th and 8 th	12 total for all 4 traits	
	11 th	7 on each prompt	

AYP performance is judged separately for each of our 9 subpopulations groups. These include the school as a whole; five major race/ethnic subpopulations (American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, African American, and White); students with disabilities (IEP); students with limited English proficiency (LEP); and students who are economically disadvantaged (SES).

AYP is determined separately for English/Language Arts (ELA) and for math. For each subject, the State established annual “targets” indicating the minimum percentage of students who must score at or above the “meets standard” level of achievement on the Nevada tests. This percentage must increase annually until 100% of students meet standard in the year 2013-14.

AYP Estimated Annual Targets Through 2013-14

School year	High School	
	ELA	Math
2002-03, 2003-04	73.5%	42.8%
2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07	77.9%	52.3%
2007-08, 2008-09	82.3%	61.9%
2009-10, 2010-11	86.7%	71.3%
2011-12	91.1%	80.8%
2012-13	95.5%	90.3%
2013-14	100%	100%

School year	Middle School	
	ELA	Math
2002-03, 2003-04	37%	32%
2004-05, 2005-06	47.5%	43.3%
2006-07	39.6%	43.3%
2007-08, 2008-09	51.7%	54.6%
2009-10, 2010-11	63.8%	65.9%
2011-12	75.9%	77.2%
2012-13	88%	88.5%
2013-14	100%	100%

School year	Elementary School	
	ELA	Math
2002-03/2003-04	30/27.5%	36/34.5%
2004-05, 2005-06	39.6%	45.4%
2006-07	39.6%	43.3%
2007-08, 2008-09	51.7%	54.6%
2009-10, 2010-11	63.8%	65.9%
2011-12	75.9%	77.2%
2012-13	88%	88.5%
2013-14	100%	100%

If target levels are not met, but the school (or subpopulation) demonstrates at least a 10% decrease in the percentage of non-proficient students from the previous school year, the school can be judged as meeting the AYP requirement. This is referred to as the Safe Harbor provision.

In order to be counted for AYP measurements, subpopulations must have a minimum of 25 students tested within the school.

In addition to the assessment performance, schools are required to have at least 95% of their enrolled students participate on the state tests to meet the AYP requirements. All students enrolled on the test date are expected to participate in the assessment.

For proficiency measurements, only students who are enrolled for a full academic year will be counted. A student who is enrolled on ‘count day’ and continues to be enrolled through the testing window (not formally withdrawn), is considered to have been enrolled for a full academic year.

HR1 also requires that schools be judged with respect to at least one “other” indicator. At the high school level, the NCLB Act requires that graduation rate be used. State statute requires that elementary and middle schools be judged relative to average daily student attendance.

Schools that fail AYP (in like areas) for two consecutive years are designated as “In Need of Improvement” (INOI). To have the INOI designation lifted, schools must meet AYP for two consecutive years.

Schools with an INOI designation face an array of consequences. Consequences are more serious for Title I schools than for non-Title I schools. Title I schools are determined by the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch. Three schools in the Carson City School District are Title I – Bordewich-Bray, Empire and Mark Twain Elementary Schools.

Aside from consequences, every school (whether meeting AYP or not) must complete a school improvement plan and revise the plan on an annual basis. School districts and the Nevada Department of Education must also provide technical assistance to schools identified as in need of improvement.

In Need of Improvement Consequences

<u>Designated INOI</u>	<u>Title I School</u>	<u>Non-Title I School</u>
Year 1	School Choice	District monitor
Year 2	Yr 1 consequence + Supplemental Services	District monitor
Year 3	Yr 1-2 consequences + Corrective Action	NV Dept. of Ed may take corrective actions
Year 4	Yr 1-3 consequences + Plan for Restructure	Department may take corrective actions
Year 5	Yr 1-4 consequences + Alternate Governance	

School Choice – allows any child attending the school the option of transferring to a school in the district that is not identified with INOI designation.

Supplemental Services – include tutoring and after-school services provided by public or private agencies that have been approved by the Nevada Department of Education.

Corrective Action – may include:

- replacing the school staff who are relevant to the failure to make AYP
- institute a new curriculum
- significantly decrease management authority
- appoint outside experts to advise the school
- extend the school year or the school day

Plan to Restructure – using one of the alternate governance arrangements in NCLB.

Alternate Governance – allows turning over the operation of the school to private or public agencies.