

## Evolution of the ABCs (Updated August 5, 2009)

### 1995

1. General Assembly directed the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop a restructuring plan for public education. The State Board conducted an in-depth study involving public hearings, surveys and interviews; reviewed current mandates and operating procedures; and undertook a major organizational analysis to relate all education operations to the mission. In May 1995, the New ABCs of Public Education outlined the framework for a dramatic restructuring.

### 1995-96

2. One hundred eight schools in ten school districts piloted The New ABCs of Public Education. The systems were Albemarle, Alleghany, Asheville City, Elizabeth City-Pasquotank, Duplin, Halifax, Lexington, McDowell, Bladen, and Lincoln.

### 1996

3. General Assembly approved the State Board's plan and put into law the School-Based Management and Accountability Program (the ABCs).

### 1996-97

4. ABCs implementation began for schools with grades K-8. The model included growth and performance composites and included EOG Reading and Mathematics and Writing at Grade 4. The new Grade 7 writing was used only in the performance composite.
5. DPI communicated ABCs Procedures to principals and teachers.
6. Assistance teams were formed and trained; assistance was offered to schools that asked for it.
7. Steering Committee for Assessment and Accountability was established by the SBE to develop the High School Model.
8. Compliance Commission for Accountability was established by the SBE to advise on testing and other issues related to school accountability and improvement. The commission was to be composed of two members from each of eight educational districts and four at-large members to represent parents, business, and the community.
9. The first ABCs Report submitted to the State Board of Education in August.
10. All schools achieving exemplary growth standards received incentive awards (\$1,000 for certified staff; \$500 for teacher assistants).

## 1997-98

11. Designated Low-Performing schools received assistance teams.
12. The next phase of statewide reform was implemented with the high school accountability model. It was considered a “work in progress” with re-examination, changes and adjustments to come.
13. The model included results on five mandated EOCs, a high school writing test (English II – time was extended to allow students 100 minutes); percentages completing College Prep/College Tech Prep (based on a year-to-year change); SAT scores and participation rates were reported.
14. The Comprehensive Test in Reading and Mathematics was administered to determine cohort growth from grade 8 to grade 10. This was to satisfy the Senate Bill 1139 legislation that called for measuring student growth (for high schools). Initially, results were to “count” for the accountability year, but it was decided to delay inclusion of these data in the growth composite for high schools until the following year.
15. Growth for K-8 schools was computed using both the “old” *unmatched* grade 3 parameters, and the “new” (1996-97) *matched* group grade 3 parameters. The higher of the two growth computations was used in the final computations for growth.
16. 7<sup>th</sup> Grade Writing was included in computing growth since this was the third year of data collection; it had previously been used only in the performance composite.
17. Algebra I scores from grades prior to the ninth grade were included in the computations for performance composites for high schools.
18. A confidence band for the performance composite was computed for identifying low-performing schools; this allowed schools a safety margin for sampling error. Schools could be slightly below 50% at or above grade level and not be penalized.
19. ABCs status label *No Recognition* was changed to *Adequate Performance*.
20. Charter Schools were included in the ABCs reporting for the first time.
21. A Comprehensive model was defined for schools that had grades included in both the K-8 and high school configurations. The school faculty voted on whether the Comprehensive model would be used to evaluate the school for the accountability year, and the vote was to be reflected in the School Improvement Plan.
22. Alternative schools were asked to submit proposals of better ways to be evaluated in subsequent accountability years.
23. Reporting guidelines were developed to accommodate feeder patterns for special education schools, alternative schools and K-2 feeder schools; high schools with major demographic shifts were accommodated under special conditions; reporting accommodations were implemented for schools with insufficient data, and guidelines were developed to handle senior high schools under the ABCs.
24. It was decided that during this accountability year, no alternative schools or special schools were to be identified as Low-Performing.
25. EOC test scores, e.g., Algebra I scores, of students in middle grades were used in the high school portion of the performance composite score but not the gain composite score.
26. K-8 and high school results under the ABCs were reported in A Report Card for the ABCs of Public Education, Volume I.
27. All schools making Expected or Exemplary Growth/Gain were awarded incentives per the Excellent Schools Act, enacted by the General Assembly (Up to \$1500 for certified staff, up to \$500 for teacher assistants in schools making Exemplary Growth/Gain; schools making Expected growth/gain received up to \$750 for certified staff; up to \$375 for teacher assistants).
28. A Report Card for the ABCs of Public Education was made available on the DPI web site.

**1998-99**

29. The SBE increased the membership of the Compliance Commission for Accountability from the original 20 members to 22 members to include an SBE member and an additional At-Large business member.
30. The Comprehensive model was applied to all schools.
31. Five additional EOC tests were added to the performance composite score.
32. The High School Comprehensive Test growth parameters were approved; the growth component was included in the high school growth/gain computations.
33. The change in the competency passing rate component was implemented in the high school growth/gain computations.
34. Changes in dropout rates were approved for implementation in the 2000-01 school year for growth calculations.
35. EOC scores in middle schools counted toward the schools' growth/gain and performance.
36. Data collection guidelines and procedures were documented in an Accountability Processing Checklist to incorporate roles of LEA, regional coordinators, and the agency staff.
37. Insufficient data rule was documented for high schools (less than 30 students in a given course for a given year of the three years of data).
38. Dual enrollment policies were documented and disseminated.
39. Membership rule for Comprehensive Tests was approved (160 days).
40. Revised grade 3 parameters were applied to the grade 3 growth computations.
41. A Report Card for the ABCs of Public Education, Volume 2 included ABCs dropout data.
42. Alternative schools with sufficient data were included in the ABCs on the basis of their data; schools with insufficient data were awarded prorated incentives based on the feeder schools.
43. The labels *Top 10/25 Schools* and *Adequate Performance* were changed to *Most Improved 10/25* and *No Recognition*, respectively.

**1999-00**

44. A rule for dropping courses in high school (10/20 Day Rule) was implemented.
45. Alternative Schools were included in the ABCs under HSP-C-013. Web interface was developed for data collection for alternative schools to enter local option data online.
46. Department of Health, Human Services (DHHS) and Office of Juvenile Justice (OJJ) Schools were included in the ABCs.
47. Schools were given test administration options for fall English II Tests due to catastrophic weather.
48. The SBE appointed a Writing Assessment Task Force.
49. Full ABCs documentation was made available on the Accountability web site.

**2000-01**

50. EOC prediction formulas for 10 multiple-choice EOCs were implemented; this fully addressed concerns related to comparing different cohorts over time at the high school level.
51. Dropout rate change was implemented as a component to the growth computations in high schools.
52. Computer Skills testing results at grade 8 were added to the performance composite.

### 2000-01 (continued)

53. EOC prediction formulas' exemplary growth standard was set at 3% more than the expected growth standard.
54. Weighting the ABCs growth composites was adopted by the SBE in part to eliminate concern over small groups of students having the same impact as large groups of students in the determination of whether the school met growth standards.
55. The North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP) was added to the performance composite.
56. Writing at grades 4 and 7 was removed from the growth composites, but remained a part of the performance composite.
57. The North Carolina Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory (NCAAAI) and the Computerized Adaptive Testing System were approved by SBE to be pilot tested and included in ABCs Volume II Report.

### 2001-02

58. The State Board of Education approved revisions to ABCs terminology for the 2001-02 school year.
59. The term *high* growth replaced *exemplary* growth, and the term *growth* replaced *growth/gain* in all designations of meeting or exceeding growth or gain standards.
60. Schools of Distinction were required to make expected growth.
61. Three tests were eliminated for the 2001-2002 school year: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Open-ended Assessments in grades 4 and 8, and the High School Comprehensive Tests in Reading and Mathematics at grade 10. (Only the latter had been included in the ABCs.)
62. English II was suspended and will not be included in the ABCs until new tests for grade 10 Writing are developed. Writing results at grades 4 and 7 were removed from the ABCs performance composite.
63. Format for reporting data in ABCs Volume II was revised, and the name was changed to *Reports of Supplemental Disaggregated State, District and School Performance Data for 2000-2001*.
64. SBE approved the revised achievement levels in mathematics determined from the summer of 2001 equating study for student reporting, student accountability standards gateways, student competency standard, and ABCs reporting (performance composites).
65. Two ABCs reporting categories were added: Schools of Progress (schools that make at least expected growth and have a performance composite of at least 60%) and Priority Schools (schools that have less than 60% performance composite and are not low-performing.)

### 2002-03

66. ABCs 91-Day Rule for Growth Calculations changed to 140-Day Rule to align with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) full academic year (FAY) requirement.
67. The ABCs 98% participation rule for grades 3-8 under the ABCs was changed to 95% to conform to the NCLB 95% participation rule.
68. No exclusions were allowed.
69. Added Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as a "closing the gap component" of the ABCs to meet requirements of General Statute 115C-105.35.
70. North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP) scoring revised to yield Reading and Mathematics scores.

**2002-03 (continued)**

71. The ABCs Report, The ABCs of Public Education 2002-2003 Growth and Performance of North Carolina Schools was made available in electronic format on DPI website. No hardcopy reports were published.

**2003-04**

72. No U.S. History tests were administered in 2003-04. Economic, Legal and Political Systems (ELP) tests were administered for transfer students, students who previously failed the course and students in 10th-12th grade who needed the course for graduation. U.S. History and ELP data will be excluded from the ABCs data analysis for 2003-04 and 2004-05 school years. New EOC tests in these subjects are under development for administration during the 2005-06 school year.
73. Alternative schools' accountability policy was revised to prescribe 8 local options; these revisions were optional for the 2003-04 school year, and mandatory in 2004-05.
74. Certain charter schools became eligible to participate in the ABCs as alternative schools per SBE policy.
75. The Occupational Course of Study (OCS) graduates were subtracted from the denominator of diploma recipients in computing the College University Prep/College Tech Prep component.
76. Writing results (grades 4, 7, and 10) were not included in the ABCs in 2003-04; results at grades 4, 7, and 10 will be included in performance composite in 2004-05.
77. SBE approved a change in weighting the dropout component of the ABCs to  $\frac{1}{4}$  membership, making it comparable to English I weight; this will be applied to the changes in dropout rates reported in the 2004-05 ABCs.
78. The SBE approved adding a recognition category for Schools of Excellence that meet AYP. The new category was named Honor Schools of Excellence.

**2004-05**

79. Writing results (grades 4, 7, and 10) were not included in the ABCs in 2003-04; results at grades 4, 7, and 10 will be included in performance composite in 2005-06.
80. Implementation of weighting the dropout component of the ABCs to  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the membership used for funding was included in growth calculations.
81. SBE approves new growth formulas and standards for the 2005-06 school year and beyond. Included is the calculation of student level growth and a variety of procedural changes precipitated by a provision in general statute from the summer of 2004.
82. SBE approves Report of 2004-05 ABCs with sixth grade reading excluded from the growth calculations.

## 2005-06

83. New editions of the mathematics End-of-Grade assessments were implemented along with new (higher) standards in grades 3-8.
84. New ABCs growth formulas for all grades and subjects were implemented.
85. Writing results (grades 4, 7 & 10) were included in the performance composite using a confidence interval.
86. The following grades and subjects were not used for growth due to new tests and editions: 3<sup>rd</sup> grade math, US History, and Civics & Economics.
87. For schools with an 8<sup>th</sup> grade, the denominator for calculating the percentage of scores proficient for computer skills in the performance composite was based not on the number of test takers but the number of eight grade students on the first day of spring testing.
88. AYP for 3-8 mathematics used implied performance from 2004-05 (using the 2005-06 math standards) as a basis for safe harbor.
89. A fundamental change in the way High Growth is computed was implemented. The standard was changed to include the ratio of students who meet their individual growth standard compared to those who do not.
90. For the first time, average growth per student at the school level is reported as is the ratio used to determine high growth.
91. Fundamental changes in data collection moved the source of the demographic information used in AYP determinations from answer sheets to authoritative sources.
92. As a U.S. Department of Education Pilot, North Carolina was one of only two states allowed to use growth as part of AYP determinations.
93. Growth by AYP group is reported for all students in the web presentation of school detail results.
94. Two new alternate assessments were implemented to meet the needs of students with particular issues accessing a standard test administration. NCCLAS and NCEXTEND2 replaced NCAAAI. NCEXTEND2 was included in AYP and the performance composite subject to a 2% cap at the LEA level of students being counted as proficient on this alternate assessment.
95. North Carolina was one of only 10 states that had received approval of its assessment system following the peer review process prior to June 30, 2006 (the USED deadline to receive such approval).
96. Due to the implementation of the new edition of the mathematics EOG assessments and subsequent setting of new standards, ABCs reporting was approved by the SBE in November and High School results were approved by the SBE (independent of lower grade level results) in October.
97. USED approved new annual measurable objectives for mathematics in grades 3-8 to account for the higher achievement level standards adopted by the SBE.

### 2006-07

98. New test editions for Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry and English I End-of-Course assessments were administered with new (higher) achievement level standards.
99. In order to combine the results from 10<sup>th</sup> graders taking the new EOC assessments with those 10<sup>th</sup> graders who had banked scores from the former editions of the Algebra I and English I EOC assessments, the NCDPI equated the new assessment scores to the old scale using an equi-percentile method and continued to use the existing annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for the 2006-07 reporting of AYP at the high school level.
100. The new 4-year cohort graduation rate was used to determine if a subgroup can access safe harbor at the high school level. The SBE adjusted the threshold of 90% to 80% for the graduation rate.
101. The final regulations posted in the *Federal Register* dated April 9, 2007, regarding the one percent cap for students with significant cognitive disabilities and the two percent cap for students assessed using modified assessments were implemented.

### 2007-08

102. New test editions were introduced for End-of Grade (EOG) Reading (grades 3-8), Biology, Chemistry, Physical Science, and Physics; and a shorter test was used for Algebra II. The State Board of Education (SBE) decided to remove these tests from ABCs calculations of academic change but to retain the results in the ABCs performance composites. Standard setting procedures were performed for the Biology EOC.
103. To accommodate the additional timeline for scaling and setting standards on the EOG reading tests, a two-stage release of AYP results was conducted. The initial release of preliminary AYP results by Local Education Agencies (LEAs) occurred July 21, 2008, revealing AYP results for high schools and partial AYP results for grades 3-8 (Mathematics only). The remaining AYP results for Reading in grades 3-8 were released at the November SBE meeting.
104. To accommodate differences in the scales between the new editions and the scales for previous editions (used for the banked scores), new standards for Reading, expressed through Achievement Level III cut scores, were set for the banked scores equivalent to the standards on the new test editions. This was implemented by an equipercentile approximation of the new edition cut scores on the previous edition tests and then recalculating student proficiency on the previous test editions. This made the proficiency determinations based on the banked scores comparable to proficiency determinations on the new editions of Algebra I and English I.
105. The new Reading standards were also applied to the previous test editions for the calculation of safe harbor.
106. New AMO targets were set for Grade 10 "reading" and "mathematics" (as structured for AYP purposes).
107. Because the State Board of Education removed the Biology EOC from ABCs growth calculations, and because scores on the previous edition of the Biology EOC test were the primary predictor for U.S. History, the prediction equation for U.S. History was re-evaluated. Scores on the Civics and Economics EOC were found to be acceptable substitutes. Consequently, for ABCs growth calculations, scores on the Civics and Economics and English I EOCs were used as predictors for U.S. History if both were available. Otherwise, scores on the Civics and Economics EOC were used as a single predictor of U.S. History.

108. The U. S. History formula for academic change was revised to use either Civics & Economics or Biology as the primary predictor in conjunction with English I as the secondary predictor.
109. Students taking the OCS EXTEND2 assessments were counted as non-participating for AYP (included in the denominator but excluded from the numerator). These assessments will continue to be included in calculating the ABCs Performance Composites.
110. The formula for the College University Prep/College Tech Prep (CUP/CTP) component of academic change was modified to give additional credit to schools when the baseline was greater than ninety percent (90%) and the current year's percentage was above ninety percent (90%).
111. The higher of the original scores or Retest 1 EOG reading and mathematics scores in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in the calculation of ABCs performance composites and for AYP. All students who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG assessment were retested. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.)
112. Students with disabilities (SWD), who were no longer classified as SWD for two consecutive years, i. e. exited SWD within the last two years, were included in AYP calculations (same as for students with limited English proficiency).
113. Science results in grades 5 & 8 were included in the ABCs Performance Composite.
114. Students in schools that participated in the American Diploma Project (ADP) Algebra II end-of-course (EOC) pilot were not required to take the NC Algebra II EOC.