

## **Determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

*(Updated September 29, 2004)*

### **Introduction**

AYP is defined as a series of performance targets that states, school districts, and schools must achieve each year to meet the requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). In each public school and LEA in North Carolina, there may be up to ten student subgroups who must meet the prescribed targets. These subgroups are officially defined as:

1. School as a Whole (all students)
2. American Indian
3. Asian
4. Black
5. Hispanic
6. Multi-Racial
7. White
8. Economically Disadvantaged (Free and Reduced Lunch)
9. Limited English Proficient (LEP)
10. Students with Disabilities (SWD)

For AYP calculations for a school, a subgroup must have at least 40 students who have been in membership a full academic year (FAY), defined as 140 days in membership as of the first day of End-of-Grade (EOG) testing.

In order for a school to make AYP, each student subgroup must meet certain targets. Each subgroup must have at least an average 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments (reading and mathematics); each subgroup must meet or exceed the State's annual measurable objectives (AMOs), and the school as a whole must show progress on the other academic indicator (OAI), which is either attendance (in schools that **do not** graduate students) or graduation rate (in schools that **do** graduate students). Progress on the other academic indicator (OAI) is defined as at least 0.1 percentage point increase from one year to the next, up to a threshold of 90%. (Any fluctuation above 90% will meet the requirement for progress.)

The AMOs were set based on 2001-02, 2000-01, and 1999-00 performance data, according to procedures prescribed by NCLB. In grades 3 through 8, for the 2002-03 and 2003-04 school years, they are: 68.9% proficiency in reading and 74.6% in mathematics. In Grade 10, the AMOs are 52.0% in reading and 54.9% in mathematics. AMOs will increase incrementally in 2004-05, 2007-08, and 2010-11, until the AMOs become 100% in 2013-14.

In summary, to determine if a school makes AYP, each student subgroup (including the school as a whole must meet these targets:

1. 95% Participation Rate in Reading assessment;
2. 95% Participation Rate in Mathematics assessment;
3. Annual Measurable Objective in Reading; and
4. Annual Measurable Objective in Mathematics, and
5. The school as a whole must also show progress on the:  
Other Academic Indicator: Attendance **OR** Graduation Rate.

### **Safe Harbor Provision**

If a subgroup meets the 95% participation rate but does **not** meet an AMO for a subject area, the subgroup can still meet the AMO with a safe harbor provision if:

1. the subgroup has reduced the percent of students not proficient by 10% from the preceding year for the subject area; and
2. the subgroup shows progress on the OAI.

A safe harbor data file will be provided by DPI. These data will be the previous years' proficiency results by subgroup, in a data file that has all the AYP decision rules applied, i.e., 140 days in membership and 40 students in a subgroup. Safe harbor "is not a right," however. If a subgroup does not have the minimum numbers of students or scores required in the safe harbor (i.e., previous year's) file, then that subgroup's performance on its annual measurable objectives (AMOs) is determined using the current year's data, without using safe harbor.

### **Operational Procedures**

The Division of Accountability Services provides software for LEAs to calculate and check their AYP results. The results for all schools were released statewide by LEAs in mid-July 2004. The reports included the numbers and percentages of AYP targets met by the school. These results are subject to confirmation by DPI in the ABCs report submitted to the State Board of Education (SBE) in August 2004.

NCLB sanctions applied only to Title I schools in 2003; however, non-Title I schools that do not make AYP two years in a row (which could happen in 2004) will have to amend their school improvement plans to indicate how they plan to improve.

Considerations for AYP calculations:

1. There must be at least 40 students in a subgroup.
2. Students must have been in membership a full academic year 140 days (FAY) for calculations in reading and mathematics proficiency targets, and attendance (but not graduation rate).
3. All students who meet the FAY requirement are counted in the school as a whole (even if they are not counted in another subgroup due to there being fewer than 40).
4. For schools with fewer than 40 students assessed in the tested grades in the entire school in the current year, whatever data are available will be used to calculate AYP. The report will note "results based on less than 40 students, and should be interpreted with caution."

5. For each AMO and OAI target, full precision is carried throughout intermediate calculations; the final result is rounded to the nearest tenth and status is based on the rounded result. For percent tested targets, the final result is rounded to the nearest whole number.
6. In K-2 schools, special education schools, hospital schools, and vocational and career centers, a feeder pattern will be used to determine AYP.
  - a. For K-2, the school that receives the largest percent of students is used to determine AYP status.
  - b. For the special education schools, vocational and career schools, and hospital schools, at least half the feeding schools must make AYP for the receiving school to be designated as making AYP.

AYP proficiency statistics are reported for the LEA and the State, in addition to the school. With AYP calculations, proficiency data for the LEAs are based on different data than the proficiency statistics for the schools. For example, there is a federal requirement to count students who have been in the LEA for at least 140 days (full academic year), even though they may not have been in a single school within that LEA for 140 days. This means some students would be counted for AYP proficiency at the LEA level but not at the school level. You cannot, therefore, combine the school-based AYP proficiency statistics (e.g. by using a weighted average) in order to compute the AYP proficiency statistics for the LEA.

### **Changes in 2003-04**

The State Board of Education and the U.S. Department of Education (USED) approved changes in the process for determining AYP for the 2003-04 accountability year that included:

1. The addition of a new ABCs recognition category, *Honor Schools of Excellence*, to denote schools that made expected or high growth and met AYP.
2. Allowing a process for medical exclusions from testing for students with serious medical conditions.
3. Averaging participation rates for the last two or three years, depending on how many years of data were available, whenever a school did not meet the 95% participation standard for the current year.
4. Special analysis of AYP for targeted assistance schools (TAS). The first analysis used all students in the school. If the TAS did not meet AYP, then the results for Title I served students were analyzed; if AYP was still not met, then the results for students eligible for Title I were analyzed. (These additional analyses were contingent upon the LEA “tagging” the appropriate students for the analyses.) Unless the TAS met the minimum number of 40 students being served or eligible to be served then the results were based on all students in the school. If the school provided services in only one subject area, then the LEA determined if the results for AYP for each subject were based on only the served students, only the eligible students or all of the students in the school. The OAI could be calculated on any of the options unless safe harbor needed to be invoked. In that case, the same criteria was used for comparison purposes (only those served or only those eligible). If this was not possible, then the OAI was based on all students in the

- school. Results from all students in the TAS are to be used for making AYP decisions at the LEA and State levels. For schools without tested grades, AYP could be determined by back-mapping or forward-mapping students.
5. Applying a 95% confidence interval to the percentages of students scoring proficient in reading and/or mathematics to determine if subgroups met the AMO.
  6. Requiring a Title I school not making AYP to miss targets in the same subject (e.g., reading) for two successive years before entering Title I School Improvement.
  7. Placing a 1.0 percent cap on the percentage of students held to alternate achievement standards and deemed proficient (through the NCAAP, and NCAAAI administered at least three years or more below students' assigned grade levels) at the district and State levels.
  8. Not requiring LEP students (who score below Intermediate High on the reading section of the language proficiency test) in their first year in U.S. schools to be assessed on the reading End-of-Grade tests, High School Comprehensive Test in Reading, or the NC Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory (NCAAAI) for reading. (Schools were to use the language proficiency test for determining the 95% participation; mathematics results were not used in determining AYP or ABCs performance composite scores for LEP students who scored below Intermediate High.) Students previously identified as LEP who exited LEP identification during the last two years were included in the AYP calculations only if the subgroup already met the minimum number of 40 students.
  9. Setting the minimum N count used in determining the AYP status of LEAs at 40 or 1% of the full academic year (FAY) students, whichever was greater. (Operationally, the LEA is treated as a school, and the 1% is based on students meeting the full academic year (FAY) requirement in grades 3 through 8 and high school.)
  10. Providing that an LEA could enter Improvement Status only if the LEA did not make AYP in the same subject area in both the 3-8 and high school grade spans for two consecutive years.
  11. Allowing site visits by a School Improvement team to make AYP designations for schools with two (2) or fewer students meeting the FAY requirements.