

# DELAWARE'S GROWTH MODEL FOR AYP DETERMINATIONS

August 1, 2007



# AYP Performance for 2007

- AYP determination was based first on the Growth Model
- If it met the target, then the school received an “Above” rating for AYP
- If it did not meet AYP using the Growth Model, then the Original Model was used to see if the school made AYP

# AYP Performance – cont'd

- If school made AYP using the Original Model, the school was assigned “Above” or “Meets” depending on whether or not confidence intervals, special education adjustment, or safe harbor were used
- If the school did not make AYP in Growth or in Original, the “Below” designation from Growth is assigned and is used for school improvement status

# Background Information

- Invitation for states to submit proposals to use a growth model
- Pilot project – up to ten states
- Model must demonstrate that it can raise student achievement and enhance school accountability
- “Bright Line” principles of NCLB upheld
- DE first submitted proposal in March 2006 – was denied
- DE revised/resubmitted proposal September 2006
- USED approved for use in 2006-07 with one condition
  - Cannot use Confidence Interval
- Calculate AYP by growth and original models
- Report both growth and original models

# Why did we submit?

- To ensure more valid and reliable accountability determinations
- To monitor various subgroups' progress
- To support our value of continuous improvement and longitudinal student growth

# What Growth Model did we propose?

- **Value Table Model**
  - Maintains emphasis on performance levels (standards based achievement)
  - Values longitudinal individual student growth
  - Gives schools credit for moving students towards proficiency
  - Values growth especially below the standard

# Who chose Delaware's model?

- Committee of Stakeholders
  - Community members
  - Parents
  - Teachers
  - District Administrators
  - School Administrators

# How do value tables work?

- Values are placed in a table to indicate points earned from growth one year to the next
- Calculate the average growth value for the school and each subgroup in reading and math
- Compare average growth to the target

# Value Table for Grade 3

	Grade 3 Level				
Grade 2 Level	Level 1A	Level 1B	Level 2A	Level 2B	Proficient
Below	0	0	0	200	300
Meets	0	0	0	0	300

# Value Table for Grades 4-10

	Year 2 Level				
Year 1 Level	Level 1A	Level 1B	Level 2A	Level 2B	Proficient
Level 1A	0	150	225	250	300
Level 1B	0	0	175	225	300
Level 2A	0	0	0	200	300
Level 2B	0	0	0	0	300
Proficient	0	0	0	0	300

# Growth Value Targets Table

	Reading	Math
2006	186	123
2007	204	150
2008	204	150
2009	219	174
2010	237	201
2011	252	225
2012	267	249
2013	285	276
2014	300	300

# AYP Growth Model Matrix

Group	Reading Growth	ELA % Participation	Math Growth	Math % Participation	Other Indicator
All Students					
American Indian					
Asian American					
African American					
Hispanic					
White					
Economically Disadvantaged					
Special Education					
Limited English Proficient					

# Delaware's Accountability System: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

## 2006

- Participation (ELA, Math)
- Other Academic Indicators
- Performance (ELA, Math)
  - Total School
    - Original Model / Safe Harbor
  - Subgroup
    - Original Model / Safe Harbor

## 2007

- Participation (ELA, Math)
- Other Academic Indicators
- Performance (ELA, Math)
  - Total School
    - Growth Model
    - Original Model / Safe Harbor
  - Subgroup
    - Growth Model
    - Original Model / Safe Harbor

# Growth Model 2007 - How to meet AYP

- Meet Growth Target in Reading (204) and math (150)

**AND**

- Meet Participation Targets in ELA (95%) and math (95%)

**AND**

- Meet the Other Academic Indicator
  - Elementary/Middle: show progress
  - High School: 79.5% or progress
    - Graduation rate

# Growth Model AYP Result

Growth Model AYP Result is expressed in the following terms:

- Above Target
  - Meets or exceeds all targets
- Meets Target
  - Meets or exceeds all targets but confidence interval (CI) was used for Other Academic Indicators (OAI)
- Below Target
  - Did not meet targets

# School Rating

School Rating is determined by the combination of:

- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
- State Progress Determination (SPD)
- Combination of AYP and SPD plus school accountability history determines current rating

# School Rating Table

AYP	STATE PROGRESS	STATE ACCOUNTABILITY DETERMINATION	AFTER 2 CONSECUTIVE YEARS
A	A	Superior	
A	M	Superior	
A	B	Commendable	
M	A	Superior	
M	M	Commendable	
M	B	Commendable	Academic Review
B	A	Academic Review	Academic Progress
B	M	Academic Review	Academic Progress
B	B	Academic Review	Academic Watch

Schools facing appropriate consequences per NCLB

# Definitions of Ratings

- Superior
  - AYP is met while the school or district is not under improvement and additional rigorous state criteria are met
- Commendable
  - AYP is met while the school or district is not under improvement
- Academic Review
  - AYP is not met for one year and SPD is met OR
  - AYP is not met for one year and SPD is not met OR
  - AYP is met and SPD is not met (second year)

# Definitions of Ratings (cont'd)

- Academic Progress
  - AYP is not met (different subject) two or more years and SPD is met
- Academic Progress – Under Improvement
  - AYP is not met (same subject) two or more years and SPD is met

# Definitions of Ratings (cont'd)

- Academic Watch
  - AYP is not met two or more years (different subject) and SPD is not met
- Academic Watch – Under Improvement
  - AYP is not met two or more years (same subject) and SPD is not met

# How to be Classified as “Under School Improvement”

- Two consecutive years **not meeting** AYP targets in **same area**
  - Participation
  - Other Academic Indicator
  - ELA/Reading
  - Math

# How to Move Out of “Under School Improvement”

- Two consecutive years of **meeting** AYP targets in **all areas**
  - Participation
  - Other Academic Indicator
  - ELA/Reading
  - Math

# Rewards and Sanctions

- Sanctions & rewards for Title I and non-Title I schools closely aligned
- Sanctions only apply when classified as Under Improvement

# Consequences of being Under Improvement for Title I Schools

- **1 year** = school implements choice
- **2 years** = school offers choice and provides supplemental services
- **3 years** = same as year 2 plus school is subject to corrective action
- **4 years** = same as year 3 plus school develops a plan for restructuring
- **5 years** = same as year 2 plus school implements the restructuring plan

# Consequences of being Under Improvement for Non-Title I Schools

- **1 year** = review and modify School Improvement Plan (SIP)
- **2 years** = same as year 1; provide additional priority to subgroups that did not meet target
- **3 years** = same as year 2; school subject to corrective action
- **4 years** = same as year 3 plus school develops plan for restructuring
- **5 years** = same as year 2 plus school implements restructuring plan

# School Accountability Ratings

- Released on DOE website 8/1/07 ([www.doe.k12.de.us](http://www.doe.k12.de.us))
- Specific data by school

# District Accountability Ratings

Will be released Fall 2007

Will include specific data by district

# Contact Information

- Robin Taylor
  - [rtaylor@doe.k12.de.us](mailto:rtaylor@doe.k12.de.us)
  - 735-4080
- Joanne Reihm
  - [jreihm@doe.k12.de.us](mailto:jreihm@doe.k12.de.us)
  - 735-4090
- Terry Anderson
  - [tanderson@doe.k12.de.us](mailto:tanderson@doe.k12.de.us)
  - 735-4140
- DOE web site
  - [www.doe.k12.de.us/aab](http://www.doe.k12.de.us/aab)