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Part I

Main Provisions for AYP under the NCLBA - Sec. 1111 and One California District (CA) Performance
I. Goal, Timeline, and Year of Starting Point

100%

12 Years

Percent of Students (%)
II. Type of Groups of Students to Be Separately Evaluated*- CA

* For a group to be included in the evaluation the number of students in the group should be sufficient to yield statistically reliable information. This study uses 30 as minimum number.

- All
- Asian (4.5%)
- White (73.3%)
- Am Ind (2.1%)
- Hispanic (10.7%)
- FRL (35.2%)
- Af Am (7.5%)
- SWD (4.1%)
- LEP (7.7%)
Percentage of Students: NC vs. CA for Major Ethnic Groups and Disadvantaged Groups

- **Percentage of NC Students:**
  - Asian: 1.9%
  - Black: 4.6%
  - Hispanic: 1.5%
  - Am. Indian: 1.5%
  - Multiracial: 2.3%
  - White: 38.5%
  - FRL: 7.7%
  - SWD: 10.7%
  - LEP: 2.1%

- **Percentage of CA Students:**
  - Asian: 30.2%
  - Black: 2.1%
  - Hispanic: 60.3%
  - Am. Indian: 12.1%
  - Multiracial: 35.2%
  - White: 35.2%
  - FRL: 4.1%
  - SWD: 7.7%
III. Separate Assessments of Reading, and Math for Each of All Valid Student Groups

**CA Reading - 1998 to 2002**

The graph shows the percent of students (%) in each of the specified groups from 1997-98 to 2001-02. The groups include:

- Asian
- White
- All
- Am Indian
- Hispanic
- FRL
- Af American
- SWD
- LEP

The data indicates trends and changes in performance over the years for each group.
III. Separate Assessments of Reading, and Math for Each of All Valid Student Groups

CA Math - 1998 to 2002

Percent of Students (%)
IV. Initial Bars

Achievement Bar: A single minimum percentage applies separately to each group of students

Initial Bars: Based on the higher of the percentage of students at the proficient level who are in (i) the State’s lowest achieving group of students, or (ii) the school at the 20th percentile in the State, based on enrollment, among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level

Based on CA Stanford/9 1997-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Lowest Group</th>
<th>The 20th Percentile School*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>46.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>45.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Weighted by enrollment
V. Choice for Raising Subsequent Bars
Raising Bars Annually vs. Every Three Years
Scenario (1): Reading Achievement Bars
Base line: 20th percentile school’s percentage weighted by enrollment
Subsequent achievement bars: Raised annually
Scenario (1): Math Achievement Bars

Base line: 20th percentile school’s percentage weighted by enrollment

Subsequent achievement bars: Raised annually
Scenario (2): Reading Achievement Bars

Base line: 20th percentile school’s percentage weighted by enrollment
Subsequent achievement bars: Raised every 3 years (including base line year)
Scenario (2): Math Achievement Bars

Base line: 20th percentile school’s percentage weighted by enrollment
Subsequent achievement bars: Raised every 3 years (including base line year)
VI. AYP Consideration (AYPC/Safe Harbor)

If any group of students does not meet /exceed the achievement bar but meet the following conditions, it can be considered to make AYP:

i) The percentage of students in that group who do not meet or exceed the proficient level for that year decreases by 10% from the proceeding school year;

ii) That group makes progress on one or more of the academic indicators, such as attendance rate, graduation rate, percentage in gifted/talented programs, and etc.

Meet AYPC: 2002-03

BP_t-1 = 100 - P_{t-1} = 40  
BP_t = 34 < BP_{t_AYPC} = 36

AP_{t-1} = 60  
AP_t = 66 > AP_{t_AYPC} = 64

BP: Percent below Proficient Level
AP: Percent at/above Proficient Level
t: Current year
t-1: Previous year
VI. AYP Consideration (AYPC/Safe Harbor)

If any group of students does not meet /exceed the achievement bar but meet the following conditions, it can be considered to make AYPC:

i) The percentage of students in that group who do not meet or exceed the proficient level for that year decreases by 10% from the proceeding school year;

ii) That group makes progress on one or more of the academic indicators, such as attendance rate, graduation rate, percentage in gifted/talented programs, and etc.

Fail to Meet AYP: 2002-03

\[ BP_{t-1} = 100 - P_{t-1} = 40 \quad BP_t = 38 > BP_{t_{AYPC}} = 36 \]

\[ AP_{t-1} = 60 \quad AP_t = 62 < AP_{t_{AYPC}} = 64 \]
VII. Uniform Averaging Procedure
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**VIII. For a School/LEA Making Annual Improvement – AYP**

Every school/LEA-level group must pass following four yellow cells
Any group fails in any yellow cell, whole school/LEA will be identified failing to make AYP

Separate Evaluation Available Valid Groups:
- School as a group, FRL group, LEP group, Disabled group, White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Multiracial, Am. Indian

- **Reading**
  - AYP
  - 95% rule
    - Yes
      - 10% reduction rule
        - High school Graduation rate
    - No
      - One other indicator
        - Elementary & Middle school Attendance rate

- **Math**
  - AYP
  - 95% rule
    - Yes
  - 10% reduction rule
    - High school Graduation rate
  - No
    - One other indicator
      - Elementary & Middle school Attendance rate
VIII. For a School/LEA Making Annual Improvement – AYP

Every school/LEA-level group must pass following five yellow cells
Any group fails in any yellow cell, whole school/LEA will be identified failing to make AYP

Separate Evaluation Available Valid Groups:
School as a group, FRL group, LEP group, Disabled group,
White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Multiracial, Am. Indian

Reading
(1) 95% rule
Yes
No
10% reduction rule
Another indicator

(2) AYP
Yes

Math
(3) 95% rule
Yes
No
10% reduction rule
Another indicator

(4) AYP

One Other Indicator
(5) High school graduation rate
(5) Elementary & middle school Attendance rate
AYP Simulation for CA

• The data of 1997-98 CA NRT Stanford/9 were used for setting the starting point. The data of 1998-99 to 2001-02 were used for simulation.

• Any student group had a population of 30 or more was included in the evaluation for the AYP.

• This simulation for the AYP did not take “95%” rule into account, nor did the other indicators.

• The AYP results included “Safe Harbor” rule. The “Safe Harbor” calculation only included “10% reduction” rule, and did not include “progress on one or more of the academic indicators” rule.
Annual Improvement -- AYP/AYPC (Including Safe Harbor)

Example: A School Made Annual Improvement - AYP - in Reading: 2002-03

![Graph showing annual improvement in reading for different years with data points for each year from 2000-01 to 2002-03.](image)
Annual Improvement -- AYP/AYPc (Including Safe Harbor)

Example: A School Failed Making Annual Improvement - AYP - in Math: 2002-03
Scenario (2): CA LEA Reading - AYP

![Line chart showing percent of students by year and category. The x-axis represents years from 1997-98 to 2002-03, and the y-axis represents percent of students (%). There are multiple lines representing different categories, each marked with different colors and symbols.](chart.png)
Scenario (1): CA LEA Math - AYP
Scenario (2): CA LEA Math - AYP
Percentage of CA Schools Made AYP
Scenario (1) vs. (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scenario (1)</th>
<th>Scenario (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of CA School-level Groups Made AYP: 2001-02
Scenario (1) vs. (2)
Part II

School Awards and Improvement under the NCLBA - Sec. 1117 & Sec. 1116 and One California District (CA) Performance
I. Academic Achievement Awards, Distinguished Schools, and Awards to Teachers

- State shall establish a program for making academic achievement awards to recognize schools that significantly closed the achievement gap between the groups, or exceeded adequate yearly progress, for 2 or more consecutive years.
- Schools that have made the greatest gains in closing the gap or exceeding adequate yearly progress shall designate as distinguished schools.
- Recognize and financial awards to teachers teaching in above schools.
Percentage of CA Schools Made 3 or 4 Consecutive Years AYP
Scenario (1) vs. (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3Ys_99-01</th>
<th>3Ys_00-02</th>
<th>4Ys_99-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario (1)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario (2)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Schools (%)
II. Title I School Improvement

• Any Title I school \textbf{fails, for 2 consecutive years,} to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) shall be identified for \textit{school improvement (SI)}. LEA shall send assistant team to the SI school and provide students enrolled in the SI school with \textit{public school choice} next year (the 3rd year).

• LEA shall further notice to parent for public school choice and to obtain \textit{supplemental educational services} (the 4th year) for the child in any Title I School \textbf{fails to make AYP} by the end of first full school year after enter the SI (including total 3 \textit{consecutive years}).
Percentage of CA Schools Failed AYP Two Consecutive Years
Scenario (1) vs. (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario (1)</th>
<th>Scenario (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI01</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI02</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI03</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of CA Schools Failed AYP Three Consecutive Years
Scenario (1) vs. (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>SES02</th>
<th>SES03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SES02: Scenario (1) 55.6%, Scenario (2) 44.4%
- SES03: Scenario (1) 64.9%, Scenario (2) 50%
III. Corrective Action

• After a Title I school enters SI, if the school further fails to make AYP by the end of the second full school year (including total 4 consecutive years), this school shall be in corrective action next year (the 5th year).

• LEA shall continue to provide to students and parents in the school with public school choice and supplemental educational services.

• LEA shall take at least one of the following action:
  – Replace relevant school staff;
  – New curriculum;
  – Significantly decrease management authority at school;
  – Appoint outside expert;
  – Extend school day or year;
  – Restructure internal organization.
Percentage of CA Schools Failed AYP Four Consecutive Years
Scenario (1) vs. (2)

Scenario (1)
55.6

Scenario (2)
44.4
IV. Restructuring

• After 1 full school year of corrective action, a school continues to fail to make AYP, (including total 5 consecutive years), this school shall prepare a plan and make necessary arrangements to carry out alternative governance (AG) in the next year (the 6th year).

• Not later than the beginning of the school year following the preparation plan year (the 7th year), any CA Title I school shall implement one of the following alternative governance arrangement:
  – Reopen as charter.
  – Replace all or most relevant school staff.
  – Contract with private management.
  – The State takes over.
  – Any other major restructuring.
V. Duration

Any Title I School in SI or CA, after making AYP for *two consecutive school years*, this school can be out of SI or CA.
Part III

Six Suggestions
I. Substantially Invest in Organizational Capacity:

1. Develop internal coherence of beliefs and expectations;
2. Develop instructional capacity;
3. Support teachers in acquiring the knowledge and skill required to reach the high standard set by the NCLB.
II. Professional Development

(A) Highly qualified teachers - by law:
1. For all teachers: State certification or Licensing exam, AND
2. BA degree, AND
3. For new teachers: rigorous tests
   For non new teachers: rigorous tests or State evaluation.

(B) Teachers with Experience in teaching with diverse student groups and minorities.
III. Improve Teaching & Learning

Actively use the findings from scientifically based researches: research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities & programs.
Eleven Schools
Made 4 Consecutive Years AYP

002 109 112 120
127 130 133 139
167 168 172
IV. Work Effectively and Deliberately:

1. State Level
2. LEA Level
3. School Level
4. Class Level
Unlimited Use of “Safe Harbor”

Percent of Students (%)
School Level FRL Group
Movement Crossing the Margin of Proficient Level: Reading

- Under Grade Level in both 2001 & 2002: 35.1%
- At-Above Grade Level in 2001 under Grade Level in 2002: 7%
- Under Grade Level in 2001 At-Above Grade Level in 2002: 7.1%
- At-Above Grade Level in both 2001 & 2002: 50.8%
School/Classroom Level

Reading Grade 3: List of Marginal Students with FRL
School/Classroom Level

Reading Grade 4: List of Marginal Students with FRL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Scale Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bliss</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cieprot</td>
<td>3276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromartie</td>
<td>7517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>5974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>3449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLellen</td>
<td>3977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millicen</td>
<td>5214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricks</td>
<td>4279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Closing Achievement Gaps

All groups should make progress

Low-performing groups should make higher progress
Have the achievement gaps been closed?
How have the achievement gaps been closed?
How have the achievement gaps been closed?
How have the achievement gaps been closed?
How have the achievement gaps been closed?
How have the achievement gaps been closed?
AYP Does Not Automatically Translate to Closing the Gaps
toward the 100% Goal or at the Desired Pattern
Closing the Gaps toward the 100% Goal for Each Group
Can Translate to AYP
VI. Urgent Tasks:

1. Act today and act right now;
2. Disaggregate student data at LEA-level, school-level, grade-level, and classroom-level;
3. Calculate 10% reduction bars for each of the above groups for 2002-03 school year and make efficient plan for reaching the goal;
4. Locate marginal students for each valid student group around proficiency level and work with them effectively;
5. Identify “VIS” students who will impact three or more student groups and work with them deliberately;
6. Work with all students successfully.