

**District of Columbia
Consolidated State Application
Accountability Workbook**

**Plan Submitted
to U.S. Department of Education
<date>**

**District of Columbia
Office of the
State Superintendent of
Education**

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

The District of Columbia’s Consolidated State Accountability Workbook submitted on May 1, 2003 and revised in June 2003, August 2006, February 2008, and February 2009 details the policies and procedures relating to the educational assessment and accountability policies of the District of Columbia. It includes the development, implementation and monitoring of a comprehensive accountability system for all public schools in the District of Columbia, including Public Charter Schools.

All students are held to the same standards and participate in a State assessment aligned to the State academic standards. Assessment data are made public to inform parents and community members about student achievement by school, Local Education Agency (LEA), and the State Education Agency (SEA). The Workbook fulfills all municipal and federal requirements and regulations associated with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

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 all students
F	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of full academic year.
F	2.3	The accountability system properly includes mobile students.

Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations

F	3.1	Accountability system expects all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14.
F	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress.
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a starting point.
F	3.2b	Accountability system establishes statewide annual measurable objectives.
F	3.2c	Accountability system establishes intermediate goals.

Principle 4: Annual Decisions

F	4.1	The accountability system determines annually the progress of schools and districts.
---	-----	--

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

F	5.1	The accountability system includes all the required student subgroups.
F	5.2	The accountability system holds schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups.
F	5.3	The accountability system includes students with disabilities.
F	5.4	The accountability system includes limited English proficient students.
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 graduation rate for high schools.
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.
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 reading/language arts and mathematics.
---	-----	---

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

F	9.1	Accountability system produces reliable decisions.
F	9.2	Accountability system produces valid decisions.
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing changes in assessment and student population.

Principle 10: Participation Rate

F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the rate of participation in the statewide assessment.
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

DRAFT

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Principle 1: All Schools

1.1 Accountability system includes all schools and district in the state.

With the passage of the District of Columbia's Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007 (D.C. Law 17-9), state-level education functions previously performed by the DC Public Schools under the DC Board of Education, were consolidated under the authority of the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE). The OSSE serves as the state education agency and performs the functions of a state education agency for the District of Columbia under applicable federal law, including grant-making, oversight, and state educational agency functions for standards, assessments, and federal accountability requirements for elementary and secondary education. The Act launched the OSSE on October 1, 2007 and reconstituted the former DC Board of Education as the State Board of Education. The Board has approval authority over state academic standards, high school graduation requirements, the state accountability plan, the NCLB report card, and other state-level rules and standards.

The OSSE holds every public school and LEA in the District of Columbia accountable. Students in public charter schools are included in the state assessment program and subject to the same accountability determinations. This means that all public schools and public charter schools participate in the standardized state assessment system and all schools will be held to the same AYP measures. The OSSE identifies the progress of all schools and LEAs in meeting performance objectives for the required populations on the District's state report card.

The definition of a "school" incorporates two criteria: first, the school demonstrates a student membership verifiable in the official enrollment counts; and second, the school program is assigned a budget code and is able to receive state and federal funds. For accountability purposes, all schools and campuses where there is a multi-campus LEA are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have distinct accountability targets (see Appendix B).

Consolidated Schools

The District of Columbia is in the process of consolidating a number of schools. For the purposes of calculating AYP, the OSSE defines a "consolidated school" as one that receives students from a sending school that has merged or closed. OSSE has determined that the receiving school's accountability status is the default status when two schools are consolidated. For example, if the receiving school is in the first year of school improvement, that designation becomes the default baseline status of the consolidated school. On a case-by-case basis, an LEA can petition to have the school or campus status be considered differently than the baseline option described above.

If the consolidated school experiences a change in population of at least forty [40] percent, safe harbor targets for the receiving school are recalculated based upon the

current population's re-rostered scores from the prior testing year and the school's improvement status will not change in the first year of consolidation.

New School Petition Option

If fifty [50] percent or more of the grade spans have changed in the receiving school, the LEA can petition for a school to be considered a "new school" for school improvement purposes. If the SEA approves the petition, the students attending the new school are included in the LEA and state levels for AYP determinations for the first year. In the second year of operation, students attending the new school are included in school, LEA, and state AYP determinations. The SEA will review all appropriate evidence to ensure the change was not made so as to avoid accountability.

Non-Public Placement Programs

In accordance with Section 300.401(b) of the IDEA regulations, students with disabilities who are placed by a public agency in a private school as a means for providing special education and related services are entitled to an education that meets the standards that apply to education provided by the State and LEA. The State's academic standards should apply to these students, and these students should participate in the State's academic assessment system. Approximately 200 State non-public day or residential placement programs served over 1,000 special education students in 2008.

All eligible public school students with disabilities under IDEA whose IEP placement is "Non-Public," are required to participate in the District of Columbia statewide assessment program and be assessed at a testing site approved by the originating local education agency assessment coordinator and under the same test security guidance. Such students' assessment scores are used in determining AYP for the LEAs that placed them in the private school or facility.

Alternative and Correctional/Juvenile Detention Facilities

All eligible public school students who attend an alternative school or are in residential correctional facilities are required to participate in the District of Columbia statewide assessment program. These students are assessed at the location where they receive instruction. Such students' assessment scores are used in determining AYP for the LEAs in which they are currently or most recently enrolled and the facility where they receive instruction.¹

¹ Young adults attending the Oak Hill Academy are attributed to the District of Columbia for purposes of accountability.

Accountability system holds all schools to the same criteria.

All public schools and LEAs are subject to the same performance system. The SEA makes no distinction between schools based on grade level, size of school, poverty status or other disaggregating factor. The local schools and LEAs all administer the same statewide assessments under the DCCAS system and the results from those examinations comprise the data from which AYP decisions are made.

Charter schools in the District of Columbia are both schools and local education agencies and, for the purposes of NCLB reporting, are considered to be schools. If the charter school has multiple campuses, each campus is considered a school for accountability purposes while the multi-campus charter school is considered the LEA.

The participation and performance scores for students in out-of-state non-public placement programs are aggregated in the results of the originating LEA and SEA. Students in these out-of-state placements may be attributed to the originating LEA in one of two ways. If a charter school elects to have District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) be its LEA for Part B of IDEA, the child counts in determining AYP for DCPS. If a charter school elects to be its own LEA under Part B, the charter school must participate in the placement decision and is held accountable for the child's performance.

For "small" schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, school data are aggregating for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.

All AYP calculations are determined by the OSSE. These determinations are then shared with schools and LEA's. Schools and LEAs have a 30 days appeal window to appeal the accuracy of the state data. Determinations are then finalized and reported publicly.

2/19/2009

1.3 Accountability system incorporates, at a minimum, a definition of *basic*, *proficient*, and *advanced* student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Beginning in 2005-2006, the state reported four achievement levels for AYP determination:

1. Advanced
2. Proficient
3. Basic
4. Below Basic

The four performance levels are reported for the general and alternative assessments in reading, science and mathematics tests. Both the general and alternate assessments are based on the approved state content standards. For the DC CAS-Alternate, linking standards are identified so that the grade level content standards are accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities. To make AYP, schools must meet the required percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced levels, the required participation rates, as well as the targets for the additional academic indicators.

Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general reading and math assessments were approved by the State Board of Education in July 2006. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state alternate assessment were approved by the State Board of Education in October 2007. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general and alternate science assessments were approved in October 2008

Standard-setting for the new science assessments was conducted in August 2008 after the first operational administration. With the exception of high school Biology, the performance of all students is measured in relation to their grade levels and out-of-grade testing is not permitted. Grade level science tests were administered in grades 5 and 8 in April 2008. Biology tests were administered for the first time in April 2008.

Draft state policies are under development to include two new requirements: first, that one of the three required laboratory science courses for graduation from a DC public school must be an approved biology course; and second, that all students will be required to take the biology test at least once prior to grade 12. These new requirements will take effect for the class of 2012 although complete cohort data will be reported for 11th graders in SY2010-2011(see below).

Biology results will be banked at the 11th grade level though students may take the Biology test in 9th, 10th, or 11th grade. Since a complete high school data cycle for students at the 11th grade level will not be available until SY2009-2010, the state will implement a transitional reporting plan to maximum the data available to schools and the public.

1.4 Accountability system provides information in a timely manner.

The OSSE makes annual AYP determinations approximately 30 days prior to the beginning of the school year. Below is a generic summary of the SEA activities and deliverables. Dates provided are for School Year 2008-09.

- **August 25:** First day of school; implement Statewide System of Support
- **October 5:** Collect and audit enrollment data
- **April 6:** Testing begins: collect and verify enrollment including all NCLB subgroup data
- **April 8:** DC CAS-Alt data collection ends
- **May 14:** All DC CAS test materials received by test vendor
- **June 11:** SEA receives raw DC CAS and DC CAS-Alt data from the test vendor and conducts quality assurance reviews
- **July 2:** AYP determinations are sent to LEAs for review
- **July 18:** Public release of AYP data
- **July-August:** Respond to appeals by schools and LEA's, disseminate state/district report cards
- **August 1:** LEAs mail letter to parents

The OSSE is implementing the second phase of a new state longitudinal data system (SLED). By July 2009, all required NCLB reports will be produced by the SLED. The SLED system will collect student-level demographic data from all LEAs beginning on February 28, 2009, allowing for reports to be disaggregated by various subgroups once assessment data are available. For SY 2009-2010, the SLED will provide a unique student identifier for all public school students, track daily attendance, and publish all required NCLB reports.

2/19/2009

1.5 Accountability system includes report cards for public schools and LEAs.

Each year, the SEA produces a state, LEA and school report cards, made available on the OSSE website at <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/> and at school offices and libraries throughout the District. School, LEA and SEA report cards were first implemented in SY2002-2003 and have been published in July or August of each subsequent year. In 2006-2007, revisions were also made to include longitudinal data on the report cards and science scores (see Critical Element 1.3).

DRAFT

1.6 Accountability system includes rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs.

SEA policy provides for the establishment of one system of rewards and sanctions. On April 16 2003 the DC Board of Education first approved the DC Consolidated State Accountability Workbook to implement the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This plan represents a unified accountability system – uniformly applicable across all schools – and includes recognitions and rewards for incentive schools, and interventions and sanctions for schools that fail to achieve AYP for either two or three years, respectively. The plan was subsequently revised in June 2003, August 2006, and February 2008.

Incentive Schools

Incentive Schools are identified as schools that achieve Adequate Yearly Progress under NCLB and are recognized and rewarded with increased flexibility and autonomy. For example, schools may be given grants to support and maintain best practices; create Demonstration Models, modeling a best practice at each school that would become a resource to assist low performing schools; develop and maintain high performing teachers and administrators by supporting professional growth through professional development; and ensure teacher development and job-embedded professional development in the areas of English/language arts and/or mathematics.

The District of Columbia's accountability system is fully aligned with the requirements of NCLB. Interventions and sanctions include:

- Schools in Need of Improvement – Year One have not achieved AYP for two consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Provide parents of eligible children the opportunity to transfer to a school not identified as in need of improvement.
 - Complete a written School Improvement Plan identifying issues hindering school improvement and addressing these issues with specific research-based improvement strategies.
- Schools in Need of Improvement – Year Two have not achieved AYP for three consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for Year One schools; and
 - Provide the opportunity for parents of eligible children to select from a state approved list of Supplemental Educational Service providers.
- Schools in Need of Corrective Action – have not achieved AYP for four consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for Year Two schools; and
 - Implement at least one of the following strategies or actions:
 - Replace staff relevant to the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Change curriculum in the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Be permitted less local school management authority
 - Appoint an outside expert to advise the school
 - Extend the school day or school year
 - Restructure the internal organization of the school

- Schools in Need of Restructuring – Year One/Planning have not achieved AYP for five consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for corrective action schools; and
 - Plan for an alternative governance structure to take effect in the following school year that includes at least one of the following actions:
 - Replace staff relevant to the area(s) of failure to achieve AYP
 - Reopen the school as a Public Charter School
 - Enter into a private management contract for the school
 - Enter into an agreement to permit the SEA to operate the school
 - Other restructuring actions that significantly alter the governance.

- Schools in Need of Restructuring – Year Two have not achieved AYP for six consecutive years and the LEA must:
 - Implement the components outlined for Restructuring – Year One schools; and
 - Reopen in accordance with the restructuring plan.

Exiting School Improvement

School in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring that achieved AYP for two consecutive years will be removed from this designation.

PRINCIPLE 2. All Students

2.1 Accountability system includes all students.

The State Accountability System includes students in general education, special education, special education centers, alternative education and non-public private day/residential placements and requires all public school students to participate in the standardized state assessment. Accountability criteria related to the participation rate are detailed in Critical Elements 3.2, 5.1, 5.2, and 10.1. For “small” schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, data are aggregated across years. School data are aggregating for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.

State guidelines are disseminated statewide to guide the assessment of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners.

Students with Disabilities

An alternative assessment is available for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Students with disabilities are identified by their IEP and verified through automated special education data systems where available. Students with a 504 plan are included in calculations like all other students, but they are not included as students with disabilities.

The state recently entered into a formal agreement with USDE to ensure that read-aloud accommodations on the ELA portion of the statewide assessment are reduced considerably. The state recognizes that this accommodation has been over-used and has set aggressive two-year reduction targets for its LEAs.

English Language Learners

Students that are deemed to be English Language Learners participate fully in the State Accountability system. Service levels for English language learners are identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. Students that score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test are classified as LEP or NEP. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test. The exit criterion for the LEP students is a 5.0 on the ACCESS test. Appendix C provides the state’s definition of “Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Population” and the criteria for “Exiting the Bilingual/ESL Program.”

2.2 Accountability system has a consistent definition of full academic year.

A 'full academic year' is defined as enrollment in a public school on the official state (fall) enrollment date in October of each year and the first day of testing (typically in April). The official enrollment from October will be compared to the enrollment in April. The scores of students that participate in the assessment but have not been enrolled for a Fully Academic Year will be reported at the LEA level only.

To count towards a school or LEA's accountability determination, students must also be "continuously enrolled". Continuous enrollment is defined as being enrolled for at least 85% of the Full Academic Year. Students that are not continuously enrolled will be assessed but the scores will not count towards the school's accountability determination.

The following details how the scores of transfer students will be applied for accountability purposes.

- If a student enrolls in more than one school within the same LEA, the student's achievement scores will apply to the LEA and SEA.
- If a student enrolls in schools in multiple LEAs, the student's achievement will apply to the SEA only.

For most students in the state, the dates of enrollment are identified using automated student data bases that are updated in real time by staff at the school level. For some public charter schools which are not part of this student information system, these data are provided to the state using excel files that are created for this purpose in October and April.

2/19/2009

2.3 Accountability system determines which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year.

The OSSE has launched a Statewide Longitudinal Data Warehouse (SLED) to serve as the single integration point of education data for students in the District of Columbia. The SLED's first component includes unique identifiers for all students, which will significantly improve the student tracking process. In addition, it will provide the ability to track daily attendance for all students by linking attendance records from each school's student information system to the unique student identifier. This data will come through either a nightly extract using a school's interoperability framework technology or via a manual file upload that will take place on a weekly basis.

DRAFT

PRINCIPLE 3: Method of AYP Determinations

3.1 Accountability system expects all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14.

The charts for *Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives* are presented in Appendix B that show the progression from the 2001-2002 starting points to 100% proficiency by 2013-2014. These charts were revised in 2005-2006 to incorporate changes in the state reading and math assessments (e.g., establishing new starting points and intermediate steps).

The methodology was the same as that used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003 as prescribed by NCLB and described in Critical Element 3.2a. The goals and objectives clearly state that 100% of students in the SEA are expected to achieve ‘proficient’ or better by SY2013-2014. For accountability purposes, all schools are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have separate accountability targets (see Appendix B).

DRAFT

3.2 Accountability system has a method for determining whether student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, they must meet three requirements. First, a school or LEA must achieve 95 % participation on the state assessments for all subgroups. Second, each subgroup (e.g., whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable achievement objectives in both reading and mathematics. Third, each school and LEA must meet the applicable additional academic indicator – i.e., attendance for elementary schools and graduation rate for secondary schools. A school, LEA, or the state may also achieve the academic targets by meeting the safe harbor provisions outlined below.

For each subgroup to fail to make AYP, a school or LEA must fail to achieve AYP in the same component (i.e., reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) for two consecutive years.

A school or LEA can achieve the ‘Safe Harbor Provision’ of NCLB by meeting all of the following criteria:

- 95% participation rate on state assessment (see Critical Element 10.1)
- % of students in each subgroup scoring below proficiency must decrease by at least 10% compared to the prior year.
- In regard to the other academic indicators (attendance or graduation rate), subgroups must show improvement on the additional academic indicators as specified in Elements 7.1 and 7.2.

3.2a Accountability system establishes a starting point.

The SEA measures achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP. Data are combined across grades for determining AYP – i.e., a weighted proportion. Separate cut scores were determined for each grade level and subject and approved the State Board of Education. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general reading and math assessments were approved by the State Board of Education in July 2006. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state alternate assessment were approved by the State Board of Education in October 2007. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general and alternate science assessments were approved by the State Superintendent for Education in October 2008.

From SY2002-SY2005, the following general grade-spans were included for determining AYP:

- Elementary: Grades 2-5
- Secondary (to include Middle and Junior High): Grades 6-12
- For schools that include both elementary and secondary grades, separate targets are applied level and a weighted proportion is then calculated.

Commencing in SY2006 through SY2014, the following definitions of elementary and secondary schools were instituted:

Elementary - schools with a 3rd, 4th and/or 5th grades that do not meet the criteria for secondary schools

Secondary - schools with no 3rd and/or 4th grades and a grade above 6th grade.

These definitions are reflected in the following examples:

Elementary	Secondary
Grades 2-5	Grades 6-8
Grades 2-6	Grades 7-9
Grades 2-8	Grades 6-12
Grades 2-12	Grades 9-12

For SY2002-SY2005, the starting points were calculated using the percent proficient in the school enrolling the 20th percentile of students of the State’s total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level. This method was applied to all schools in the Elementary and Secondary grade-spans. The starting points were calculated using data from the SY2001-02 school year. The starting points were the same for all schools in the Elementary Grade-span and in the Secondary Grade-span. Schools with un-graded or age-based groupings were identified according to the closest grade that would apply.

For SY2006-2014, the state recalculated the starting points based on the results of the first administration of the new state tests, DC CAS, using the same method outlined above. The starting points, annual objectives, and intermediate goals for the new assessment are presented in Appendix B.

2/19/2009

3.2b Accountability system establishes statewide annual measurable objectives.

The charts for *Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives* are presented in Appendix B and show the progression from the 2001-2002 starting points to 100% proficiency by 2013-2014.

To establish new intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, the state utilized the 2005-2006 DC CAS results and the same methodology used to set the initial goals and objectives in 2002-2003 as prescribed by NCLB and described in Critical Element 3.2a. 100 percent of students in the SEA are expected to achieve the 'proficient' or advanced achievement level by SY2013-2014.

DRAFT

2/19/2009

3.2c Accountability system establishes intermediate goals.

The charts for *Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives* are presented in Appendix B and show the progression from the 2001-2002 starting points to 100% proficiency by 2013-2014. The baseline year for NCLB was 2001-2002. The first increase in the state's achievement targets (i.e., intermediate goals) was in SY2003-2004. Each subsequent increase occurs every two years and is equal incrementally except the last step where there is only a one-year interval

The state recalculated the annual objectives and intermediate goals in 2005-2006 based on the results of the first administration of the new state tests, DC CAS, and the new performance levels (see Critical Element 1.4).

DRAFT

PRINCIPLE 4: Annual Decisions

4.1 Accountability system determines annually the progress of schools and LEAs.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, each subgroup (whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and all major racial/ethnic groups) must have at least 95 % participation rate on the state assessment and meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives. For each subgroup to fail to make AYP, a school or LEA must fail to achieve AYP in the same component (i.e., reading, mathematics, or other academic indicator) for two consecutive years. For example, a school is not be considered to fail to achieve AYP two consecutive years if the school failed to achieve AYP in reading one year and in math the next.

If any school or LEA meets ALL of the following, they will make AYP under the ‘Safe Harbor Provision’:

- 95% participation rate on the state assessment (see Critical Element 10.1);
- Percentage of students in each subgroup scoring below proficiency decreased by 10% compared to the prior year.²
- In regard to the other academic indicators (i.e., attendance graduation rate), subgroups can achieve safe harbor by showing improvement on the additional academic indicators as specified in Elements 7.1 and 7.2.

The OSSE makes annual AYP determinations approximately 30 days prior to the beginning of the school year.

² For the 2005-2006 transition year for the new state test, and for the purpose of calculating safe harbor, SY2005 proficiency data were adjusted linearly based on the differences between the overall SY2005 and SY2006 state proficiency rates; this was a one-time adjustment.

PRINCIPLE 5: Subgroup Accountability

5.1 The accountability system includes all the required student subgroups.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, each subgroup (whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and from all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives and have at least 95 % participation rate in state assessment. For each subgroup to fail to make AYP, the school or LEA must fail to achieve AYP in the same component for two consecutive years.

Students with disabilities are identified by their IEP and verified through SEDS, an automated special education data system. 504 students are included in calculations like all other students, but they are not included as students with disabilities. Economically disadvantaged students are identified through their application for free/reduced lunch. Major racial and ethnic groups, which include: African-American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, White and other are identified through the official enrollment.

Students that are deemed to be English Language Learners participate fully in the State Accountability system. Service levels for English language learners are identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. LEP and NEP student (now referred to as English language learners) are those students who score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test. The exit criterion for the LEP students is a score of 5.0 on the ACCESS test.

5.1 Accountability system holds schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, they must meet three requirements. First, each subgroup (see below) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable achievement objectives in both reading and mathematics. Second, each school and LEA, and the state, must meet the applicable additional academic indicator – i.e., attendance of elementary schools and graduation rate for secondary schools. Third, a school, LEA, or the state must achieve 95 % participation on the state assessments for all subgroups. A school, LEA, or the state may also achieve the academic targets by meeting the safe harbor provisions outlined in Critical Element 3.2. Each school, district, and state must meet all three requirements.

Subgroups include the whole school, economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students. LEAs are required to collect and report all required data to allow the State to disaggregate data consistent with the regulations of NCLB. Scores for students who were classified as limited English or non-English proficient, but become fully English proficient, are included in the school, district, and state LEP/NEP subgroup summaries for 2 years after the students exit the LEP/NEP program.

The SEA is currently implementing the second phase of a new state longitudinal data system (SLED). By July 2009, all required NCLB reports will be produced by the SLED. The SLED system will be collecting student-level demographic data from all LEAs beginning on February 28, 2009, allowing for reports to be disaggregated by various subgroups once assessment data are available. For SY 2009-2010, the SLED will provide a unique student identifier (USI) for all public school students in DC. In addition, it will provide the ability to track daily attendance for all students by linking attendance records from each school's student information system to the USI. These data will come through either a nightly extract using a school's interoperability framework technology or via a manual file upload that will take place on a weekly basis.

5.3 Accountability system includes students with disabilities.

Students with disabilities participate in the statewide assessment consistent with the accommodations outlined in the students' IEPs. All state accommodations fall in one of four categories: setting, timing/scheduling, presentation, and response.

Students who meet the state criterion – i.e., students with the significant cognitive disabilities – will be eligible to participate in the state alternate assessment which is based on grade level content standards and uses alternate academic achievement standards. The criteria for participation in the DC CAS-Alternate are outlined in Appendix A. In accordance with NCLB, statewide, the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or above levels must not exceed 1 percent.

DRAFT

5.4 Accountability system includes limited English proficient students.

All LEP/NEP students are included in the State's definition of AYP and the large majority participate in the general assessment with accommodations (unless they are eligible to participate in the alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities).

In accordance with NCLB guidance, scores for LEP/NEP students who have enrolled in schools in the United States within the previous 12 months will not be required to participate in the reading portion of the state assessment and will be counted as participants for AYP if they participated in the state language proficiency assessments. The SEA report card reports the prevalence of this population. These same students must, however, take the mathematics assessment (with accommodations as appropriate). Although mathematics test participation is required, the scores are not counted in calculating AYP. If students do not take the mathematics test, they are counted as non-participants. DC CAS reading scores are also not counted in calculating AYP even if the tests are taken.

Scores for students who were classified as limited English or non-English proficient, but become fully English proficient, are included in the school, district, and state LEP/NEP subgroup summaries for 2 years after the students exit the LEP/NEP program.

Service levels for NEP/LEP students is identified using the state Home Language Survey and the state language proficiency test, ACCESS for English language learners. LEP and NEP student are those students who score at levels 1-4 on the ACCESS test. (Fully) English proficient students are those who score at level 5 on the ACCESS test. State guidance prescribes how students with disabilities and English language learners are assessed in regard to testing accommodations (see Appendix C).

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.

The following table details the minimum number of students for reporting and accountability for all subgroups. For small schools – i.e., schools with fewer than 25 students enrolled for a full academic year, data are aggregated across years. School data are aggregating for two consecutive years for the purpose of evaluating whether a school has achieved adequate yearly progress.

<i>Minimum-N</i>	<i>Number</i>
For reporting (privacy)	10
For AYP determination (reliability)	25 (academic proficiency) and 40 (participation rate)

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.

Confidentiality is assured by the state policy of not reporting results for groups of less than 10. In cases where all students in a group score at the same performance level and confidentiality is compromised, the state is examining the feasibility of reporting the results as ranges of performance rather than exact percentages.

DRAFT

PRINCIPLE 6: Academic Assessments

6.1 Accountability system is based primarily on academic assessments.

For a school or LEA to make AYP, they must meet three requirements. First, a school or LEA must achieve 95 % participation on the state assessments for all subgroups. Second, each subgroup (e.g., whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable achievement objectives in both reading and mathematics. Third, each school and LEA must meet the applicable additional academic indicator – i.e., attendance for elementary schools and graduation rate for secondary schools. A school, LEA, or the state may also achieve the academic targets by meeting the safe harbor provisions outlined in Critical Element 3.2. Each school and LEA must meet all three requirements to make AYP.

DRAFT

PRINCIPLE 7: ADDITIONAL INDICATORS

7.1 Accountability system includes graduation rate for high schools.

Graduation rate is the additional academic indicator for determining AYP at the high school level. DC currently uses the Common Core of Data: Graduate Leaver Indicator. This formulation defines graduation rate as the total number of graduates for a given year with a regular diploma divided by the sum of the number of graduates (for that year) and dropouts for the current year and the three preceding years. The definition of diploma excludes GED, certificates of completion, certificates of attendance, or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards.

For schools below the baseline state average, AYP is currently achieved if the school graduation rate increases each year by one percentage point until they reach the baseline SEA average. Dropouts are defined based on the criterion established by the National Center for Educational Statistics and as reported in the Common Core of Data.

As a result of a change in USDE regulations, the District of Columbia has begun to collect data needed to calculate the graduate rate using the new required student cohort method. Complete four-year data using the new method will be publicly reported for the first time for the class of 2010-2011.

DC will conduct an analysis, including an examination of other state practices and local impact data, to establish, as outlined in Section B of the new guidance [34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(3)], “(a) a single graduation rate goal that represents the rate the State expects all high schools in the State to meet, and (b) annual graduation rate targets that reflect continuous and substantial improvement from the prior year toward meeting or exceeding the State's graduation rate goal.”

7.2 Accountability system includes an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

Attendance is the additional academic indicator for all elementary and middle schools (e.g., schools without grade 12). Attendance will be calculated by dividing the total daily attendance over the full academic year by the total daily enrollment taken over the same period. Schools will be required to record and report both daily attendance and enrollment.

The state's implementation of its longitudinal data warehouse will facilitate a more accurate, single integration point of education data, including attendance. The data warehouse will significantly improve the attendance and enrollment tracking process. For SY 2009-2010, the SLED will provide a unique student identifier (USI) for all public school students in DC. In addition, it will provide the ability to track daily attendance for all students by linking attendance records from each school's student information system to the USI. This data will come through either a nightly extract using schools interoperability framework technology or via a manual file upload that will take place on a weekly basis.

To make the attendance AYP indicator, a school must meet the following:

- A school with have 90% daily attendance.
- A school with less than 90% attendance must show annual improvement of at least 1 percentage point.

7.3 Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) uses an automated student information system that requires schools to take attendance daily. The Office of the State Superintendent, District of Columbia Public Charter School Board, and the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) are collaborating to implement systems that will permit the state to monitor and report state level data. Most schools are able produce daily and periodic audit and summary reports.

Public charter schools are required to report monthly attendance; they are currently studying more efficient ways to gather and transmit attendance data. Appropriate data collection strategies and quality control measures are being applied to the attendance, enrollment, and graduation rate data to ensure graduation rate and attendance data are valid and reliable. All DCPS schools undergo an internal enrollment audit. All schools within the District of Columbia, including charter schools, are required to fully participate in an external census audit of enrollment, special education and bilingual service participation, and attendance. The enrollment auditor is Thompson, Cobb, and Bazilio and Associates (TCBA).

The SLED system will be used at the state level to monitor attendance. All daily attendance data will be populated into the SLED directly from the source systems at the LEAs. This will allow for report generation and comparisons between LEAs and schools. The state produces annual technical reports assessing the reliability and validity of state assessments that are reviewed by the state's Technical Advisory Committee. Technical reports examining the general and alternate reading and mathematics assessments support the alignment, reliability and validity of the test design. Similarly, the studies of science demonstrate the general and alternate assessments are valid, reliable and aligned to the state science content standards.

PRINCIPLE 8: SEPARATE DECISIONS FOR READING/LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

8.1 Accountability system holds schools and districts separately accountable for reading/language arts and mathematics.

The State AYP determination for all students will separately measure reading and mathematics in the aggregate and for each identified subgroup.

For accountability purposes, all schools are classified as either elementary or secondary schools that have separate accountability targets (see Appendix B). All grade level performance percentages within a category (e.g., elementary) are compared to the same annual measurable objective (see Critical Element 3.2.a). For a school, the AYP status is determined by the subject area with the “lowest level.” For example, if a school achieves AYP in math but fails to achieve AYP in reading for two consecutive years, the school is classified as “in need of improvement, year 1.”

For LEAs and the SEA, the AYP (and school improvement) status is also determined by the “lowest level.” For example, if an LEA achieves AYP at the elementary level but fails to achieve AYP for two consecutive years at the secondary level, the LEA is classified as “in need of improvement, year 1.”

DRAFT

PRINCIPLE 9: SYSTEM VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

9.1 Accountability system produces reliable decisions.

The state periodically commissions studies of the reliability of AYP determinations. Reliability will be calculated by comparing AYP determinations across years by schools and subgroups. These studies focus on the reliability of the classifications (e.g., the probability of Type I and II classification errors). The state has completed annual technical reports for the 2006 and 2007 general assessment and alternate assessments. The initial technical report for the state science assessments was completed in January 2009. The state has also completed alignment studies, strand validity studies, and convergent/divergent validity studies. For science, these studies are scheduled for submission with the 2009 Peer Review documentation.

DRAFT

9.2 Accountability system produces valid decisions.

The state periodically commissions external analyses to examine the reliability of AYP determinations (see Critical Element 9.1). Moreover, the state has worked closely with LEAs to develop parallel analytic systems so that LEAs are able to validate all state determinations. Towards this end, the State has established an appeal process for all LEAs to appeal an accountability decision and schools are provided 30 days to appeal AYP decisions.

DC is also currently implementing the second phase of a new state longitudinal data system (SLED) with the goal of further improving the reliability of AYP determinations. By July 2009, all required NCLB reports will be produced by the SLED. The SLED system will be collecting student-level demographic data from all LEAs beginning on February 28, 2009, allowing for reports to be disaggregated by various subgroups once assessment data is included. For SY 2009-2010, the SLED will provide a unique student identifier (USI) for all public school students in DC. In addition, it will provide the ability to track daily attendance for all students by linking attendance records from each school's student information system to the USI. This data will come through either a nightly extract using a school's interoperability framework technology or via a manual file upload that will take place on a weekly basis.

DRAFT

9.3 State has a plan for addressing changes in assessment and student population.

Currently, the state does not plan to change either the reading or mathematics assessments. As noted in Critical Elements 9.1 and 9.2, the state will examine the decision accuracy of the accountability system including an examination of the reliability of AYP determinations.

DRAFT

PRINCIPLE 10: PARTICIPATION RATE

10.1 Accountability system has the means for calculating the rate of participation in the statewide assessment.

The State Accountability System holds LEAs accountable for reaching the 95% participation rate for assessment. The accountability for participation will be separate from that for proficiency and the other academic indicators.

When a group does not have 95% tested for the AYP Report for the current year their percent tested are averaged across the current and previous 2 years. If the average is at least 95%, the group is credited with meeting the percent tested target.

The State defines the Full Academic Year as described in Element 2.2, and then calculates the 95% rate of participation in both the aggregate and by subgroup. The participation rate corresponds to the population reported on the mandated state, LEA, and school report cards – i.e., the student population on first day of testing. Participants or test takers are students that complete the reading and mathematics subtests.

DRAFT

2/19/2009

10.2 Accountability system has a means of applying the 95 percent assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.

The State Accountability System will ensure that the 95% participation requirement will be applied when the group size is statistically significant according to State definitions and regulations. The minimum group size for participation is 40.

DRAFT

2/19/2009

APPENDIX A
CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION IN DCCAS ALT

DRAFT

APPENDIX B

NCLB TARGETS: 2002-2014 ³

Elementary Reading (Grades 3-6) – Annual Targets and (Six) Intermediate Goals for SY2002-2014 (Percentage Scoring at the Proficient or Above Level)

												100
										86.8	86.8	
								73.6	73.6			
						60.5	60.5					
				47.3	47.3							
		34.2	34.2									
21.0	21.0											
5	5											
		1		2		3		4		5		6
2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014

Elementary Mathematics (Grades 3-6) – Annual Targets and (Six) Intermediate Goals for SY2002-2014 (Percentage Scoring at the Proficient or Above Level)

												100
										85.0	85.0	
								70.1	70.1			
						55.2	55.2					
				40.2	40.2							
		25.3	25.3									
10.4	10.4											
2	2											
		1		2		3		4		5		6
2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014

³ Annual goals and intermediate steps were adjusted based on the results of the first operational administration of the DC CAS in 2005-2006.

NCLB TARGETS: 2002-2014

Secondary Reading (Grades 7-11) – Annual Targets and (Six) Intermediate Goals for SY2002-2014 (Percentage Scoring at the Proficient or Above Level)

													100
											85.90	85.90	
									71.79	71.79			
						57.69	57.69						
				43.58	43.58								
		29.48	29.48										
15.38	15.38												
		1		2		3		4		5		6	
2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	

Secondary Mathematics (Grades 7-11) – Annual Targets and (Six) Intermediate Goals for SY2002-2014 (Percentage Scoring at the Proficient or Above Level)

													100
										85.14	85.14		
								70.27	70.27				
						55.41	55.41						
				40.54	40.54								
		25.68	25.68										
10.81	10.81												
		1		2		3		4		5		6	
2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	

APPENDIX C

Definition of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Population

Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Student - a student who understands or speaks a language other than English which was learned from his/her family background or a student with a family background where a language other than English is spoken in the

2/19/2009

home. Students who were born in other countries where English Creole, Patois, or Pidgin may be spoken are also assessed in the District of Columbia for English language proficiency (Chapter 31, Board of Education *Rules*) and are considered linguistically and culturally diverse.

English Language Learner (ELL)⁴ Student - a linguistically and culturally diverse student with an English language proficiency level that does not allow the student to participate in the general program of the school without alternative language services (Chapter 31, Board of Education *Rules*).

Exiting the Bilingual/ESL Program - Exiting from bilingual/ESL program services occurs when a student attains fluency in English language proficiency as measured by the *ACCESS for ELLs*TM.

Local schools will ensure that parents are notified of the school's intent to exit students from bilingual/ESL services. Parents may respond in writing regarding their agreement or disapproval of their children's exit from the program. If parents disapprove of exit, students may remain in a program when space permits.

The *Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Student Enrollment Report* will indicate the date students attained English Proficiency Level 5.0 or above. At the beginning of the school year immediately following that date, students will enter the general education program and will receive monitoring services for two years.

⁴ ELL students are referred to as LEP students in the federal definition