



## **2009-10 Accountability Progress Reporting System**

---

# **2010 Adequate Yearly Progress Report**

## **Information Guide**

---

**September 2010**

**Prepared by the  
California Department of Education**

Available online at:  
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/>

# Table of Contents

**Preface** .....1

**Key Changes to the 2010 AYP and 2010-11 PI Reports** .....2

**Adequate Yearly Progress**

**What is AYP?** .....7

    No Child Left Behind Act.....7

        Title I.....7

        Title III.....7

    California’s Accountability Workbook .....8

    California’s Definition of AYP .....8

    Sources of Data Used in AYP Calculations .....8

        Assessment Results Used in 2010 AYP Calculations .....9

    Considerations Regarding Assessment Results .....10

        Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications .....10

        CAPA in AYP.....10

        CMA in AYP.....11

**What is Included in AYP Reports?**.....13

    County and LEA Lists of Schools.....13

    School and LEA Reports .....13

    Statewide Data Files .....14

**Accountability Reporting Timeline** .....15

**Who Receives an AYP Report?**.....17

    Schools and LEAs Receive an AYP Report.....17

    Charter Schools .....17

**Subgroups** .....18

    Definitions of Subgroups Used in AYP.....18

    Reclassified Fluent-English-Proficient.....19

    ELs First Enrolled in U.S. Schools .....19

    Students with Disabilities .....20

    Race and Ethnicity Categories.....20

# Table of Contents (continued)

## Adequate Yearly Progress (continued)

<b>AYP Criteria</b> .....	22
AYP Targets Increase for 2010.....	22
2010 AYP Criteria Flowchart.....	24
AYP Targets, 2002-2014 .....	25
School Type for AYP Purposes.....	28
How School Type is Determined .....	28
2010 AYP Criteria Summary .....	30
2010 AYP Targets, Standard Criteria .....	30
2010 AYP Targets, Small School/LEA/Subgroup Criteria.....	31
2010 AYP Criteria Details .....	32
Requirement 1: Participation Rate.....	32
Standard Criteria .....	32
Small School/LEA/Subgroup Criteria .....	32
Exclusions .....	32
Subgroups.....	32
Alternative Methods .....	33
Requirement 2: Percent Proficient – AMOs.....	33
Standard Criteria .....	33
Small School/LEA/Subgroup Criteria .....	34
Confidence Interval Adjusted AMO Table for 2010 .....	36
Confidence Interval Adjusted AMO Table for 2011 .....	37
Exclusions .....	38
Subgroups.....	38
Alternative Methods .....	38
Requirement 3: API as an Additional Indicator .....	39
Standard AYP Criteria for API.....	39
Proposed API for AYP Rules.....	40

# Table of Contents (continued)

## Adequate Yearly Progress (continued)

Requirement 4: Graduation Rate.....	40
Standard Graduation Rate Criteria.....	40
Calculating the 2010 AYP Graduation Rate .....	41
Four-Year Graduation Rate Formula for ESEA.....	42
Three Options for Meeting 2010 AYP Graduation Rate Criteria.....	42
Graduation Rate Rules.....	44
Safe Harbor .....	45
Example of Safe Harbor .....	46
Alternative Methods .....	49
Alternative Methods Descriptions .....	49
Alternative Methods Codes .....	51
AYP Appeals Process.....	51
<b>Percent Proficient Caps for LEAs .....</b>	<b>53</b>
CAPA 1.0 Percent Cap .....	53
Automatic Exception for COEs and Small LEAs.....	53
How the Percent Proficient Rate is Calculated .....	53
CMA 2.0 Percent Cap .....	54
Automatic Exemption for Small LEAs .....	54
How the Percent Proficient Rate is Calculated .....	55
Flexibility in the 1.0 and 2.0 Percent Caps.....	55
How to Calculate the CMA Cap .....	55
Five Examples of Applying 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 Percent Caps.....	56
Reassignment of Scores Exceeding the Caps.....	57
Reassignment of Scores Exceeding 1.0 or 2.0 Percent Caps .....	58
Example of Reassignment.....	58
<b>Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules.....</b>	<b>61</b>
Tools for Using the Flowchart .....	62
Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart.....	63
Testing Codes Considered in AYP Calculations .....	69

# Table of Contents (continued)

## Adequate Yearly Progress (continued)

CAHSEE Matching Rules .....	71
CST in General Mathematics .....	71

## Program Improvement

<b>School Accountability</b> .....	72
Identification of Schools for PI .....	72
2010–11 PI Identification Criteria for Title I Schools .....	72
Four Examples of PI Identification of Title I Schools.....	73
Schools Already in PI.....	74
Advancing in PI.....	74
Maintaining PI Status.....	74
Exiting PI .....	74
<b>LEA Accountability</b> .....	75
Identification of LEAs for PI.....	75
2010-11 PI Identification Criteria for Title I LEAs .....	75
LEA PI Identification Alternative Methods.....	75
Four Examples of PI Identification of Title I LEAs.....	76
LEAs Already in PI .....	78
Advancing in PI.....	78
Maintaining PI Status.....	79
Exiting PI .....	79
<b>School and LEA Accountability</b> .....	80
Breaks in Title I Funding .....	80
Changes to PI Status .....	80
<b>CDE Contacts and Related Internet Pages</b> .....	82
<b>Acronyms</b> .....	83

# Preface

This information guide provides technical information about the 2010 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and 2010–11 Program Improvement (PI) reports. The guide is intended for accountability coordinators at local educational agencies (LEAs) to use in administering their academic accountability programs to meet the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The California Department of Education (CDE) provides AYP and PI reports as part of its Accountability Progress Reporting (APR) system. The APR system provides an integrated approach to reporting results for state and federal accountability requirements and includes information about the state, LEAs, schools (including charter schools), and numerically significant subgroups:

## 2009–10 APR System

<b>State Accountability Requirements</b> (Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999)	<b>Federal Accountability Requirements</b> (Elementary and Secondary Education Act)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 2009 Base Academic Performance Index (API) Reports (release May 2010)</li> <li>■ 2010 Growth API Reports (release September 2010)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 2010 AYP Reports (release September 2010)</li> <li>■ 2010–11 PI Reports (release September 2010)</li> </ul>

This guide is not intended to serve as a substitute for state and federal laws or regulations or to detail all of an accountability coordinator’s responsibilities in applying accountability requirements to an LEA or school. The guide should be used in conjunction with academic accountability information provided through the CDE AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/> and from e-mail and correspondence disseminated by the CDE to accountability coordinators. For information about being included on the CDE accountability coordinators listing, contact the Academic Accountability and Psychometrics (AAP) Unit by phone at 916-319-0863 or by e-mail at [aau@cde.ca.gov](mailto:aau@cde.ca.gov). This guide is produced by the CDE’s AAP and Evaluation, Research, and Analysis (ERA) Units in the Assessment, Accountability, and Awards Division (AAAD). Questions about API or AYP calculations should be addressed to the AAP Unit at the phone number or e-mail address listed above. Questions about school and LEA ESEA accountability requirements, PI determinations, and AYP appeals should be addressed to the ERA Unit by phone at 916-319-0875 or by e-mail at [evaluation@cde.ca.gov](mailto:evaluation@cde.ca.gov) (ESEA and AYP appeals) or [piaccountability@cde.ca.gov](mailto:piaccountability@cde.ca.gov) (PI determinations).

Material in this publication is not copyrighted and may be reproduced.

# Key Changes to the 2010 AYP and 2010–11 PI Reports

## AYP Targets Increase for 2010

The AYP targets for schools and LEAs increased in 2010 (changes in **bold**).

- The required percentage of students proficient or above for elementary schools, middle schools, and elementary school districts in English-language arts (ELA) is now **56.8**, in mathematics **58.0**.
- The required percentage of students proficient or above for high schools and for high school districts that have students in any of grades nine through twelve in ELA is now **55.6**, in mathematics **54.8**.
- The required percentage of students proficient or above for unified school districts, for high school districts, and for county offices of education (COEs) that have students in any of grades two through eight and nine through twelve in ELA is now **56.0**, in mathematics **56.4**.
- To meet the API requirement for AYP purposes, an LEA or school must demonstrate a growth of at least 1 point or a minimum API score of at least **680**.
- **The graduation rate criteria have changed.** Beginning with the 2010 AYP, a school or an LEA with grade twelve students must meet one of three graduation rate targets to make AYP: (1) a 2010 graduation rate of at least 90.00, (2) a 2010 fixed growth target rate, or (3) a 2010 variable growth target rate. The fixed and variable growth targets are unique to each school rather than a standard target for all, as was required in the past.

The AYP targets for percent proficient or above and the API will continue to increase annually until 2014. The AYP targets for graduation rate increase until 2019 if the school or LEA has a graduation rate below 90 percent.

## Accountability Workbook Revisions

The revision to California's 2010 Accountability Workbook regarding graduation rates has been approved by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The CDE has received verbal approval of the other four proposed revisions to the Workbook (race and ethnicity categories, safe harbor, minimum group size for the API, and the California Modified Assessment [CMA]) but has not yet received formal written confirmation. All changes are effective for the 2010 AYP results and are not retroactive to the 2009 AYP results.

## ■ Revision - Approved

### Graduation Rate

On October 28, 2008, the ED published its final guidance to states regarding the requirement to submit for approval a new graduation rate goal and new growth targets that reflect continuous and substantial improvement from the prior year. The new goal and growth targets must be in place for the 2010 AYP determinations. In addition, the guidance requires that states produce a four-year, on-time, graduation rate using longitudinal pupil level data for the 2012 AYP determinations.

The federal guidance on the graduation rate indicates states should establish more rigorous graduation goals than are currently in place. Graduation goals need not be set at 100 percent because not all students graduate with a regular high school diploma. However, the guidance also states that all but a small percentage of students can and should graduate with a regular diploma and states are expected to establish a rigorous graduation goal. States are also required to establish new growth targets that are substantial enough to result in schools and LEAs meeting the graduation rate goal within a reasonable period of time. The ED has stated that a growth target as little as 0.1 percent would not meet that requirement. In accordance with federal requirements, the CDE submitted a proposed amendment to California's Accountability Workbook to restructure the graduation rate calculation and growth targets for 2010. The proposal was accepted.

The graduation rate goal for all schools and LEAs is now 90 percent beginning with the 2010 AYP, and the new growth target structure requires all schools and LEAs to meet the 90 percent goal by 2019 AYP. Schools and LEAs can meet the new graduation rate criteria in at least one of three ways. For 2010 AYP, the school or LEA must meet: (1) a 2010 graduation rate of at least 90.00, (2) a 2010 **fixed growth target rate**, or (3) a 2010 **variable growth target rate**.

The **fixed growth** graduation rate schedule was established based on the difference between the school's or LEA's baseline graduation rate (i.e., 2009 AYP graduation rate) and the 90 percent goal divided by the number of years remaining before the 2019 AYP (i.e., ten years). This difference was used to establish a schedule of ten equal graduation rate targets. The schedule of ten graduation rate targets was developed once in the 2010 AYP and will not be recalculated each year.

The **variable growth** graduation rate is established based on the difference between the school's or LEA's current graduation rate and the 90 percent goal divided by the number of years remaining before the 2019 AYP. The variable graduation rate target is calculated yearly for each school and LEA. For the 2010

AYP, the variable growth target rate will be the same as the fixed growth target rate. However, the variable growth target rate changes each year according to the school's current graduation rate.

The federal guidance also allows states the option of requesting a minimum subgroup size for the graduation rate in 2010. The ED acknowledges that graduation rates are sensitive to fluctuations for small cohorts of students; however, the guidance also states that the ED does not anticipate approving a minimum subgroup size greater than the approved subgroup size for the participation rate. Therefore, California's minimum subgroup size for the new graduation rate is 50 students (i.e., the same as the minimum size for participation rate). Schools and LEAs with 50 or fewer students in the graduation rate denominator (i.e., graduates plus dropouts from the prior four years) will be exempt from the graduation requirement. More information about the new graduation requirements is provided on pages 40 through 45.

### ■ Revisions – Approval Expected

**As indicated on page 2, the CDE has received verbal approval for the following revisions, but has not yet received formal written confirmation. The 2010 AYP Reports that were revised on January 7, 2011 include all revisions.**

#### **Race and Ethnicity Categories**

In October 2007, the ED published new guidance to states on maintaining, collecting, and reporting race and ethnicity data. The California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) began collecting data following this guidance in the fall of 2009. The subgroup reporting categories for the 2009–10 AYP report have changed to accommodate the changes around the collection and reporting of information on race and ethnicity. In January 2010, the SBE approved the following categories (the changes noted in boldface represent changes from the prior reporting categories):

- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Filipino
- Hispanic or Latino
- **Native Hawaiian** or Pacific Islander
- White
- **Two or More Races**

The former "Pacific Islander" category is now called "Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander." A new category called "Two or More Races" is added. Schools and LEAs will be held accountable for any of these subgroups that are considered

numerically significant. Results for the socioeconomically disadvantaged, English learners (ELs), and students with disabilities (SWD) will also be provided as it has been in the past. More information about the race and ethnicity categories is provided on pages 20 and 21.

### **Safe Harbor**

For safe harbor to be applied, the school, LEA, or subgroup must also meet the participation rate and the additional indicators (API and graduation rate). Because the SBE adopted the CDE recommendation for new race and ethnicity categories for accountability purposes, the CDE does not have sufficient data to calculate a four-year graduation rate by student subgroup, as required by the safe harbor provision.

In the initial request, California proposed to use the school or LEA graduation rate instead of the student subgroup graduation for safe harbor purposes. The ED was unable to approve that request and instead approved the use of a graduation rate for student subgroups that includes only the years for which California has student-level data, thereby allowing the State to do the necessary cross-walk between the new and old race and ethnicity categories and calculate a graduation rate for each student subgroup.

### **Minimum Group Size for the API**

For the same reasons of validity and reliability, the CDE proposed a minimum group size of 50 for the API, which is an additional indicator for AYP. Having a minimum group size for both additional indicators (graduation rate and API) will provide consistency in the federal accountability system. This minimum group size for the API only applies in AYP determinations. Under this proposal, schools or LEAs with fewer than 50 valid scores would be exempt from the API requirement for making AYP.

### **California Modified Assessment**

The CMA was first administered statewide in 2008 to SWDs for ELA and mathematics (grades three through five) and for science (grade five). These assessments in ELA and mathematics were incorporated into the 2008 AYP. In the spring of 2009, the CMA was expanded to include ELA (grades six through eight), mathematics (grades six and seven), and science (grade eight). These assessments in ELA and mathematics were incorporated into the 2009 AYP. In the spring of 2010, the CMA was further expanded to include ELA (grade nine), Algebra I (end-of-course, available for grades seven through eleven), and science (grade ten). The CMA for Algebra I (end-of-course, available for grades seven and eight) will be incorporated into the 2010 AYP. The CMA is an assessment of California's content standards based on modified achievement standards and was developed in response to federal regulations. The CMA is

offered to some SWD in accordance with their individualized education programs (IEPs). CMA results from grades two through eight in ELA and mathematics (but not science) are used in AYP calculations.

For the September 2008 and 2009 AYP reports, students who took the CMA were counted as participants but test results were not included in percent proficient calculations. In November 2008 and 2009, the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted performance levels for the CMA, and the AYP reports were updated to include test results in the percent proficient calculations.

The process for the 2010 AYP is similar to previous years. Adopted performance levels for the CMA were not available in time for reporting the 2010 AYP in September 2010. To accommodate this situation, students who took the CMA were counted as participants but were not included in percent proficient calculations in the September 2010 AYP reports. In January 2011, following SBE adoption of performance levels for the CMA, the 2010 AYP reports will be updated to include in the percent proficient calculations the test results from the CMA for Algebra I (end-of-course, available for grades seven and eight).

As with the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) results in AYP reporting, the performance level the student received on the CMA (advanced, proficient, basic, below basic, or far below basic) is the level that is included in the AYP calculations. The same calculation rules used for the California Standards Test (CST) also apply to the CMA.

# What is AYP?

AYP is a series of annual academic performance goals established for each school, LEA, and the state as a whole. Schools, LEAs, and the state are determined to have met AYP if they meet or exceed each year's goals (AYP targets and criteria).

## No Child Left Behind Act

AYP is required under Title I of the federal ESEA. States commit to the goals of ESEA by participating in Title I, a program under ESEA that provides funding to help educate low-income children. The primary goal of Title I is for all students to be proficient in ELA and mathematics, as determined by state assessments, by 2014.

### ■ Title I

Schools, LEAs, and the state must meet all AYP criteria in order to meet federal ESEA accountability requirements. Currently, the consequences of not meeting AYP criteria apply only to those schools and LEAs that receive federal Title I, Part A, funds. Schools and LEAs that receive Title I, Part A, funds face ESEA PI requirements if they do not meet AYP criteria.

PI is a formal designation for Title I-funded schools and LEAs. A Title I school or LEA is identified for PI if it does not meet AYP criteria for two consecutive years in specific areas. If a school or an LEA is designated PI, it must provide certain types of required services and/or interventions during each year it is identified as PI. A school or an LEA is eligible to exit PI if it makes AYP for two consecutive years.

The ESEA Act contains four education reform principles: (1) stronger accountability for results, (2) increased flexibility and local control, (3) expanded options for parents or guardians, and (4) an emphasis on scientifically-based effective teaching methods. This information guide describes California's implementation of the first principle under Title I of the ESEA. More information about ESEA is located on the ED Web site at <http://www.nclb.gov/> (Outside Source).

### ■ Title III

Title III of the ESEA Act provides supplemental funding to LEAs and consortia to implement programs designed to help ELs and immigrant students attain English proficiency and meet the state's academic and content standards. Title III requires that each state:

- Establish English language proficiency standards
- Conduct an annual assessment of English language proficiency

- Define two annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for increasing the percentage of EL students' developing and attaining English proficiency
- Include a third AMAO relating to meeting AYP for the EL subgroup at the LEA or consortium level
- Hold LEAs and consortia accountable for meeting the three AMAOs (ESEA Section 3122)

Specific information about Title III accountability is located in the 2010 Title III Accountability Report Information Guide on the CDE Title III Accountability Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/>.

## California's Accountability Workbook

The importance of stronger accountability was emphasized by the federal requirement for states to complete an Accountability Workbook as the first component of its Consolidated State Application. California's workbook describes its plan for complying with the assessment and accountability requirements of ESEA. The development and continued maintenance of the workbook is based upon a series of action items adopted by the SBE and approved by the ED. Each year since 2003, the SBE has approved and submitted a package of workbook amendments to the ED. Following a period of negotiation, the ED has approved an amended Accountability Workbook for California each year. A copy of the most recent workbook is available on the CDE Accountability Workbook Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/sa/wb.asp>.

## California's Definition of AYP

Under California's criteria for ESEA, schools and LEAs are required to meet or exceed requirements within each of the following four areas in order to make AYP annually:

- Requirement 1: Participation Rate
- Requirement 2: Percent Proficient—Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)
- Requirement 3: API as an Additional Indicator
- Requirement 4: Graduation Rate

If a school or an LEA misses one or more requirement, it does not make AYP and may be identified for PI. The "AYP Criteria" section describes the specifics for each of the four requirements.

## Sources of Data Used in AYP Calculations

The information that forms the basis for AYP participation rate and percent proficient calculations (Requirements 1 and 2) comes from assessment results of the

Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program and the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). More information about these testing programs is located on the CDE Testing and Accountability Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/>. ESEA mandates that all students tested on statewide assessments in ELA and mathematics perform at the proficient level or above on these assessments by 2014. The following chart shows the assessment results that were used in 2010 AYP calculations.

### Assessment Results Used in 2010 AYP Calculations

<b>Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program</b>
<p><b>California Standards Tests (CSTs)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California English-Language Arts Standards Test (CST in ELA) Grades two through eight, including a writing component in grade seven</li> <li>• California Mathematics Standards Test (CST in mathematics) Grades two through seven and the following course-specific tests for grade eight: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General mathematics</li> <li>- Algebra I</li> <li>- Geometry</li> <li>- Algebra II</li> <li>- Integrated mathematics 1, 2, or 3</li> </ul> Students in grade seven may take the Algebra I test if they completed an Algebra I course.</li> </ul>
<p><b>California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English-language arts and mathematics Grades two through eight and ten</li> </ul>
<p><b>California Modified Assessment (CMA)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English-language arts Grades three through eight</li> <li>• Mathematics Grades three through seven</li> <li>• Algebra I (end-of-course, available in grades seven and eight) to be added in November 2010</li> </ul>
<b>California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)</b>
<p><b>CAHSEE</b> (administered in February and March and May for make-ups)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English-language arts, including a writing component, and mathematics Grade ten</li> </ul>

Requirement 3 uses the API as an additional indicator of AYP. For Requirement 3, the 2009 Base and 2010 Growth API results are used to determine if a school, an LEA, or the state made AYP for 2010. The API is the cornerstone of the state's academic accountability requirements. It measures the performance and growth of schools based upon results of statewide tests at grades two through twelve. More information about the API and the assessments included in the API is located on the CDE API Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/api/>.

For Requirement 4, the number of high school graduates and four years of dropout data

are used to calculate a graduation rate for a school, an LEA, and the state. Graduates and grade twelve dropouts come from student level data collected through CALPADS. Grades ten through eleven dropouts come from the student level data collected through the Annual Statewide Student Identifier (SSID) Maintenance, and information on grade nine comes from aggregate level CBEDS data.

## **Considerations Regarding Assessment Results**

Special considerations or adjustments are made in AYP calculations for statewide assessment results of students who take the tests using varied test administrations or who take the tests based on alternate standards.

### **■ Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications**

Students who take exams in the STAR Program and CAHSEE may be provided certain test variations, accommodations, and/or modifications. A description of these varied test administrations are provided in the "Matrix of Test Variations, Accommodations and Modifications" located on the CDE STAR Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/>. Test administration variations and accommodations do not result in changes to AYP calculations. Modifications, however, do result in changes. Scores for students tested with modifications are not counted in AYP calculations, with one exception. If the student used a calculator on the mathematics portion of the CAHSEE, the student's results are counted as tested and are considered in percent proficient determinations. Changes due to modifications are made to accountability reporting only and do not affect the individual student's score report. The student receives an individual score report with his or her actual score.

#### **Students Who Use Calculators on CAHSEE Mathematics**

For the 2010 AYP, the CDE counted as participants those SWDs who used calculators on the mathematics portion of the CAHSEE in accordance with their IEPs. The students' scores will be counted as proficient if the scale score was 384 or above for the February and March administrations or 383 or above for the May administration.

### **■ CAPA in AYP**

In response to federal requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Amendments of 1997, and the ESEA, California developed the CAPA, an alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate in the general STAR Program assessments, even with accommodations or modifications. A student's IEP specifies whether the student should take the CAPA. Students taking the CAPA work toward achieving

selected state academic standards using alternate achievement standards to measure their progress.

The alternate assessment population is made up of a relatively small number of students with significant cognitive disabilities. In California, less than one percent of the total number of students statewide take the CAPA. Since examiners may adapt the CAPA based on students' instruction mode, accommodations and modifications do not apply to the CAPA. Further information is located on the CDE CAPA Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/capa.asp>.

For AYP reporting, the CAPA performance level the student receives (advanced, proficient, basic, below basic, or far below basic) is the level that is included in the AYP calculations. The CAPA is not treated as a separate test for accountability, because the CAPA is an "alternate" to the CSTs. The same basic calculation rules used for the CST also apply to the CAPA in AYP calculations.

## ■ CMA in AYP

In April 2007, the ED enacted regulations to require an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards. The CDE, in response to the federal regulations, developed the CMA, an alternate assessment of the California content standards based on modified achievement standards for students with an IEP who meet the SBE-adopted eligibility criteria. The purpose of the CMA is to allow students to demonstrate achievement of the content standards in ELA, mathematics, and science.

The CMA was administered statewide in 2010 for ELA (grades three through nine), mathematics (grades three through seven), Algebra I (end-of-course, available for grades seven through eleven), and science (grades five, eight, and ten). For 2010, a student with an IEP in these grades could take the CMA in one or more content areas instead of the CST for the same content area. It is up to the IEP team to determine participation in the CMA. Students without an IEP may not take the CMA. Students may take the CMA with accommodations if identified in the student's IEP. Further information is located on the CDE CMA Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/cmastar.asp>.

CMA results from grades two through eight in ELA and mathematics (but not science) are used in AYP calculations. The CMA for ELA and mathematics (grades three through five) were incorporated into the 2008 AYP. The CMA for ELA (grades six through eight) and mathematics (grades six and seven) were incorporated into the 2009 AYP. The CMA for Algebra I (end-of-course, available for grades seven and eight) will be incorporated into the 2010 AYP.

For the fall 2008 and 2009 AYP reports, students who took the CMA were counted as participants but test results were not included in percent proficient

calculations. In November 2008 and 2009, the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted performance levels for the CMA, and the AYP reports were updated to include test results in the percent proficient calculations.

Pending ED approval, the process of integrating new CMA assessments in the 2010 AYP determination is similar to previous years. Adopted performance levels for the CMA were not available in time for reporting the 2010 AYP in September 2010. To accommodate this situation, students who took the new CMA were counted as participants but were not included in percent proficient calculations in the September 2010 AYP reports. In November 2010, following SBE adoption of performance levels for the CMA, the 2010 AYP reports will be updated to include in the percent proficient calculations the test results from the CMA for Algebra I (end-of-course, available for grades seven and eight).

As with the CAPA and CST results in AYP reporting, the performance level the student received on the CMA (advanced, proficient, basic, below basic, or far below basic) is the level that is used in the AYP determinations. Students who scored at the proficient or advanced levels are counted as proficient or above. Students who scored at the bottom three levels are counted as not proficient.

# What is Included in AYP Reports?

The AYP reports provide federal accountability information about schools, LEAs, and the state. These reports are accessed on the CDE AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/>. This section describes the type of information included in AYP reports.

## County and LEA Lists of Schools

The County List of Schools and LEA List of Schools summarize selected AYP information for each school and LEA. The reports for 2010 have the same basic structure as the prior year reports. Both the County and LEA Lists of Schools contain the following information about each school or LEA:

- Whether 2010 AYP criteria were met for:
  - All components
  - ELA Participation Rate and AMO
  - Mathematics Participation Rate and AMO
  - API indicator
  - Graduation Rate indicator
- PI Status of the school or LEA

## School and LEA Reports

The school and LEA reports for 2010 have the same basic structure as the prior year reports. The brown navigation bar in the middle of the page allows users to easily move between results for the state API, federal AYP, and federal PI requirements. The selection links at the top right side of the page allows users to navigate various reports.

- The Summary report is located on the far left of the brown navigation bar (middle of the page). It contains the key state and federal overall results for 2009–10 that are also provided in the List of Schools reports. For AYP, information on both participation rate and percent proficient is provided for each content area.
- The AYP section on the brown navigation bar contains the remaining AYP reports. Once the user clicks on the AYP section, the selection links at the top right side of the page shows the links to the remaining reports.
  - The first selection link is to the Overview. The AYP Overview contains data showing whether the school or LEA met all AYP criteria and criteria in each of four AYP areas (participation rate, percent proficient, API as

additional indicator, and graduation rate). Participation rate and percent proficient results for subgroups are also provided.

- The second selection link is to the Chart. The AYP Chart contains the percent proficient results for the school overall and for all subgroups in a bar chart format.
- The third selection link is to the full report. The AYP report provides detailed results for each of the four areas (participation rate, percent proficient, API as additional indicator, and graduation rate).
- The fourth selection link is to the PI information. This contains a PI Status report for an LEA or a school. Additionally, LEAs receive PI Status and Grade Span reports that show whether each grade span (two to five, six to eight, and ten) met AYP criteria in ELA and mathematics for 2009 and 2010. The results in these reports are used to determine whether the LEA is identified for PI.

## **Statewide Data Files**

The data files of statewide AYP and PI results are provided in both DBF and ASCII text formats and are downloadable from the CDE AYP Data Files Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/aypdatafiles.asp>. Record layout, data definitions, and download instructions are also provided on this Web page.

# Accountability Reporting Timeline

- August 2010** New Accountability Coordinator Webcast occurs.
- The *2010 Adequate Yearly Progress Report Information Guide* is released on the CDE AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/>.
- The data review process for LEAs to examine CAHSEE data occurs. LEAs can make changes to demographic data from late August through early October.
- September 2010** The 2010 Growth API, 2010 AYP, 2010–11 PI, and Title III Accountability reports are released on September 9, 2010, on the CDE APR Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/apr/> and CDE Title III Accountability Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/>. The AYP reports incorporate reassignments resulting from the CAPA 1.0 percent cap for LEAs.
- The data review process for LEAs to examine STAR Program data begins. LEAs can make changes to demographic data through the test contractor during September through October.
- The appeals deadline for the September 2010 AYP results is September 23.
- November 2010** The SBE adopts performance levels for the new CMA, which includes ELA (grade nine), Algebra I (end-of-course, available for grades seven through eleven), and science (grade ten).
- Updated 2010 Growth API, 2010 AYP, 2010–11 PI, and Title III Accountability reports are released. These updated reports incorporate AYP appeal decisions and CMA results for Algebra I (end-of-course, available in grades seven and eight) for AYP and reassignments resulting from the CMA 2.0 percent cap for LEAs for AYP.
- February 2011** Updated 2010 Growth API, 2010 AYP, 2010-11 PI, and Title III Accountability reports are released on the APR and Title III Accountability Web pages. The CDE Title III Accountability Web page is at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/>. These reports will reflect data corrections for the CAHSEE and STAR Program made through the test contractor.

**April 2010**

The *2010-11 Academic Performance Index Reports Information Guide* is posted on the CDE API Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/api/>.

The 2010 Base API reports are released on the CDE APR Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/apr/>. These reports will include the 2010 Base API, growth targets, subgroup data, demographic data, statewide ranks, similar schools ranks, and school content area weights. These reports will also include results of the CMA for grades nine through eleven, including grades five, eight, and ten in science.

For more information about API and AYP reports, trainings, data review, and corrections processes, contact the AAP Unit by phone at 916-319-0863 or by e-mail at [aaucde@cdede.ca.gov](mailto:aaucde@cdede.ca.gov).

For more information about PI reports, AYP appeals, and PI determinations, contact the ERA Unit by phone at 916-319-0875 or by e-mail at [evaluation@cdede.ca.gov](mailto:evaluation@cdede.ca.gov) (PI reports and AYP appeals) or [piaccountability@cdede.ca.gov](mailto:piaccountability@cdede.ca.gov) (PI determinations).

For more information about Title III accountability reports, contact the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and Title III Accountability Programs Unit by phone at 916-319-0863 or by e-mail at [amao@cdede.ca.gov](mailto:amao@cdede.ca.gov).

# Who Receives an AYP Report?

## Schools and LEAs Receive an AYP Report

All schools, LEAs, and the state receive an AYP report. Schools and LEAs that receive federal Title I, Part A, funds receive a PI status. An LEA, for AYP reporting, is defined as a school district, a COE, or a statewide benefit charter.

A school must have a county-district-school (CDS) code, and an LEA must have a county-district (CD) code at the time of testing to receive a report. Information about CDS code assignments is located on the CDE Schools and Districts Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/si/ds/>.

## Charter Schools

Charter schools that are locally funded (funded through the LEA) and charters that are their own LEA (direct funded charter schools) are subject to the same AYP requirements of the ESEA Act of 2001 that apply to all public schools. If the charter school receives Title I, Part A, funds, the PI accountability provisions under Section 1116 of Title I, Part A, also apply. For accountability purposes, a statewide benefit charter is considered an LEA, and each of its school sites is considered a school.

Although a direct funded charter school is considered to be its own LEA (*Education Code [EC] Section 47636[a][1]*), the school is treated as a school for Title I purposes and receives the school report only. In addition, a direct funded charter school is subject to the PI provisions that apply to schools and not LEAs.

A direct funded charter school with no valid test scores for assessments used in AYP calculations is assigned the percent proficient results of its authorizing charter agency. If results of the authorizing agency are absent, results of the county as a whole are used.

AYP results from direct funded charter schools will not be counted in the AYP results of the sponsoring school district or COE. The CAPA 1.0 and CMA 2.0 percent caps apply to LEAs, including direct funded charter schools.

# Subgroups

Schools, LEAs, and the state must meet percent proficient and participation rate criteria (Requirements 1 and 2) in each content area (ELA and mathematics). Also, each numerically significant subgroup within a school, LEA, or the state must meet Requirements 1 and 2 in order for the school, LEA, and the state to make AYP. Reporting occurs for subgroups with at least 11 students enrolled on the first day of testing or 11 valid scores, but schools and LEAs are held accountable only for numerically significant subgroups.

## Definitions of Subgroups Used in AYP

Terms	Definitions
<p>A subgroup is “numerically significant” for AYP if it has:</p>	<p><b>Participation Rate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 or more students enrolled on the first day of testing</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• 50 or more students enrolled on the first day of testing who make up at least 15 percent of the total population eligible for testing</li> </ul> <p><b>Percent Proficient - AMOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 or more students with valid scores</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• 50 or more students with valid scores who make up at least 15 percent of the total number of all students with valid scores</li> </ul> <p>Note: A school or an LEA with fewer than 100 students enrolled on the first day of testing or fewer than 100 valid scores has no numerically significant subgroups for that indicator for AYP purposes.</p>
<p>Pending approval of California’s Accountability Workbook by the ED, “subgroups” used in AYP calculations include:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Black or African American</li> <li>• American Indian or Alaska Native</li> <li>• Asian</li> <li>• Filipino</li> <li>• Hispanic or Latino</li> <li>• Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</li> <li>• White</li> <li>• Two or More Races</li> <li>• Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</li> <li>• English Learners</li> <li>• Students with Disabilities</li> </ul> <p>The former “Pacific Islander” category is now called “Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.” A new category called “Two or More Races” is added in 2009–10.</p>

## Definitions of Subgroups Used in AYP (continued)

Terms	Definitions
"Socioeconomically Disadvantaged" is defined as:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A student neither of whose parents has received a high school diploma</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• A student who is eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program, also known as the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)</li> </ul>
"English Learners" are defined as:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELs, students who are identified as EL based on results of the California English Language Development Test (CELDT)</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• Reclassified fluent-English-proficient (RFEP) students who have not scored at the proficient level or above on the CST in ELA three times after being reclassified. These students are counted in determining numerical significance for the EL subgroup.</li> </ul>
"Students with Disabilities" are defined as:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students who receive special education services and have a valid disability code</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• Students who were previously identified as special education but who are no longer receiving special education services for two years after exiting special education. These students are <b>not</b> counted in determining numerical significance for the SWD subgroup.</li> </ul>

### Reclassified Fluent-English-Proficient

In calculating AYP for the EL subgroup in a school or an LEA, reclassified fluent-English-proficient (RFEP) students who have not scored proficient or above on the CST in ELA three times since reclassification are included in calculating the participation rate and AMOs for the EL subgroup. These RFEP students are counted when determining whether the EL subgroup meets the minimum subgroup size to be numerically significant.

For AYP calculations, RFEP student records for grades five and higher that are blank in the section that indicates whether or not the student scored at the proficient or above level on the CST in ELA three times default to a "yes." This means that an RFEP student in grade five or higher with a blank in that data field does not count in the EL subgroup.

### ELs First Enrolled in U.S. Schools

The results of ELs who were first enrolled in U.S. schools for less than a year before testing are not included in the count of valid scores or in the count of proficient or above. The definition of "the year ELs are first enrolled in U.S. schools" for 2010 AYP compares the date first enrolled to the date when most students have yet to start STAR Program testing, which was determined to be March 15, 2010. Any EL with an enrolled date after

March 15, 2009, is considered as enrolled in a U.S. school less than a year before STAR Program or CAHSEE testing and is not included in the count of valid scores or the count of proficient or above. (These students, however, are included in the AYP participation rate.)

## **Students with Disabilities**

The CDE includes in the SWD subgroup the scores of students who were previously identified under Section 602(3) of the IDEA but who are no longer receiving special education services for two years after exiting these services. Any student record with a special education exit date after March 15, 2008, is considered to have received special education services within the past two years and is included in the SWD subgroup. These students, however, are not counted when determining whether the SWD subgroup meets the minimum group size to be numerically significant. This rule matches the rule used in API calculations.

All students that take the CAPA or CMA are considered as receiving special education services, even if the disability code is blank.

A student with a disability who is placed in a private school by an LEA is included in the assessment and accountability system in the following ways:

- The student is required to participate in the state's academic assessment system.
- The assessment results are included in the LEA and statewide AYP decisions.
- The student counts towards the LEA's 1.0 percent CAPA cap and 2.0 percent CMA cap.

## **Race and Ethnicity Categories**

In October 2007, the ED published new guidance to states on maintaining, collecting, and reporting race and ethnicity data. The guidance requires states to ask respondents a two-part question. The first question addresses ethnicity and asks whether the respondent is Hispanic or Latino. The second question addresses race, which all respondents (including Hispanic or Latino respondents) are required to answer. It requests the respondent to select one or more races from a list of racial categories. Respondents who indicate they are Hispanic or Latino are reported as Hispanic or Latino, regardless of their response to the race question. In the fall of 2009, the CALPADS began collecting data following this guidance.

Pending approval of California's Accountability Workbook by the ED, the subgroup reporting categories beginning with the 2010 AYP are revised to accommodate the

changes around the collection and reporting of information on race and ethnicity. The race and ethnicity categories used in AYP reports are the same categories used in API reports.

Beginning with the 2010 AYP, race/ethnicity subgroups are reported on the API report as subgroups in eight categories: Black or African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Filipino, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races. The subcategories for Asian (i.e., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Asian Indian, Laotian, Cambodian, Other Asian, or Hmong) are counted as Asian. The subcategories for Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (i.e., Native Hawaiian, Guamanian, Samoan, Tahitian, or Other Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander) are counted as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. If multiple subcategories are marked in the same racial category (e.g., Chinese and Korean) the student is classified as that category (e.g., Asian), not Two or More Races.

The following steps determine in which race/ethnicity AYP subgroup a student's test results are included:

1. If the student record shows Hispanic or Latino in any field, the student's results are included in the Hispanic or Latino AYP subgroup.
2. If the student record shows non-Hispanic or Latino and only one race, the student's results are included in the AYP subgroup of that racial category.
3. If the student record shows non-Hispanic or Latino and more than one race, the student's results are included in the Two or More Races AYP subgroup.
4. If the student record shows blank in all fields only, the CDE will match against CALPADS to establish if the race/ethnicity category can be determined. If the race/ethnicity can be determined from CALPADS, the student's results will be included in the AYP subgroup of that race/ethnicity category. If the race/ethnicity cannot be determined from CALPADS, the student's results will only be included in the schoolwide and LEA-wide AYP results and will not count in any subgroup.

# AYP Criteria

This section describes the details of AYP criteria for California. Schools and LEAs are required to meet or exceed criteria annually in the following four areas in order to make AYP:

- Requirement 1: Participation Rate
- Requirement 2: Percent Proficient—AMOs
- Requirement 3: API as an Additional Indicator
- Requirement 4: Graduation Rate

Requirements 1 and 2 apply at the school, LEA, and subgroup levels. Requirements 3 and 4 apply only at the school and LEA levels.

If a school, an LEA, or a subgroup misses any one criterion of AYP, the school or LEA does not make AYP and could be identified for PI. Potentially, a school or an LEA may have up to 50 different criteria to meet in order to make AYP.

Requirements may be applied using **standard criteria** or **small school/LEA/subgroup criteria**. Standard criteria were established for schools, LEAs, or subgroups with sufficient numbers of test results or data. Small school/LEA/subgroup criteria using alternative methods are for schools, LEAs, or subgroups with small numbers of test results or data. Criteria details are provided in the “2010 Criteria Details” section on pages 32 through 45.

## AYP Targets Increase for 2010

The AYP targets for schools and LEAs increased for the 2010 AYP (changes in **bold**).

- The required percentage of students proficient or above for elementary schools, middle schools, and elementary school districts in ELA is now **56.8**, in mathematics **58.0**.
- The required percentage of students proficient or above for high schools and high school districts in ELA is now **55.6**, in mathematics **54.8**.
- The required percentage of students proficient or above for unified school districts, high school districts, and COEs in ELA is now **56.0**, in mathematics **56.4**.
- To meet the API requirement for AYP purposes, an LEA or school must demonstrate a growth of at least 1 point or a minimum API score of at least **680**.
- **The graduation rate criteria have changed beginning with the 2010 AYP.** Beginning with the 2010 AYP, a school or an LEA with grade twelve students


must meet one of three graduation rate targets to make AYP: (1) a 2010 graduation rate of at least 90.00, (2) a 2010 fixed growth target rate, or (3) a 2010 variable growth target rate. The fixed and variable growth targets are unique to each school rather than a standard target for all, as was required in the past.

The AYP targets for percent proficient or above and the API will continue to increase annually until 2014, as shown in the charts on pages 25 through 27. The AYP targets for graduation rate increase until 2019 if the school or LEA has a graduation rate below 90 percent.

## 2010 AYP Criteria Flowchart

This chart illustrates the process of determining whether a school or an LEA makes AYP.



### School or LEA




- API** = Academic Performance Index
- AYP** = Adequate Yearly Progress
- ELA** = English-language arts
- LEA** = Local educational agency (school district, COE, or statewide benefit charter)
- NSS** = Numerically significant subgroup
- SL** = Schoolwide or LEA-wide

## AYP Targets, 2002–2014 Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, and Elementary School Districts

- Participation Rate – 95 percent (schoolwide/LEA-wide and subgroups)
- Percent Proficient – AMOs (schoolwide/LEA-wide and subgroups)



- Additional Indicator – Growth in the API of at least one point OR a minimum API score (schoolwide/LEA-wide)





Note: AMO targets are level at two time intervals between 2002 and 2007 and then increase yearly to 2014. This pattern was established to reflect the expectation that the strongest academic gains in schools and LEAs are likely to occur in later years (after alignment of instruction with state content standards, after schools and LEAs have the opportunity for increased capacity, and after a highly-qualified teacher is in every classroom).

## AYP Targets, 2002–2014


### High Schools and High School Districts

(with students in any of grades nine through twelve)

- Participation Rate – 95 percent (schoolwide/LEA-wide and subgroups)
- Percent Proficient – AMOs (schoolwide/LEA-wide and subgroups)



- Additional Indicator – Growth in the API of at least one point OR a minimum API score (schoolwide/LEA-wide)
- Minimum graduation rate OR fixed growth target OR variable growth target (schoolwide/LEA-wide)



### Minimum Graduation Rate



- 2010 AYP graduation rate of at least 90.00
- or -
- 2010 fixed growth target rate for a school or an LEA
- or -
- 2010 variable growth target rate for a school or an LEA

Note: AMO targets are level at two time intervals between 2002 and 2007 and then increase yearly to 2014. This pattern was established to reflect the expectation that the strongest academic gains in schools and LEAs are likely to occur in later years (after alignment of instruction with state content standards, after schools and LEAs have the opportunity for increased capacity, and after a highly-qualified teacher is in every classroom).


## AYP Targets, 2002-2014 Unified School Districts, High School Districts, and County Offices of Education

(with students in any of grades two through eight and nine through twelve)

- Participation Rate – 95 percent (schoolwide/LEA-wide and subgroups)
- Percent Proficient – AMOs (schoolwide/LEA-wide and subgroups)



- Additional Indicator – Growth in the API of at least one point OR a minimum API score (schoolwide/LEA-wide)
- Minimum graduation rate OR fixed growth target OR variable growth target (schoolwide/LEA-wide)



### Minimum Graduation Rate

- 2010 AYP graduation rate of at least 90.00
- or -
- 2010 fixed growth target rate for a school or an LEA
- or -
- 2010 variable growth target rate for a school or an LEA

Note: AMO targets are level at two time intervals between 2002 and 2007 and then increase yearly to 2014. This pattern was established to reflect the expectation that the strongest academic gains in schools and LEAs are likely to occur in later years (after alignment of instruction with state content standards, after schools and LEAs have the opportunity for increased capacity, and after a highly-qualified teacher is in every classroom).

## School Type for AYP Purposes

The targets determined for AYP vary by school type (elementary, middle, and high) and by LEA type (elementary, high, unified, and COE). School type designations of elementary, middle, and high have previously been determined for AYP using the same methodology used in determining school type for the API ranks. LEA type is determined from the California Public School Directory database. School type for 2010 AYP will be updated once enrollment data are available through CALPADS.

### ■ How School Type is Determined

This section describes the basic steps the CDE used in determining school type for 2010 AYP.

#### Step 1: Grade span from STAR Program data used to assign school type.

Using data from the 2010 STAR Program database, the CDE determined a school's grade span according to the lowest and highest grade in which student answer documents were reported for a school. For most schools, the AYP school type was determined according to the following table:

**Grade Span Criteria  
for AYP School Type Classification**

School Type Assigned for AYP	Grade Span of STAR Program Student Answer Documents
Elementary	2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 2-7, 2-8 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-6, 3-7, 3-8 4-4, 4-5, 4-6, 4-7 5-5, 5-6 6-6
Middle	4-8 5-7, 5-8 6-7, 6-8, 6-9 7-7, 7-8, 7-9 8-8, 8-9
High	7-10, 7-11, 7-12 8-10, 8-11, 8-12 9-9, 9-10, 9-11, 9-12 10-10, 10-11, 10-12 11-11, 11-12 12-12

**Step 2: Predominance of students in grade levels used to assign school type.**

Some schools have grade spans that are much broader than those listed in Step 1. For example, a two through twelve grade school serves elementary, middle, and high school students.

### School Type by Predominance of Students in Grade Levels

School Type Assigned for AYP	Grade Span of STAR Program Student Answer Documents
Determined by Enrollment	2-9, 2-10, 2-11, 2-12 3-9, 3-10, 3-11, 3-12 4-9, 4-10, 4-11, 4-12 5-9, 5-10, 5-11, 5-12 6-10, 6-11, 6-12

In these cases, school type is determined according to the number of students in each grade level at a school and according to "core" grade spans:

### Core Grade Spans for Determining AYP School Type

School Type	Core Grade Span Served
Elementary	2-5
Middle	7-8
High	9-12

Note: Grade six is left out of the core grade span designations. Because some schools view grade six as "elementary" while others view it as "middle," the process remains neutral on whether grade six is considered one or the other.

Schools with a grade span that crosses three core spans (e.g., grades four through twelve) are assigned a school type according to the highest number of students in a core grade span. For example, a school with grades four through twelve has enrollment of 106 students in the two through grade five span; 192 students in the seven and eight span; and 52 students in the nine through twelve span. Since the enrollment in grades seven and eight is the largest of the three core grade spans, the school is assigned a "middle" school type. If the enrollment for two core grade spans is equal, the school type is equal to the previous year's AYP school type.

**Step 3: School name or characteristics is used to assign school type.**

In a very small number of cases, a school may not have a current grade span or enrollment on file at the CDE. In these situations, the school type may be assigned based on the name or characteristics of the school. Absent the pertinent indicators used to determine a school's type, a school type of elementary will be assigned for AYP purposes. If the school is new and has no test results for the year of the AYP,

the school does not receive an AYP report. Also, California testing begins in grade two. For schools with only kindergarten and/or grade one or with no STAR Program student answer documents due to late testing, the prior year’s school type will be maintained.

## 2010 AYP Criteria Summary

The following two tables summarize the AYP criteria for 2010. The first table displays the standard criteria for most schools, and the second table displays the criteria for a small school, LEA, or subgroup.

### 2010 AYP Targets, Standard Criteria

These criteria apply to schools, LEAs, and numerically significant subgroups that have at least 100 students enrolled on the first day of testing and/or at least 100 valid scores. Subgroups are excluded from Requirements 3 and 4. Graduation rate criteria apply to schools or LEAs with grade twelve data and with 50 or more students in the graduation rate denominator (graduates plus dropouts) of the current and prior year calculation.

Type of School or LEA	Requirement 1: Participation Rate	Requirement 2: Percent Proficient - AMOs	Requirement 3: API as an Additional Indicator	Requirement 4: Graduation Rate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elementary Schools</li> <li>Middle Schools</li> <li>Elementary School Districts</li> </ul>	ELA: 95% Math: 95% (rounded to nearest whole number)	ELA: 56.8% Math: 58.0% (rounded to the nearest tenth)	680 API or 1 point growth	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Schools</li> <li>High School Districts</li> </ul> (with students in any of grades 9–12)	ELA: 95% Math: 95% (rounded to nearest whole number)	ELA: 55.6% Math: 54.8% (rounded to the nearest tenth)	680 API or 1 point growth	Meet at least one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>90.00%</li> <li>Fixed growth target rate</li> <li>Variable growth target rate</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unified School Districts</li> <li>High School Districts</li> <li>County Offices of Education</li> </ul> (with students in any of grades 2–8 and 9–12)	ELA: 95% Math: 95% (rounded to nearest whole number)	ELA: 56.0% Math: 56.4% (rounded to the nearest tenth)	680 API or 1 point growth	Meet at least one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>90.00%</li> <li>Fixed growth target rate</li> <li>Variable growth target rate</li> </ul>

Note: Not all schools contain grades or results for each AYP requirement, and alternative methods are applied in some cases to ensure that all schools and LEAs receive an AYP report. These methods and codes are described in the “Alternative Methods” section on pages 48 through 50.

## 2010 AYP Targets, Small School/LEA/Subgroup Criteria

These criteria apply to schools, LEAs, and numerically significant subgroups with fewer than 100 students enrolled on the first day of testing and/or fewer than 100 valid scores. To be considered numerically significant under Requirement 2, the subgroup must be in a school or an LEA that has at least 100 valid scores. If not, none of the subgroups are considered numerically significant, and Requirement 2 would not apply. Subgroups are excluded from Requirements 3 and 4. Graduation rate criteria apply to schools or LEAs with grade twelve data or with 50 or more students in the graduation rate denominator (graduates plus dropouts) of the current and prior year calculation.

Size of School, LEA, or Subgroup	Requirement 1: Participation Rate	Requirement 2: Percent Proficient - AMOs	Requirement 3: API as an Additional Indicator	Requirement 4: Graduation Rate
51–99 students	ELA: 95% Math: 95% (rounded up to nearest whole number)	For a school or an LEA: Confidence Interval Adjusted AMO Table (see page 36) For a numerically significant subgroup: Standard Criteria (see table on page 34)	680 API or 1 point growth	Meet at least one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90.00%</li> <li>• Fixed growth target rate</li> <li>• Variable growth target rate</li> </ul>
50 students	Must test at least 47 students	For a school or an LEA: Confidence Interval Adjusted AMO Table (see page 36) For a numerically significant subgroup: Standard Criteria (see table on page 34)	680 API or 1 point growth	Meet at least one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90.00%</li> <li>• Fixed growth target rate</li> <li>• Variable growth target rate</li> </ul>
11–49 students	N/A	For a school or an LEA: Confidence Interval Adjusted AMO Table (see page 36) For a numerically significant subgroup:N/A	N/A	N/A
Fewer than 11 students	N/A	For a school or an LEA: Confidence Interval Adjusted AMO Table (see page 36) For a numerically significant subgroup:N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: Not all schools contain grades or results for each AYP requirement, and alternative methods are applied in some cases to ensure that all schools and LEAs receive an AYP report. These methods and codes are described in the "Alternative Methods" section on pages 48 through 50.

## 2010 AYP Criteria Details

The specific details of Requirements 1 through 4 are described under the next four bulleted items.

### ■ Requirement 1: Participation Rate

ESEA requires a 95 percent participation rate in the percentage of students taking statewide assessments in order to make AYP. This requirement is applied separately for schools, LEAs, and numerically significant subgroups for each content area (ELA and mathematics).

#### **Standard Criteria**

A participation rate of 95 percent, rounded to the nearest whole number, is required of a school, an LEA, or a numerically significant subgroup with 100 or more students enrolled on the first day of testing.

#### **Small School/LEA/Subgroup Criteria**

For small schools, LEAs, and subgroups, alternative criteria are applied. If the school or LEA has 49 or fewer students enrolled on the first day of testing, the participation rate requirement does not apply. If the school, LEA, or subgroup has 50 students enrolled on the first day of testing, at least 47 students must be tested to meet the participation rate criterion. If the school, LEA, or subgroup has between 51 to 99 students enrolled on the first day of testing, the participation rate requirement is 95 percent, rounded up to the nearest whole number.

#### **Exclusions**

Students who are absent from testing due to a significant medical emergency are excluded from the participation rate. (Student records marked as “not tested due to significant medical emergency” will not be counted for or against the school or LEA in the participation rate.)

ELs during their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools are included in the participation rate.

#### **Subgroups**

A numerically significant subgroup for participation rate calculations is defined as having 100 or more students enrolled on the first day of testing or 50 or more students enrolled on the first day of testing who make up at least 15 percent of the total student population. If the school or LEA has 100 or more students enrolled on the first day of testing, the participation rate is calculated for subgroups that are numerically significant. If the school or LEA has fewer than 100 students enrolled on the first day of testing, none of the subgroups are considered numerically significant.

## Alternative Methods

Schools where LEA data are used to determine the percent proficient or above level (i.e., use of pair and share alternative method) do not have a participation rate calculation.

A two-year average participation rate will be considered for schools, LEAs, and numerically significant subgroups that have not met the 2010 participation rate criteria using a one-year formula. Averages are determined by aggregating enrollments over two years. First, the one-year participation rate is calculated. This is the only rate that is printed on all reports. If a school, an LEA, or a subgroup does not meet the minimum 95 percent participation rate using the one-year rate calculation, the two-year participation rate is calculated.

### Two-Year Formula

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Two-Year Participation Rate for 2010</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Number Tested in 2010 + Number Tested in 2009</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>divided by</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Enrollment on the First Day of Testing 2010 + Enrollment on the First Day of Testing 2009</p>
---

## ■ Requirement 2: Percent Proficient – AMOs

ESEA mandates that all students perform at the proficient or above level on statewide assessments in ELA and mathematics by 2014. California's AMOs are the minimum percentages of students who are required to meet or exceed the proficient level on the state assessments used for AYP. The AMOs will continue to rise every year so that by 2014, 100 percent of students in all schools, LEAs, and numerically significant subgroups must score at the proficient or above level.

### Standard Criteria

The following table shows California's 2010 percent proficient standard criteria for schools or LEAs with at least 100 valid test scores or for numerically significant subgroups that have at least 50 students with valid scores. It is important to note that the percent proficient criteria for schools in a unified school district differ from the school district's criteria. The percent proficient criteria for the state are the same as for a unified school district. The percent proficient rates are rounded to the nearest tenth.

## Standard Criteria for AMOs

These criteria apply to schools or LEAs that have at least 100 students with valid scores or numerically significant subgroups that have at least 50 students with valid scores.

Standard Schools and LEAs	Percent Proficient or Above On the CST, CAHSEE, CMA, and CAPA for 2010	
	English-Language Arts	Mathematics
<b>Schools</b>		
• Elementary and Middle Schools	56.8	58.0
• High Schools	55.6	54.8
<b>LEAs</b>		
• Elementary School Districts	56.8	58.0
• High School Districts (with grades 9–12)	55.6	54.8
• Unified School Districts, • High School Districts, and • County Offices of Education (with grades 2–8 and 9–12)	56.0	56.4

### Small School/LEA/Subgroup Criteria

Different AMO criteria are applied to small schools, LEAs, and subgroups in AYP calculations.

- **Small Schools and Small LEAs**

All schools and LEAs receive an AYP report, including those in the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM), small schools, small school districts, and small COEs. Schools and LEAs with fewer than 100 valid scores have adjusted AMOs to account for the small number of test scores. These schools and LEAs must meet the adjusted percent proficient criteria for under 100 valid test scores. The AMOs are adjusted using a confidence interval methodology.

The tables on pages 36 and 37 show the number of scores a school or an LEA needs at the proficient or above level in order to meet the adjusted AMO criteria for 2010 and 2011. The table for 2011 is also included in this guide to show the upcoming targets for next year. The tables were generated by using the standard error of the proportion to construct a confidence interval around the school's observed proportion ("proficient or above"), based on a 99 percent confidence interval for each school. This confidence interval covers 2.33 standard deviation units above the

school's observed proportion. If the percent proficient falls within this range, it cannot be considered statistically different enough from the school's observed proportion; therefore, the school is considered to have scored high enough to meet the AMO. The percent proficient has been converted into the number of proficient or above scores to facilitate the use of the table. Finally, the tables have been adjusted to smooth the transition at the upper range of valid scores so that there is not an abrupt jump in the percent proficient targets when moving from 99 to 100 valid scores.

## Confidence Interval Adjusted AMO Table for 2010

To use the table, determine the number of valid scores available in a content area. Then reference the appropriate percent proficient, or AMO criteria, at the top of the table to determine the number of scores at or above the proficient level that are needed to meet the criterion. Refer to the AMOs on pages 25 through 27 for the appropriate percent proficient for your school or LEA.

Number of Valid Scores	Percent Proficient (AMO) Criteria					
	54.8%	55.6%	56.0%	56.4%	56.8%	58.0%
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	2	2	2	2	2	2
10	2	2	2	2	2	2
11	2	2	2	2	2	3
12	3	3	3	3	3	3
13	3	3	3	3	3	3
14	3	3	4	4	4	4
15	4	4	4	4	4	4
16	4	4	4	4	4	5
17	5	5	5	5	5	5
18	5	5	5	5	5	6
19	5	6	6	6	6	6
20	6	6	6	6	6	6
21	6	6	6	7	7	7
22	7	7	7	7	7	7
23	7	7	7	7	8	8
24	7	8	8	8	8	8
25	8	8	8	8	8	9
26	8	9	9	9	9	9
27	9	9	9	9	9	10
28	9	9	10	10	10	10
29	10	10	10	10	10	11
30	10	10	10	11	11	11
31	11	11	11	11	11	12
32	11	11	11	12	12	12
33	11	12	12	12	12	13
34	12	12	12	12	13	13
35	12	13	13	13	13	13
36	13	13	13	13	14	14
37	13	14	14	14	14	14
38	14	14	14	14	14	15
39	14	14	15	15	15	15
40	15	15	15	15	15	16
41	15	15	16	16	16	16
42	16	16	16	16	16	17
43	16	16	16	17	17	17
44	16	17	17	17	17	18
45	17	17	17	18	18	18
46	17	18	18	18	18	19
47	18	18	18	19	19	19
48	18	19	19	19	19	20
49	19	19	19	20	20	20
50	19	20	20	20	20	21

Number of Valid Scores	Percent Proficient (AMO) Criteria					
	54.8%	55.6%	56.0%	56.4%	56.8%	58.0%
51	20	20	20	20	21	21
52	20	21	21	21	21	22
53	21	21	21	21	22	22
54	21	22	22	22	22	23
55	22	22	22	22	23	23
56	22	22	23	23	23	24
57	22	23	23	23	24	24
58	23	23	24	24	24	25
59	23	24	24	24	25	25
60	24	24	25	25	25	26
61	24	25	25	25	26	26
62	25	25	26	26	26	27
63	25	26	26	26	27	27
64	26	26	27	27	27	28
65	26	27	27	27	28	28
66	27	27	28	28	28	29
67	27	28	28	28	29	29
68	28	28	29	29	29	30
69	28	29	29	29	30	30
70	29	29	30	30	30	31
71	29	30	30	30	31	31
72	30	30	30	31	31	32
73	30	31	31	31	32	32
74	31	31	31	32	32	33
75	31	32	32	32	33	33
76	32	32	32	33	33	34
77	32	33	33	33	34	35
78	33	34	34	34	35	36
79	34	35	35	35	36	37
80	35	36	36	36	37	38
81	36	37	37	37	38	39
82	37	38	38	38	39	40
83	38	39	39	39	40	41
84	39	40	40	40	41	42
85	40	41	41	41	42	43
86	41	42	42	42	43	44
87	42	43	43	43	44	45
88	43	44	44	44	45	46
89	44	45	45	45	46	47
90	45	46	46	46	47	48
91	46	47	47	47	48	49
92	47	48	48	48	49	50
93	48	49	49	49	50	51
94	49	50	50	50	51	52
95	50	51	51	51	52	53
96	51	52	52	52	53	54
97	52	53	53	53	54	55
98	53	54	54	54	55	56
99	54	55	55	55	56	57
100	55	56	56	56	57	58

## Confidence Interval Adjusted AMO Table for 2011

To use the table, determine the number of valid scores available in a content area. Then reference the appropriate percent proficient, or AMO criteria, at the top of the table to determine the number of scores at or above the proficient level that are needed to meet the criterion. Refer to the AMOs on pages 25 through 27 for the appropriate percent proficient for your school or LEA.

Number of Valid Scores	Percent Proficient (AMO) Criteria					
	66.1%	66.7%	67.0%	67.3%	67.6%	68.5%
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	2	2	2	2	2	2
8	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	3	3	3	3	3	3
10	3	3	3	3	3	3
11	4	4	4	4	4	4
12	4	4	4	4	4	4
13	5	5	5	5	5	5
14	5	5	5	5	5	5
15	6	6	6	6	6	6
16	6	6	6	6	6	6
17	7	7	7	7	7	7
18	7	7	7	7	7	8
19	8	8	8	8	8	8
20	8	8	8	8	8	9
21	9	9	9	9	9	9
22	9	9	9	10	10	10
23	10	10	10	10	10	10
24	10	10	11	11	11	11
25	11	11	11	11	11	12
26	11	12	12	12	12	12
27	12	12	12	12	12	13
28	13	13	13	13	13	13
29	13	13	13	13	14	14
30	14	14	14	14	14	14
31	14	14	15	15	15	15
32	15	15	15	15	15	16
33	15	16	16	16	16	16
34	16	16	16	16	16	17
35	16	17	17	17	17	17
36	17	17	17	17	18	18
37	18	18	18	18	18	19
38	18	18	19	19	19	19
39	19	19	19	19	19	20
40	19	20	20	20	20	20
41	20	20	20	20	21	21
42	20	21	21	21	21	22
43	21	21	21	22	22	22
44	22	22	22	22	22	23
45	22	22	23	23	23	23
46	23	23	23	23	24	24
47	23	24	24	24	24	25
48	24	24	24	25	25	25
49	25	25	25	25	25	26
50	25	25	26	26	26	26

Number of Valid Scores	Percent Proficient (AMO) Criteria					
	66.1%	66.7%	67.0%	67.3%	67.6%	68.5%
51	26	26	26	26	27	27
52	26	27	27	27	27	28
53	27	27	27	28	28	28
54	27	28	28	28	28	29
55	28	28	29	29	29	29
56	29	29	29	29	30	30
57	29	30	30	30	30	31
58	30	30	30	31	31	31
59	30	31	31	31	31	32
60	31	31	32	32	32	33
61	32	32	32	32	33	33
62	32	33	33	33	33	34
63	33	33	33	34	34	34
64	33	34	34	34	34	35
65	34	34	35	35	35	36
66	34	35	35	35	36	36
67	35	36	36	36	36	37
68	36	36	36	37	37	37
69	36	37	37	37	37	38
70	37	37	38	38	38	39
71	37	38	38	38	39	40
72	38	39	39	39	40	41
73	39	40	40	40	41	42
74	40	41	41	41	42	43
75	41	42	42	42	43	44
76	42	43	43	43	44	45
77	43	44	44	44	45	46
78	44	45	45	45	46	47
79	45	46	46	46	47	48
80	46	47	47	47	48	49
81	47	48	48	48	49	50
82	48	49	49	49	50	51
83	49	50	50	50	51	52
84	50	51	51	51	52	53
85	51	52	52	52	53	54
86	52	53	53	53	54	55
87	53	54	54	54	55	56
88	54	55	55	55	56	57
89	55	56	56	56	57	58
90	56	57	57	57	58	59
91	57	58	58	58	59	60
92	58	59	59	59	60	61
93	59	60	60	60	61	62
94	60	61	61	61	62	63
95	61	62	62	62	63	64
96	62	63	63	63	64	65
97	63	64	64	64	65	66
98	64	65	65	65	66	67
99	65	66	66	66	67	68
100	66	67	67	67	68	69

- **Small Subgroups**

The school or LEA must have at least 100 valid scores for the subgroup to be considered numerically significant for the AMO. If the school or LEA has fewer than 100 valid scores, none of the subgroups are considered numerically significant, and Requirement 2 would not apply. For example, a subgroup with 99 valid scores in a school with 99 valid scores would not be considered numerically significant.

If the numerically significant subgroup is in a school or an LEA with at least 100 valid scores, the standard criteria for AMOs are applied if the subgroup has between 50 to 99 valid scores. Subgroups with 49 or fewer valid scores are not numerically significant, and AMOs would not apply.

### **Exclusions**

Students who are absent from testing due to a significant medical emergency are excluded from the percent proficient calculations. (Student records marked as “not tested due to significant medical emergency” are not counted for or against the school or LEA in the percent proficient.)

ELs during their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools are excluded from the percent proficient calculations.

### **Subgroups**

If the school or LEA has 100 or more valid test scores, the percent proficient is calculated for numerically significant subgroups. A numerically significant subgroup for percent proficient calculations is defined as having 100 or more students with valid scores or 50 or more students with valid scores who make up at least 15 percent of the total number of students with valid scores. If the school or LEA has fewer than 100 valid scores, none of the subgroups are considered numerically significant.

### **Alternative Methods**

A two-year average percent at the proficient or above level will be considered for schools, LEAs, and numerically significant subgroups that have not met the 2010 AMOs using a one-year formula. Averages are determined by aggregating results over two years. First, the one-year percentage is calculated. This is the only percentage that is printed on all reports. If a school, an LEA, or a subgroup does not meet its AMO target using the one-year method, the two-year method is used.

## Two-Year Formula

**Two-Year Percent Proficient for 2010**

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{Number Proficient or Above in 2010} \\ + \text{Number Proficient of Above in 2009} \end{array}}{\begin{array}{l} \text{Number of Valid Scores in 2010} \\ + \text{Number of Valid Scores in 2009} \end{array}}$$

### ■ Requirement 3: API as an Additional Indicator

ESEA requires that each state adopt an “additional” indicator for AYP. California has chosen to use the API as an additional indicator for all schools and LEAs. Progress on the API is defined differently for AYP requirements than for the state API requirements. A school or an LEA that had its API invalidated also fails to make AYP.

### Standard AYP Criteria for API

Pending approval of California’s Accountability Workbook by the ED, these criteria apply to schools and LEAs that have at least 50 students with valid scores.

Type	Criteria
<b>Standard Schools and LEAs</b>	To meet API requirements for the 2010 AYP, the school or LEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Show growth of at least one point for 2009–10</li> <li style="text-align: center;">- or -</li> <li>• Have a 2010 Growth API of at least 680</li> </ul>

For example, a school with a Base API of 593 that grew to 594 on its Growth API would meet the API criteria for the additional indicator under AYP. These requirements apply at the school and LEA levels but do not apply to subgroups.

The state’s *California Code of Regulations* and California *EC* specify what constitutes a valid API for state accountability. A school or an LEA with an invalid Growth API does not meet the API as an additional indicator criteria (Requirement 3) under AYP, and the school or LEA would not make AYP.

**Proposed API for AYP Rules**

Pending ED approval, the group size of 50 would be used for the API as the additional indicator for AYP. Having a minimum group size for both the API and graduation rate for AYP will provide consistency in California’s accountability system. The minimum group size for the API would only apply in AYP determinations. Schools or LEAs would be exempt from the API requirement for AYP if they have fewer than 50 valid scores.

■ **Requirement 4: Graduation Rate**

ESEA requires that the state use the graduation rate as an additional indicator for all schools and LEAs with grade twelve students. The graduation rate for AYP purposes is defined according to the year of AYP reporting (e.g., rate for 2010). On other CDE reports, the graduation rate is defined as the school year of the graduating class (e.g., Class of 2008–09). Note that the AYP graduation rate data on the report are one year older (e.g., 2008–09) than other data on the AYP report (e.g., 2009–10). This is permissible under federal guidance.

High school graduates and four years of dropout data are used to determine the rate. Graduates and grade twelve dropouts will come from student level data collected through CALPADS. Grades ten through eleven dropouts come from the student level data collected through the Annual SSID Maintenance, and information on grade nine comes from aggregate level CBEDS data.

Comprehensive high schools and LEAs with grade twelve data have their 2010 graduation rates calculated using standard procedures. The graduation rate goal for all schools and LEAs is 90 percent beginning with the 2010 AYP. Also beginning with the 2010 AYP, the new growth target structure requires all schools and LEAs to meet the 90 percent goal by 2019 AYP.

**Standard Graduation Rate Criteria**

Type	Criteria
Schools and LEAs with High School Students	To meet graduation rate criteria for the 2010 AYP the school or LEA must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a 2010 graduation rate of at least 90.00</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• Meet its 2010 fixed growth target rate</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• Meet its 2010 variable growth target rate</li> </ul>

- **Fixed Growth Target Rate**

The **fixed growth** graduation rate schedule was established based on the difference between the school's or LEA's baseline graduation rate (i.e., 2009 AYP graduation rate) and the 90 percent goal divided by the number of years remaining before the 2019 AYP (i.e., ten years). This difference was used to establish a schedule of ten equal graduation rate targets. The schedule of ten graduation rate targets was developed once in the 2010 AYP and will not be recalculated each year.

For example, a school with a 2009 AYP graduation rate of 50 percent would have a target schedule of 4.00 percentage points per year. The target is calculated by subtracting 50 percent (i.e., baseline graduation rate) from 90 percent (i.e., the graduation rate goal) and dividing by 10 (i.e., the number of years until 2019 AYP). The target is then used to calculate the schedule of targets for the next ten years (e.g., 54.00, 58.00, 62.00, and so on).

The **fixed growth target rate** is the sum of the prior year rate (i.e., 2009 AYP graduation rate) and the fixed growth target.

- **Variable Growth Target Rate**

The **variable growth** graduation rate is established based on the difference between the school's or LEA's current graduation rate and the 90 percent goal divided by the number of years remaining before the 2019 AYP. The variable graduation rate target is calculated yearly for each school and LEA. For the 2010 AYP, the variable growth target rate will be the same as the fixed growth target rate. However, the variable growth target rate changes each year according to the school's current graduation rate.

For example, a school with a 2009 AYP graduation rate of 60 percent would have a variable target of 3.00 percentage points for the 2010 AYP. If this same school has a 2010 graduation rate of 62 percent, its variable target for the 2011 AYP would be 3.11 percentage points.

The **variable growth target rate** is the sum of the prior year rate (i.e., 2009 AYP graduation rate) and the variable growth target.

### **Calculating the 2010 AYP Graduation Rate**

The graduation rate calculation method for the 2010 AYP will be the same as the method used for 2009 AYP. A four-year graduation rate is used, based on the definition established by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).


## Four-Year Graduation Rate Formula for ESEA

<p><b>Graduation Rate for 2010</b></p> <p>Number of Graduates (2008–09)</p> <p><b>divided by</b></p> <p>Number of Graduates (2008–09)</p> <p>+ Grade 9 Dropouts (2005–06) + Grade 10 Dropouts (2006–07)</p> <p>+ Grade 11 Dropouts (2007–08) + Grade 12 Dropouts (2008–09)</p>
--

### Three Options for Meeting 2010 AYP Graduation Rate Criteria


Three options for meeting 2010 AYP graduation rate criteria are shown below and on the next page.

#### Option 1: Graduation Rate of 90.00 or Above




In this example, North Star High School met its 2010 AYP criteria for the graduation rate under Option 1 because the rate for 2010 was 93.07, which exceeds the minimum rate of 90.00.

## Option 2: Meet Fixed Growth Target Rate



In this example, Polaris Unified School District met its 2010 AYP criteria for the graduation rate under Option 2 because its 2010 graduation rate of 81.60 percent exceeded the fixed growth target rate of 80.51 percent.

## Option 3: Meet Variable Growth Target Rate



In this example, Saturn High School did not meet its 2010 AYP criteria for the graduation rate under Option 3 because the school's 2010 graduation rate of 81.37 percent is less than its variable growth target rate of 83.45 percent.

## Graduation Rate Rules

### Schools

1. The graduation rate data used to determine AYP are always lagged. For example, the 2010 AYP determination includes the Class of 2008–09 graduation data to determine if the goal of 90 percent was met and includes the Class of 2007–08 and the Class of 2008–09 graduation data to determine if one of the growth targets were met.
2. The graduation rate requirement applies only to schools with grade twelve data. This is defined as:
  - Grade twelve enrollment data during the year of the most recent graduation data (i.e., for the 2010 AYP determination, a school with grade twelve enrollment at any time during the 2008–09 school year will be subject to the graduation rate criteria), or
  - Grade twelve graduation data during the year of the most recent graduation data, or
  - Grade twelve dropout data during the year of the most recent graduation data.

Schools without these grade twelve data are exempt from the criteria.

3. The graduation rate criteria apply only to schools with 50 or more students in the graduation rate denominator (graduates plus dropouts) in both the prior and current years.
4. All direct funded charter schools, regardless of whether they are ASAM or county run schools, with 50 or more students in both the prior and current year's graduation rate have their own graduation rate calculated.
5. All county run schools and ASAM schools with 50 or more students in both the prior and current year's graduation rate have an assigned rate. The county run schools have the countywide rate assigned, and the district run ASAM schools have the district rate assigned.
6. The State Special Schools have the countywide rate assigned if they have 50 or more students in both the prior and current year's graduation rate.
7. High schools without grade twelve students are not held accountable for the graduation rate criteria until they are eligible to receive a graduation rate for two years (i.e., once they have grade twelve students for two years).

### School Districts

1. All students' graduation and dropout data are rolled up to the school district, including students in schools without grade twelve enrollment and students in schools that do not receive a graduation rate. This excludes direct funded charter schools and State Special Schools.
2. The graduation rate requirement applies only to school districts with 50 or more students in both the prior and current years' graduation rate denominator. School districts without these minimum data are exempt from the graduation rate requirement.
3. School districts with 50 or more students in both the prior and current years' graduation rate denominator have their own graduation rate calculated. Districts do not receive an assigned graduation rate.

### County Offices of Education

1. The graduation rate criteria apply only to COEs that have 50 or more graduates and dropouts in both the prior and current years. COEs without these minimum data are exempt from the graduation rate requirement.
2. COEs with 50 or more graduates and dropouts in both the current and prior years have the countywide average graduation rate applied.

## **Safe Harbor**

ESEA contains a "safe harbor" provision for meeting AMOs in some circumstances and is applied in the AYP reports when these circumstances occur. Safe harbor is an alternate method of meeting the AMOs. Currently, if a school, an LEA, or a subgroup does not meet its AMO criteria in either or both content areas but shows progress in moving students from scoring below the proficient level to the proficient level or above on the assessments, it may make AYP if all of the following conditions are met:

- The percentage of students in the school, LEA, or subgroup performing below the proficient level in either ELA or mathematics decreased by at least 10 percent of that percentage from the preceding school year;
- The school, LEA, or subgroup had a "Yes" or blank in the "Met 2010 AYP Criteria" column for participation rate for the assessments in ELA and mathematics;
- The school, LEA, or subgroup demonstrated at least a one-point growth in the API or had a Growth API of 680 or more; and
- The school or LEA met graduation rate criteria, if applicable.

In order to apply safe harbor, the school, LEA, or subgroup current year's percent proficient or above level must be higher than the previous year's percent proficient or above level. Safe harbor for LEAs is applied for both grade spans and numerically significant subgroups within grade spans of an LEA. A confidence interval adjustment of 75 percent is applied to safe harbor calculations. Safe harbor is one of the alternative methods approved by the ED for meeting AMO targets. (See the "Alternative Methods" section on pages 48 through 50.) Like the other alternative methods, there is no limit on how many times a school or LEA may make AYP using safe harbor. No distinction is made regarding how schools and LEAs make AYP, only whether or not AYP is met. Therefore, schools and LEAs may exit PI if they meet AYP for two consecutive years, even if AYP was made using safe harbor or another alternative method.

## **Graduation Rates for Safe Harbor**

Beginning with the implementation of CALPADS in the fall of 2009, the CDE required LEAs to report race and ethnicity data based on the new federal guidelines. Subsequently, in January 2010 the SBE approved using the new race and ethnicity categories for accountability reporting. This change required the CDE to cross-walk students from prior race and ethnicity categories to the new federal race and ethnicity categories. This can be done for years in which student-level data was collected (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09). Because only three years of student-level data are available, California was not able to apply a traditional four-year graduation rate for 2010 AYP determinations.

For 2010 safe harbor calculations at the student subgroup level, the 2008–09's two-year graduation rate (i.e., 2007–08 and 2008–09 graduates and dropouts) was compared to the 2007–08's two-year graduation rate (i.e., 2006–07 and 2007–08 graduates and dropouts).

The CDE expects to seek SBE approval for a revision to the 2011 safe harbor calculations at the student subgroup level to compare the 2009-10 three-year graduation rate (i.e., 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 graduates and dropouts) to the 2008-09 three-year graduation rate (i.e., 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 graduates and dropouts). And finally, for 2012 safe harbor calculations the four-year longitudinal graduation rate will be in place.

## Example of Safe Harbor

In the example of safe harbor shown on the following page, the elementary school shows five percent of its students scoring at the proficient level or above schoolwide in 2009 in ELA (shown as PP<sub>09</sub> in row D, column A).

In 2010, the school's percent at the proficient or above level in ELA increased to 13 percent (shown as PP<sub>10</sub> in row D, column B). Except for ELA, the school met all the other criteria for making AYP. (It met its AMO in mathematics, its API was above the target, and it had a "Yes" or blank in the "Met 2010 AYP Criteria" column for participation rate in ELA and mathematics.)

The school would not ordinarily make AYP in 2010 because 13 percent is below the AMO of 56.8 percent for ELA. However, the school's percentage at the below proficient level in ELA decreased by the safe harbor requirement of at least 10 percent with the 75 percent confidence interval adjustment (shown in the calculation steps in rows E through I). According to safe harbor rules, the school meets AYP because the percentage of students below the proficient level decreased by at least 10 percent from the preceding school year in ELA, the content area in which AMO was not met, and it met its other AYP criteria. The 75 percent confidence interval provides an extra margin of error in the calculations to enhance accuracy in determining whether or not schools meet the safe harbor criteria.

The safe harbor calculations are automatically applied to schools and LEAs that fail to meet one or more of their AMOs. The process includes an LEA grade span analysis used to determine if an LEA is identified for PI.

## Safe Harbor Example Elementary School

The school met its 2010 AMO in mathematics schoolwide but missed its 2010 AMO in ELA schoolwide. Also in 2010, the school had a “Yes” in the “Met 2010 AYP Criteria” column for participation rate in both ELA and mathematics and a 2010 Growth API of 680. The school had no numerically significant subgroups in either 2009 or 2010.

Steps	2009 ELA	2010 ELA	Calculations
	A	B	C
A. Number Proficient or Above (NP)	10 (NP <sub>09</sub> )	26 (NP <sub>10</sub> )	
B. Number Below Proficient (NBP)	190 (NBP <sub>09</sub> )	174 (NBP <sub>10</sub> )	
C. Total Number of Valid Scores (TN)	200 (TN <sub>09</sub> )	200 (TN <sub>10</sub> )	
D. Percent Proficient or Above (PP)	5 (PP <sub>09</sub> )	13 (PP <sub>10</sub> )	$(NP/TN) \times 100$
E. Percent Below Proficient (PBP) The 2010 rate should decrease by at least 10 percent from the 2009 rate to meet safe harbor criteria.	95 (PBP <sub>09</sub> )	87 (PBP <sub>10</sub> )	$100 - PP$
F. Maximum Percent Below Proficient (MPBP) This is the maximum percent below proficient for 2010 to meet safe harbor criteria.		85.5 (MPBP)	$0.9 \times PBP_{09}$
G. Minimum Percent Proficient Safe Harbor (PPSH) for 2010 This is the minimum 2010 percent proficient or above necessary to meet safe harbor criteria in 2010.		14.5 (PPSH)	$100 - MPBP$
H. 75 Percent Confidence Interval (CI) This is the extra margin of error provided to the 2010 percent proficient or above.		1.99110572 (CI)	$0.68 \times \text{SQRT} (PP_{09} \times PBP_{09}/TN_{09} + PPSH \times MPBP/TN_{10})$
I. 2010 Percent Proficient for 2010 Safe Harbor with 75 Percent Confidence Interval (PPCI) If this rate is higher than the minimum PPSH for 2010, the safe harbor criteria were met.		14.9911057 (PPCI)	$PP_{10} + CI$ If $PPCI > PPSH$ , criteria met.

This school met the safe harbor criteria for the AMO in ELA because the “2010 Percent Proficient for 2010 Safe Harbor with 75 Percent Confidence Interval” (14.9911057) is greater than the “Minimum Percent Proficient Safe Harbor for 2010” (14.5 percent).

## Alternative Methods

The ESEA requires that all schools be included in AYP reporting. Not all schools contain grades or results for which AYP data are collected. A number of alternate methodologies to combine and report data are required to ensure all schools and LEAs receive an AYP report.

Only schools and LEAs with 2010 CST, CMA, or CAPA results in grades two through eight and/or CAHSEE or CAPA results in grade ten were processed for participation rates, percent proficient, and API according to the standard procedures. Other schools and LEAs were evaluated using alternative methodologies.

### Alternative Methods Descriptions

Alternative Method	Description
CA = County average	For schools with no results on tests used in AYP calculations, calculations were based on the school district averages. If no school district values are available, county-wide averages were used. For LEAs (school districts and COEs) with no test results, county-wide averages were used. For COEs that oversee schools that serve high school students, countywide average graduation rates were used for both the schools and the COEs.
CI = Passed using confidence intervals	Small schools and LEAs with fewer than 100 valid scores have adjusted AMOs to account for the small number of test scores. These schools and LEAs met the adjusted percent proficient criteria using a confidence interval methodology. Very small schools and LEAs with fewer than 11 valid scores have adjusted API criteria to account for the very small number of test scores. These schools and LEAs met the adjusted API criteria using confidence interval methodology.
CK = CAPA and CAHSEE only	Schools with CAPA and CAHSEE but no CST or CMA results have APIs based only on CAPA and CAHSEE.
CP = CAPA only	Schools with CAPA but no CST or CMA results have APIs based only on CAPA.
DA = District average	For schools with no results on tests used in AYP, calculations were based on the school district averages. ASAM schools with grade twelve students and that are administered by a school district have district-wide graduation rates.
EN = Enrollment less than 50	Schools or LEAs with less than 50 students enrolled do not have participation rate criteria, and "Yes" is shown for schoolwide or LEA-wide in the "Met 2010 AYP Criteria" column on the report.
ER = Enrollment 50 to 99	Small schools and LEAs with 50 to 99 students enrolled have slightly adjusted participation rate criteria to account for the small numbers. These adjusted criteria also apply to numerically significant subgroups in a school or an LEA that has at least 100 students enrolled. Schools, LEAs, or subgroups with 50 students enrolled meet participation rate criteria by having at least 47 students tested. Schools, LEAs, or subgroups with between 51 and 99 students enrolled meet participation rate criteria by having a participation rate of at least 95 percent, with the rate rounded up to the nearest whole number.

## Alternative Methods Descriptions (continued)

Alternative Method	Description
G1 = Grade 11 only	High schools without grade ten CAHSEE results and grade nine CST results but with grade eleven CST results based on at least 95 percent tested on CST in mathematics have participation rates and percent proficient based on grade eleven CST results.
G9 = Grade 9 only	High schools without grade ten CAHSEE results but with grade nine CST results have participation rates and percent proficient based on grade nine CST results.
KC = CAHSEE only	Schools with CAHSEE but no CST/CMA/CAPA results have APIs based only on CAHSEE.
NG12 = No grade 12 data	Schools without grade twelve enrollment, graduation, and/or dropout data do not have a graduation rate calculated.
OT = Other	In very rare cases, special calculations may be used due to unique situations.
PS = Pair and share	California testing begins in grade two. For schools with only kindergarten and/or grade one, the second grade scores of the schools to which these students matriculate will be used. This is referred to as "pairing and sharing." For schools that do not supply pair and share data, the school district or county values are used (DA or CA).
SH = Passed by safe harbor	The school, LEA, or subgroup met the criteria for safe harbor, which is an alternate method of meeting the AMO if a school, an LEA, or a subgroup shows progress in moving students from scoring at the below proficient level to the proficient level.
UE = Passed by one point growth	The school had under eleven valid scores in one or both years but made at least one point growth in the API.
U50 = Graduation less than 50	Schools, LEAs, or subgroups that have fewer than 50 students in the graduation rate denominator (graduates plus dropouts) in either the prior or current year's graduation data do not have a graduation rate calculated.
Y2 = Passed by using 2-year average	Schools, LEAs, or subgroups that have not met 2010 AYP participation rate or percent proficient (AMO) criteria using a one-year formula met the participation rate or AMO using a two-year formula.
YMA = Yes, met on appeal	The school, LEA, or subgroup met criteria because its appeal was approved.

Note: The original data for the school, LEA, or subgroup are shown on the 2010 AYP report, even though the alternative method is used as the criterion, unless the school, LEA, or subgroup had no results for enrollment, valid scores, and/or graduation rate. In those cases, the alternative data are shown on the report.

## Alternative Methods Codes

The alternative methods may apply to one or more of the four areas of AYP requirements (participation rate, AMO, API, graduation rate). The following chart shows whether each method applies to the AYP areas and whether the method is applicable to a school, an LEA, or a subgroup.

Alternative Method	Participation Rate	AMO	API	Graduation Rate
CA = County average		SL	SL	SL
CI = Passed using confidence intervals		SL	SL	
CK = CAPA and CAHSEE only			SL	
CP = CAPA only			SL	
DA = District average		SL	SL	SL
EN = Enrollment less than 50	SL/NSS			
ER = Enrollment 50 to 99	SL/NSS			
G1 = Grade 11 only	SL/NSS	SL/NSS		
G9 = Grade 9 only	SL/NSS	SL/NSS		
KC = CAHSEE only			SL	
NG12 = No grade 12 data				SL
OT = Other	SL/NSS	SL/NSS	SL	SL
PS = Pair and share		SL	SL	
SH = Passed by safe harbor		SL/NSS		
UE = Passed by one point growth			SL	
U50 = Graduation less than 50				SL
Y2 = Passed by using 2-year average	SL/NSS	SL/NSS		
YMA = Yes, met on appeal	SL/NSS	SL/NSS	SL	SL

SL = Schoolwide or LEA-wide

NSS = Numerically significant subgroup

## AYP Appeals Process

An LEA on its own behalf or on behalf of its schools may appeal the 2010 AYP results that are shown on the September 9, 2010, AYP report. A separate appeal form must be submitted for the LEA and each school. The appeal form for 2010 is posted on the CDE AYP Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/>. The CDE will accept appeals of updated 2010 AYP results only if the AYP status of the school or LEA changed as a result of the updated 2010 AYP report.

The results of an AYP appeal could impact the PI status of any Title I-funded school or LEA that will potentially enter, advance in, or exit from PI in 2010–11. Therefore, it is essential that LEAs submit all appeals by the deadline of September 23, 2010. Schools or LEAs making an appeal will remain in the same AYP and PI status as reported on September 9, 2010, until final decisions are reached on all appeals.

## Criteria for Appeals of the 2010 AYP Determination

This table lists the only reasons appeals of the 2010 AYP determination will be accepted by the CDE.

Reason for Appeal	Description
A. Substantive reason	An example would be a natural disaster that prevented the LEA from administering the applicable assessment. Supporting documentation should establish the unique character of the substantive reason.
B. Medical emergency	A significant medical emergency prevented the student from taking the originally scheduled state assessment(s) as well as the make-up assessment(s) used for establishing AYP (STAR for grades two through eight, CAHSEE for grade ten, CAPA for grades two through eight and ten), and the schoolwide and/or numerically significant subgroup participation rate has been affected.
C. Pair and share	The AYP determination was based on results from other students, schools, or LEAs. (The AYP was based on pairing and sharing the results of other schools or of the school district or county in which the school is located.) In this instance, the LEA or school must submit test results or other data that are a more valid measure of the LEA's or school's performance than the information that appears on the 2010 AYP report.

Appeals of the September 9, 2010, release must be filed with the AAAD at the CDE by 5 p.m. on September 23, 2010. Appeal results will be incorporated into the revised 2010 AYP reports scheduled for release in November 2010. Appeal results of the November 2010 release will be incorporated into the revised 2010 AYP reports to be released in February 2011.

Each appeal must include appropriate documentation supporting the appeal criteria and a detailed description of the issue and how its resolution would modify the AYP determination. Failure to submit appropriate documentation will result in denial of the appeal.

The appeal process is separate from the data correction process. Appeals based on the submission of erroneous data by schools or LEAs will not be considered by the CDE. These errors should be corrected by the school or LEA.

Graduation rates will not be available for the September AYP release. Therefore, the CDE will accept appeals of graduation rate criteria following the release of revised AYP reports that include graduation rate.

Questions about the AYP appeals process may be directed to the CDE's ERA Unit by phone at 916-319-0875 or by e-mail at [evaluation@cde.ca.gov](mailto:evaluation@cde.ca.gov).

# Percent Proficient Caps for LEAs

This section describes the criteria and methodology for meeting the requirements of the federal ESEA regulations concerning alternate and modified assessment in determining AYP based on 2010 statewide testing. It explains the rules for the CAPA 1.0 percent cap, CMA percent 2.0 cap, flexibility in the application of the CAPA and CMA caps, and the method for reassignment of scores.

## CAPA 1.0 Percent Cap

On December 9, 2003, federal regulations were adopted that set a cap of 1.0 percent on the percentage of students in LEAs, including direct funded charter schools, whose scores can be counted as proficient or above based on an alternate assessment using alternate achievement standards. The alternate assessment used in California for students with severe cognitive disabilities is the CAPA. The 1.0 percent cap may be exceeded in cases where the LEA provides adequate justification to the state. Absent an approved exception from the CDE, proficient or advanced level scores above the cap must be counted as not proficient in AYP calculations.

All LEAs were notified May 18, 2010, of the process to apply for an exception. The deadline for applying for an exception was July 1, 2010. Exception requests are reviewed and processed by the CDE. The official AYP determination of LEAs that are over the 1.0 percent cap is included in the September 9, 2010 release of the 2010 AYP reports. Questions regarding the application for exception to the 1.0 percent cap should be addressed to Meredith Cathcart, Special Education Consultant, in the Assessment, Evaluation, and Support Unit of the Special Education Division by phone at 916-327-3730 or by e-mail at [mcathcart@cde.ca.gov](mailto:mcathcart@cde.ca.gov).

### ■ Automatic Exception for COEs and Small LEAs

For 2010 AYP, all COEs and any LEA with ten or fewer valid CAPA scores in a content area (ELA or mathematics) or five or fewer valid proficient and advanced CAPA scores in a content area receive an automatic exception.

### ■ How the Percent Proficient Rate is Calculated

For 2010 AYP, the CAPA percent proficient rate is calculated using the following formula:

- Numerator = Number of 2010 CAPA scores in the proficient and advanced levels in grades two through eight and ten by content area from students who were continuously enrolled in the LEA since the October 2009 CBEDS date.
- Denominator = 2010 STAR enrollment on the first day of testing in grades two through eight and 2010 CAHSEE enrollment on the first day of testing

in grade ten for students who were continuously enrolled in the LEA since the October 2009 CBEDS date.

The example below shows how the percentage is calculated for determining if an LEA is above the 1.0 percent cap. The rate is calculated separately for ELA and mathematics. The example shows the calculation for ELA only.

### Example of CAPA Percent Proficient Rate for ELA

<b>Polaris Unified School District</b>		
The school district shows the following data:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 4,960 students enrolled on the first day of testing</li> <li>▪ 60 of those students were not continuously enrolled since the CBEDS date</li> <li>▪ 27 students with CAPA scores at proficient or advanced level in ELA</li> <li>▪ 5 of those students were not continuously enrolled since the CBEDS date</li> </ul>		
Numerator	Denominator	Rate
Proficient and advanced on CAPA in ELA for students continuously enrolled  27 minus 5 = 22	STAR enrollment on the first day of testing for students continuously enrolled  4,960 minus 60 = 4,900	CAPA percent proficient rate for ELA:  22 divided by 4,900 = 0.448%

The LEA in this example is below the CAPA 1.0 percent rate for ELA because 0.448 percent is less than 1.0 percent. The numerator only includes those CAPA scores used in calculating the percent proficient or above, and the denominator includes all students in the grades assessed. There is no rounding in determining the proportion of test takers (i.e., 1.09 is not 1.1, and a proportion of a student would not be one student).

## CMA 2.0 Percent Cap

On April 9, 2007, federal regulations were adopted that set a cap of 2.0 percent on the percentage of students in LEAs, including direct funded charter schools, whose scores can be counted as proficient or above based on an assessment using modified achievement standards. The modified assessment used in California is the CMA, which is designed for students with mild to moderate disabilities. The proficient and advanced level scores above the cap must be counted as not proficient in AYP calculations. This 2.0 percent cap may be exceeded if the LEA is below the CAPA 1.0 percent cap.

### ■ Automatic Exemption for Small LEAs

For 2010 AYP, any LEA with ten or fewer valid CMA scores in a content area (ELA or mathematics) or five or fewer valid proficient and advanced CMA scores in a content area receives an automatic exemption.

**■ How the Percent Proficient Rate is Calculated**

The percent proficient rate for CMA follows the same calculation rules as the rate for CAPA. For 2010 AYP, the CMA percent proficient rate is calculated using the following formula:

- Numerator = Number of 2010 CMA scores in the proficient and advanced levels in grades three through eight in ELA or three through seven in mathematics from students who were continuously enrolled in the LEA since the October 2009 CBEDS date.
- Denominator = 2010 STAR enrollment on the first day of testing in grades three through eight in ELA or three through seven in mathematics for students who were continuously enrolled in the LEA since the October 2009 CBEDS date.

The rate is calculated separately for ELA and mathematics. The numerator only includes those scores used in calculating the percent proficient or above, and the denominator includes all students in the grades assessed. There is no rounding in determining the proportion of test takers (i.e., 1.09 is not 1.1 and a proportion of a student would not be considered one student).

**Flexibility in the 1.0 and 2.0 Percent Caps**

The federal regulations provide LEAs some flexibility in applying the 1.0 and 2.0 percent caps by allowing a combined cap of 3.0 percent. An LEA may exceed the 3.0 percent cap if granted a CAPA 1.0 percent cap exception. The following table summarizes the circumstances when an LEA can exceed the caps but avoid reassignment of scores.

**When Can an LEA Exceed the 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 Percent Caps?**

CAPA – 1% Cap	CMA – 2% Cap	CAPA and CMA – 3% Cap
Only if granted an exception by the State.	Only if LEA is below 1% cap. If not below 1% cap, never.	Only if granted an exception to the 1% cap by the State, and only by the amount of the exception.

**How to Calculate the CMA Cap**

The CMA cap may vary according to the extent to which an LEA is above or below the CAPA 1.0 percent cap. The table on the following page shows five examples of how the flexibility rules are applied and how the CMA cap is determined based on an LEA’s percent proficient or above on CAPA.

## Five Examples of Applying 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 Percent Caps

Example LEAs	Percent Proficient and Above Scores on CAPA	Percent CAPA Cap	Percent Proficient and Above Scores on CMA	Percent CMA Cap	Percent Proficient and Advanced Scores Reassigned as Not Proficient
<b>LEA A</b> Exceeds the 2.0% cap	0.9	1.0	2.6	2.1	0.5 CMA scores
<p><b>Description for LEA A:</b></p> <p>This LEA does not exceed the 1.0 percent CAPA cap; it is 0.1 percent under the cap. However, LEA A exceeds the 2.0 percent CMA cap by 0.6 percent. Since an LEA may exceed the 2.0 percent cap by the amount it is below the 1.0 percent cap, the LEA only needs 0.5 percent of its proficient and advanced scores reassigned to not proficient (<math>0.9 \text{ percent} + 2.6 \text{ percent} = 3.5 \text{ percent} - 3.0 \text{ percent} = 0.5 \text{ percent}</math>).</p>					
<b>LEA B</b> Exceeds the 2.0% cap	0.7	1.0	2.3	2.3	0
<p><b>Description for LEA B:</b></p> <p>This LEA is under the 1.0 percent CAPA cap by 0.3 percent and over the 2.0 percent CMA cap by 0.3 percent. An LEA may exceed the 2.0 percent cap as long as it does not have more than a total of 3.0 percent proficient and advanced scores from both assessments. In this case, LEA B does not exceed that 3.0 percent limit so it does not need any scores reassigned.</p>					
<b>LEA C</b> Exceeds the 1.0% cap, not granted exception	1.4	1.0	1.5	2.0	0.4 CAPA scores
<p><b>Description for LEA C:</b></p> <p>This LEA exceeds the 1.0 percent CAPA cap by 0.4 percent, but is under the 2.0 percent CMA cap by 0.5 percent. An LEA may not exceed the 1.0 percent cap (unless the LEA is granted an exception), even if it has less than 2.0 percent of proficient and advanced scores on the CMA. Therefore, LEA C has 0.4 percent of its proficient and advanced scores from the CAPA that must be reassigned to not proficient.</p>					
<b>LEA D</b> Exceeds both the 1.0% and 2.0% caps, not granted CAPA exception	1.3	1.0	2.6	2.0	0.3 CAPA scores 0.6 CMA scores
<p><b>Description for LEA D:</b></p> <p>This LEA exceeds both the 1.0 percent and 2.0 percent caps (by 0.3 and 0.6 percent, respectively). Therefore, LEA D has 0.9 percent of its proficient and advanced scores from its assessments that must be reassigned to not proficient. (<math>1.3 \text{ percent} + 2.6 \text{ percent} = 3.9 \text{ percent} - 3.0 \text{ percent} = .9 \text{ percent}</math>). Note that 0.3 percent must be from CAPA scores since LEA D was 0.3 percent over the 1.0 percent cap and 0.6 percent must be from CMA scores.</p>					

## Five Examples of Applying 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 Percent Caps (continued)

Example LEAs	Percent Proficient and Above Scores on CAPA	Percent CAPA Cap	Percent Proficient and Above Scores on CMA	Percent CMA Cap	Percent Proficient and Advanced Scores Reassigned as Not Proficient
LEA E Exceeds the 1.0% cap and granted exception	1.3	1.0	2.0	2.0	0
<b>Description for LEA E:</b> This LEA exceeds the 1.0 percent CAPA cap by 0.3 percent. However, the LEA is granted a CAPA exception by the State. Because the LEA has an exception and has only 2.0 percent of proficient and advanced CMA scores, it does not need any scores reassigned.					

## Reassignment of Scores Exceeding the Caps

Without an approved exception, proficient and advanced alternate assessment scores that exceed the 1.0 or 2.0 percent caps must be counted as not proficient in the AYP calculations for the applicable schools and LEAs. An equitable and efficient method to identify the particular student records to be reassigned in an LEA was developed in order to address this issue. Reassignment in this section refers to the process of identifying and changing student scores from proficient or advanced to not proficient. It should be noted the reassignments are only applicable to AYP calculations at the school and LEA levels; individual student scores do not change. Reassignment of scores for AYP purposes do not affect scores used to calculate the API. Reassignments are done separately for ELA and mathematics.

### ■ Reassignment of Scores Exceeding 1.0 or 2.0 Percent Caps

The same procedure is used to reassign scores that exceed the 1.0 percent CAPA cap or the 2.0 percent CMA cap in an LEA. In order to accomplish the reassignment process, records of students who took the CAPA or CMA in an LEA are reassigned separately by test (CAPA or CMA) and by content area (ELA and mathematics). For each test and content area in the LEA, the number of scores that must be reassigned is determined. The number of scores that must be reassigned is the number in excess of the 1.0 or 2.0 percent cap. (See “How the Percent Proficient Rate is Calculated” on pages 52 through 54.) Next, the advanced and proficient scores in the LEA are identified. Reassignment of those advanced and proficient scores then occurs in the following order:

1. Student scores in the school district program are reassigned first. These student records show a school code of ‘0000001.’


2. Student scores that have not been enrolled in a school continuously since CBEDS are reassigned next.
3. Student scores with records that show a blank district of residence code or show a CD code that is the same as the CD code where the student was tested are reassigned next.
4. Scores of all other students are reassigned last.

Within each of the four groups above, scores of proficient students are reassigned first, and scores of advanced students are reassigned second. The reassignments are done in priority order from the lowest to the highest scale score. In the event that there are several students with the same scale score, reassignment occurs in the following order:

1. Student records showing a missing date of birth are reassigned first.
2. Student records with the most recent date of birth are reassigned first, followed by the next most recent date of birth, and so on, until the least recent date of birth is reassigned.
3. Student records with the lowest SSID are reassigned first, followed by the next highest SSID, and so on, until the highest SSID is reassigned.

**■ Example of Reassignment**

An example of the method for reassigning scores is described in this section. The following chart shows an LEA’s percent proficient rate for the CAPA in ELA and the number of scores that must be reassigned.



In the chart on the previous page, 150 students were continuously enrolled in the LEA and scored proficient or advanced on the CAPA in ELA. These 150 students represent the total pool of students whose scores may be reassigned. Scores from 50 of the total pool of 150 students in the LEA must be reassigned from proficient or advanced to not proficient.

Reassignments in this example LEA are done as follows. Of the 150 students, two students were in the school district program and are reassigned first. Twenty students have not been enrolled in a school continuously since CBEDS and are reassigned next. Twenty more students had a blank district of residence code and are reassigned after that. The remaining eight reassignments are made among all other student records in the LEA who have not yet been reassigned and who were continuously enrolled and scored proficient or advanced on the CAPA in ELA. The following paragraph describes how the remaining eight reassignments are made.

To reassign the remaining eight student scores, it is necessary to examine the remaining pool of scores. Of the 150 total pool of students, 42 of the proficient or advanced scores have been reassigned (as described in the preceding paragraph), leaving a potential pool of 108 students from which the remaining eight scores may be reassigned. Three of the 108 students scored proficient, and the remaining 105 students scored advanced. All of the students that were proficient are reassigned, leaving a total of five student scores that remain to be reassigned. The remaining advanced scores in the potential pool must then be ordered from lowest to highest scale score. The lowest scale score should be reassigned first. However, in this example, the 22 lowest advanced scores have the same scale score. Therefore, the birth date of these students must be examined in order to determine which student scores will be reassigned. Those with a missing birth date are reassigned first. One student has a missing birth date and is reassigned. However, the remaining 21 students have the same birth date. The SSIDs of these students must be examined to determine the order for the remaining reassignments. The four students with the lowest SSIDs are reassigned, bringing the total number reassigned in this LEA example to 50. The chart on the following page summarizes the reassignment process for this LEA.

### **Saturn Unified School District Summary of Reassignments**

The LEA shows the following data:

- 150 students with CAPA scores at proficient or advanced in ELA who have been continuously enrolled since CBEDS date
- 50 scores of those students must be reassigned

The scores that must be reassigned are processed in the following order:

- 2 in the school district program are reassigned
- 20 not continuously enrolled in a school since CBEDS date are reassigned
- 20 with a blank district of residence code are reassigned
- 8 of all other students are reassigned
  - 3 remaining proficient scores in the LEA are reassigned
  - 1 with missing birth date is reassigned (of 22 with same advanced scale score)
  - 4 of the lowest SSIDs are reassigned (of 21 with same advanced scale score)

Questions about the calculation of the caps and reallocation and reassignment of scores should be addressed to the AAP Unit by phone at 916-319-0863 or by e-mail at [aaucde@ca.gov](mailto:aaucde@ca.gov).

# Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules

Inclusion/exclusion and adjustment rules have been established in order to treat student data as fairly and consistently as possible in AYP calculations. These rules are applied to the STAR Program and CAHSEE test results as the first preliminary step to calculating AYP results. In this process, some student records are excluded, and some performance levels are adjusted in order to account for differences that affect test results, such as student mobility, student absence from testing, test administration, and test type. The rules are applied in AYP calculations for a school, an LEA, or a subgroup only and do not affect the score report an individual student receives.

An “Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart” is provided on pages 62 through 67 to describe the rules and to illustrate the procedures used in applying the rules. The rules are applied in calculating the participation rate and percent proficient results shown on AYP reports. The following key counts are provided on AYP reports for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and in mathematics:

## **Participation Rate:**

- *Enrollment First Day of Testing*
- *Number of Students Tested*

## **Percent Proficient:**

- *Valid Scores*
- *Number At or Above Proficient*

The inclusion/exclusion rules are applied in determining these counts, which are thereafter used to calculate the percentages for the AYP participation rate and the percent proficient. The “Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart” shows how the rules are applied in three steps, according to each type of test and grade level:

Step 1 – CST, CMA, and CAPA, Grades Two Through Eight

Step 2 - CAHSEE, Grade Ten

Step 3 - CAPA, Grade Ten

Once each step is completed, the results of all three steps are summed and used to calculate the percentages for a school, an LEA, or a subgroup in ELA and mathematics.

## Tools for Using the Flowchart

The flowchart includes references to testing codes and CAHSEE census/makeup matching that are considered when applying inclusion/exclusion rules. Reference information is located in separate sections:


- “Testing Codes Considered in AYP Calculations” are provided on pages 68 and 69.
- “CAHSEE Matching Rules” are provided on page 70.

“Score” in the flowchart refers to a performance level of advanced, proficient, basic, below basic, or far below basic on the CSTs, CMA, or the CAPA. For AYP, proficient or above on the CAHSEE is a scale score of at least 380 for ELA or mathematics, except if a SWD took the mathematics test with a calculator. These students are counted as tested and in the number of valid scores, but their score results are counted as proficient only if the scale score was 384 or above for the February or March administrations or 383 or above for the May administration. Inclusion/exclusion and adjustment rules for AYP calculations may not always match the procedures used for the API or generating the STAR Program or CAHSEE summary reports.

## Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart Step 1 CST, CMA, and CAPA, Grades Two Through Eight


### *Enrollment First Day of Testing*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.



### *Number of Students Tested*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.




- 1 For LEAs only, a student record with a valid County/District of Residence code and a valid Primary Disability code (other than 000) is included in the county/district of residence for the LEA report if the student's school of attendance (normal CDS code) is a special education school. The record is also included in the student's school of attendance.
- 2 "Continuously enrolled" means the student was enrolled from the CBEDS date through the first day of STAR Program testing.
- 3 If the record shows grade seven "Writing Test Only" and is not matched with the rest of the CST, the unmatched Writing Test is not counted.

## Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart Step 1 (continued) CST, CMA, and CAPA, Grades Two Through Eight

### *Valid Scores*


Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.

Codes are listed on pages 68-69.



### *Number At or Above Proficient*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.




- 4 If the record shows a blank for continuously enrolled in this instance, the record is counted. Only records marked as "No" are not counted as continuously enrolled for the number of valid scores.
- 5 Mobility Rule: If the student has been continuously enrolled in a **school** from the October CBEDS date to the testing date, the student is counted in the **school** AYP. If the student has been continuously enrolled in the **LEA** from the October CBEDS date to the testing date, the student is counted in the **LEA** AYP. If the record shows a blank for continuously enrolled in this instance, the record is counted.

Note: The Number At or Above Proficient will include CMA results for grades six through eight following the SBE adoption of performance levels for those grades, scheduled to be in November 2010.

## Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart Step 2 CAHSEE, Grade Ten


### *Enrollment First Day of Testing*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.



### *Number of Students Tested*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.



6 The number of CAHSEE census student answer documents, grade ten, are used to determine enrollment for students who take CAHSEE and CAPA.

7 The tested **makeup** record takes the place of the untested census record when they are matched by SSID. A tested makeup record does not show CAHSEE Code A, E, M, R, or T. An untested census record shows CAHSEE Code A or E. If a record has no census or makeup flag, it is treated as census. If a school has no February or March records marked as census, then all records are treated as census.


8 This record is either a census record tested in May or a makeup only record and is not included in enrollment.

9 If the student record shows that a calculator was used for mathematics, it is not considered a modification (CAHSEE Code I).

## Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart Step 2 (continued) CAHSEE, Grade Ten


### *Valid Scores*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.



### *Number At or Above Proficient*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.



- 10 If the record shows a blank for continuously enrolled in this instance, the record is counted. Only records marked as "No" are not counted as continuously enrolled for the number of valid scores.
- 11 Mobility Rule: If the student has been continuously enrolled in a **school** from the October CBEDS date to the testing date, the student is counted in the **school** AYP. If the student has been continuously enrolled in the **LEA** from the October CBEDS date to the testing date, the student is counted in the **LEA** AYP. If the record shows a blank for continuously enrolled in this instance, the record is counted.
- 12 A student with disabilities who used a calculator on the mathematics portion of the 2010 CAHSEE will be counted as tested for 2010 AYP. The student's score will be counted as proficient if the scale score was 384 or above for the February or March administrations or 383 or above for the May administration.

## Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart Step 3 CAPA, Grade Ten


### *Enrollment First Day of Testing*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.

The number of CAHSEE census student answer documents, grade 10, are used to determine enrollment both for students who take CAHSEE and for students who take CAPA. The enrollment on the first day of testing for CAPA students is included in *Enrollment First Day of Testing*, shown under Step 2 on page 64.

### *Number of Students Tested*


Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.



## Inclusion/Exclusion and Adjustment Rules Flowchart Step 3 (continued) CAPA, Grade Ten


### *Valid Scores*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.



### *Number At or Above Proficient*

Calculate for each school, LEA, or subgroup separately in ELA and mathematics.



- 13 If the record shows a blank for continuously enrolled in this instance, the record is counted. Only records marked as "No" are not counted as continuously enrolled for the number of valid scores.
- 14 Mobility Rule: If the student has been continuously enrolled in a **school** from the October CBEDS date to the testing date, the student is counted in the **school** AYP. If the student has been continuously enrolled in the **LEA** from the October CBEDS date to the testing date, the student is counted in the **LEA** AYP. If the record shows a blank for continuously enrolled in this instance, the record is counted.
- 15 Results of records counted as tested but without a valid performance level are counted as not proficient for the content area.

## Testing Codes Considered in AYP Calculations

The following listing shows the STAR Program and CAHSEE testing codes that are considered in AYP calculations. STAR Program accommodations codes are not listed because records with those codes would have no AYP adjustments.

### ■ STAR Program Special Conditions Codes

- (C) Student observed cheating
- (E) Not tested due to significant medical emergency
- (L) Enrolled after first day and was tested
- (M) Took some tests but moved before these tests were administered
- (T) Enrolled during testing and tested at previous school
- (Z) Tested but marked no answers
- (Y) Document replaces a lost or destroyed answer document

### ■ STAR Program Modifications Codes (CSTs only)

- (N) Student used a dictionary
- (O) Test examiner used Manually Coded English or American Sign Language (ASL) to present test questions to student
- (Q) Student used a calculator
- (R) Student used an arithmetic table
- (S) Student used math manipulatives
- (T) Student used word processing software with spelling and grammar check tools enabled
- (U) Student dictated responses to a scribe that provided all spelling and language conventions
- (V) Student used assistive device that interfered with the independent work of the student
- (W) Student used an unlisted modification
- (Z) Student heard test examiner read test questions or text in Writing Prompt aloud (audio CD presentation not used)

The “Testing Variations, Accommodations, and Modifications” is provided on the CDE STAR Program Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/>.

The following shows the codes considered for each content area (for the CSTs only):

**ELA** = N, O, P, V, W, Z

**Mathematics** = N, Q, R, S, V, W

**Science** = N, Q, R, S, V, W

**History-Social Science** = N, V, W

### ■ Irregularities

- There were adult testing irregularities (Box A1-Scoring Use Only-Row 1)
- There was inappropriate test preparation (Box A1-Scoring Use Only-Row 1)
- **Special Testing Conditions Code (C)** Student observed cheating

### ■ CAHSEE Codes (Grade Ten Census Only)

#### CAHSEE Codes and Inclusions/Exclusions for AYP

Codes	Included in AYP Calculations			
	Enrolled First Day of Testing	Tested	Valid Scores	Percent Proficient
(A) Absent	Yes	No	No	No
(C) Score invalidated (cheating)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
(E) Not tested due to significant medical emergency	No	No	No	No
(H) Pending (on hold or cancelled)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
(I) Modified (modification used)	Yes	No*	No*	No*
(M) Moved in	No	No	No	No
(N) Not passed	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
(P) Passed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, with scale score of 380 or above*
(R) Previously satisfied requirement	No	No	No	No
(X) Not attempted	Yes	No, unless items attempted	No	No
(T) Tested before	No	No	No	No
(Z) Not attempted (0 responses)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

\* Exception: A SWD with a CAHSEE Code I (modification used) who used a calculator on CAHSEE mathematics will be counted as tested and in the number of valid scores. The student's score will be counted as proficient if the scale score was 384 or above for the February or March administrations or 383 or above for the May administration.

## CAHSEE Matching Rules

CAHSEE census and makeup records have the following matching rules.

- **Rule 1: Same CDS Code; No Matching SSID**

A make-up record with no matching census record for the same CDS code is treated as a census record at the school level.

- **Rule 2: Same District; Different School; No Matching SSID**

A make-up record with no matching census record for the same district is treated as a census record at the district level.

- **Rule 3: Same District; Two Different Schools; Same SSID**

A tested make-up record from School B is matched with an untested census record at School A in the same district. The untested census record is dropped from School A and the make-up record is counted as March census at School B. No district adjustment is needed.

- **Rule 4: Two Different Districts; Same SSID**

A make-up record from District E is matched with an untested census record at a District F. The untested census record is dropped from District F (and from the District F school) and the make-up record is counted as March census at District E (and at the District E school). Both district and school level adjustments are made.

- **Rule 5: Same CDS Code; Same SSID (Duplicate Records)**

A tested census record is matched with a second tested census record or with a tested make-up record from the same school or district in the same content area. The first tested record is counted and the duplicate record is dropped.

## CST in General Mathematics

The CST in general mathematics is administered to students in grades eight and nine. However, the test is based on grades six and seven state content standards. API calculations are adjusted to account for this difference. However, this adjustment is not made in AYP calculations.

# School Accountability

## Identification of Schools for PI

The ESEA Act of 2001 requires that all schools annually meet AYP criteria. Schools that receive Title I, Part A, funds will be identified for PI if they do not meet AYP criteria for two consecutive years in the same specific area. The PI requirements of ESEA do not apply to schools that do not receive Title I, Part A, funds. A school must receive Title I, Part A, funds for two consecutive years before it is considered for PI identification.

ESEA requirements for PI schools can be found on the CDE PI Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/programimprov.asp>.

LEAs have the primary responsibility to identify PI schools and to notify parents or guardians of students enrolled in the school of the school's PI status. LEAs should identify Title I schools as either PI or not PI based on their September 2010 AYP results and the 2010–11 PI identification criteria shown in the table below. Examples of PI identification are also provided on the following page for clarification. The 2010–11 PI status of schools (and LEAs) based on 2009 and 2010 AYP results may be confirmed by consulting the 2010–11 PI report in September 2010.



There is no distinction between a Targeted Assistance School (TAS) and a Schoolwide Program (SWP) school in PI identification. The following table shows the 2010–11 PI identification criteria for Title I schools.

### 2010–11 PI Identification Criteria for Title I Schools



<p>A Title I school will be identified for PI when, for each of two consecutive years, the school:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not make AYP in the same content area (ELA or mathematics) (schoolwide or any numerically significant subgroup)</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• Does not make AYP on the same indicator (API or graduation rate) (schoolwide)</li> </ul>
--	---

## Four Examples of PI Identification of Title I Schools

### Content Area



### Indicator



## Schools Already in PI

Three options for schools that have been identified for PI are as follows:

### ■ Advancing in PI

A school that begins the school year in PI and does not meet all AYP criteria for that school year will advance to the next year of PI. For example, a school that implemented Year 1 of PI during the 2009–10 school year and did not meet all 2010 AYP criteria will advance to Year 2 of PI during 2010–11. This school must continue the interventions that began during Year 1 and begin those interventions required in Year 2. PI requirements for schools are located on the CDE PI School Requirements Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/schoolpireq.asp>.

### ■ Maintaining PI Status

A school that begins the school year in PI and meets all AYP criteria for that school year will maintain the same PI status for the next school year. For example, a school that implemented Year 1 of PI during the 2009–10 school year and met all 2010 AYP criteria will maintain Year 1 of PI during 2010–11. This school must continue the same interventions begun during Year 1. In 2010-11, PI high schools with a “Pending” status will continue in the same PI status until a determination has been made whether they met the graduation rate criteria.

### ■ Exiting PI

A school will exit PI if it makes AYP for two consecutive years. A school exiting PI will not be subject to Title I corrective actions or other ESEA sanctions. For example, a school that was in PI during the 2009–10 school year and met all 2009 and 2010 criteria will exit PI during 2010–11. Exit from PI for any school that administered the CMA for Algebra I in 2010 is delayed until November 2010 after the SBE adopts performance levels for that assessment.

# LEA Accountability

## Identification of LEAs for PI

ESEA requires the CDE to annually review the performance of each LEA receiving Title I, Part A, funds. The CDE must then identify for PI any LEA that has not made AYP for two consecutive years in the same specific area. The requirements of ESEA to identify LEAs for PI do not apply to LEAs that receive no Title I, Part A, funds. An LEA must receive Title I, Part A, funds for two consecutive years before it is considered for PI identification. ESEA requirements for PI LEAs can be found on the CDE PI Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/programimprov.asp>.

Currently, school districts, direct funded charter schools, and COEs are LEAs that are eligible to receive Title I, Part A, funds. However, single school districts and direct funded charter schools are treated as schools (not as LEAs) for AYP and PI identification purposes. For these school districts and charter schools, refer to information about school PI identification on pages 71 through 73. PI information for LEAs is included in the 2010–11 PI reports released in September 2010.

### 2010–11 PI Identification Criteria for Title I LEAs

<p>An LEA receiving Title I, Part A, Basic funds will be identified for PI status when, for each of two consecutive years, the LEA:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not make AYP in the same content area (ELA or mathematics) <b>AND</b> does not meet AYP criteria in the same content area in each grade span (grades two through five, grades six through eight, and grade ten)</li> <li>- or -</li> <li>• Does not make AYP on the same indicator (API or graduation rate for high school students)</li> </ul>
---	---

## LEA PI Identification Alternative Methods

LEA PI identification uses alternative methods for grade spans. The CDE uses the same alternative methods when calculating AYP at the grade span level as it uses in determining whether or not a school or an LEA has made AYP. These include:


- **SH = Passed by safe harbor:** The application of safe harbor for grade spans. A confidence interval of 75 percent is applied to safe harbor calculations.
- **CI = Passed using confidence intervals:** The use of a 99 percent confidence interval in the overall AYP determination for grade spans with fewer than 100 valid scores, but not for numerically significant subgroups within grade spans with fewer than 100 valid scores.

- **Y2 = Passed by using 2-year average:** The use of two-year averaging in determining whether or not a grade span or numerically significant subgroup within a grade span has met the participation rate or the percentage proficient or above criteria.

### Four Examples of PI Identification of Title I LEAs

Identifying LEAs for PI is a two-step test. First, Test 1 is applied. Under Test 1, achievement data of LEAs that receive Title I funds are aggregated to the LEA level to determine which LEAs missed AYP in the same content area or on the same additional indicator for two consecutive years. Only LEAs that missed criteria for the same content area or indicator over two consecutive years would be identified for PI, as shown in examples 1 and 2. In the case of example 1, Test 2 would not apply. In example 2, LEAs that missed criteria for the same additional indicator for two consecutive years are identified for PI. In this case, Test 2 also would not apply.



#### Indicator



Examples 1 and 2 show LEAs that did not require Test 2. The following page, however, shows examples 3 and 4 in which Test 2 is applied. Example 3 illustrates an LEA that missed the same content area (ELA) for two consecutive years. In this case, the process moves from Test 1 to Test 2. Under Test 2, the LEA results are disaggregated by grade spans. LEAs that missed some content area criteria, but not for all grade spans, over two consecutive years are not identified for PI, as shown in example 3. LEAs that missed the content area criteria are identified for PI if **all** grade spans missed AYP in the same content area for two consecutive years, as shown in example 4.

The AMO targets for grade spans two through five and six through eight are the same as those used for elementary and middle schools (shown on page 25). The AMO targets for grade ten are the same as those used for high schools (shown on page 26).

### Content Area



The following two tables summarize the results of example 4:

### Example 4 LEA PI Identification Summary

Test 1: Overall LEA Performance		
Year	Met AYP for ELA	Met AYP for Mathematics
2009	No	Yes
2010	No	Yes

The LEA missed AYP for two consecutive years in ELA. Proceed to Test 2.

Test 2: Grade Span Performance			
Year	Grade Level	Met AYP for ELA	Met AYP for Mathematics
2009	Grades 2-5	No	Yes
	Grades 6-8	No	No
	Grade 10	No	Yes
2010	Grades 2-5	No	Yes
	Grades 6-8	No	No
	Grade 10	No	Yes

All grade spans missed AYP in ELA for two consecutive years. Therefore, the LEA is identified for PI because the LEA and all grade spans missed AYP for two consecutive years in ELA. (If the “Met AYP for ELA” column had “Yes” for one or more grade spans, the LEA would not be identified for PI.)

## LEAs Already in PI

Similar to schools identified for PI, LEAs that are identified for PI have three options: advancing in PI, maintaining PI status, and exiting PI. The grade span criteria only is applied when initially identifying LEAs for PI and is not applied when determining if LEAs advance in their PI status, maintain their PI status, or exit PI.

### ■ Advancing in PI

An LEA that begins the school year in PI and does not meet all AYP criteria for that school year will advance to the next year of PI status. For example, an LEA that implemented Year 1 of PI during the 2009–10 school year and did not meet all 2010 AYP criteria will advance to Year 2 of PI during 2010–11. This LEA must continue to implement the plan developed in Year 1. PI requirements for LEAs are located on the CDE PI LEA Requirements Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/leapireq.asp>.

## ■ **Maintaining PI Status**

An LEA that begins the school year in PI and meets all AYP criteria for that school year will maintain the same PI status for the next school year. For example, an LEA that implemented Year 1 of PI during the 2009–10 school year and met all 2010 AYP criteria will maintain Year 1 status during 2010–11. This LEA must continue to implement the plan developed in Year 1. In 2010-11, PI LEAs with a “Pending” status will continue in the same PI status until a determination has been made whether they met the graduation rate criteria.

## ■ **Exiting PI**

An LEA will exit PI if it makes AYP for two consecutive years. An LEA exiting PI will not be subject to Title I corrective actions or other ESEA sanctions. Exit from PI for any LEA that administered the CMA for Algebra I in 2010 is delayed until November 2010 after the SBE adopts performance levels for that assessment.

# School and LEA Accountability

## Breaks in Title I Funding

Normally, schools and LEAs receive Title I, Part A, federal funding on a continual basis to meet the educational needs of low-achieving students in California's highest-poverty schools. However, occasionally, schools or LEAs may have a break in their funding and regain funding in a subsequent year. Beginning with the 2007–08 school year, the CDE began tracking breaks in Title I, Part A, funding.

A school or an LEA must receive Title I, Part A, funds for two consecutive years before it is considered for PI identification. If a school or LEA is in PI, but subsequently has a break in Title I, Part A funding, the school or LEA is considered as not in PI and is not required to continue PI activities during the period in which no funds are received. When a school or LEA regains Title I, Part A, funding after a break, it will retain the same PI placement it had prior to the break in funding. For example, a school that begins with a PI placement of Year 1 prior to a break in Title I Part A funding retains the same Year 1 PI placement upon regaining Title I, Part A funding. A school with a PI placement of Year 2 would retain Year 2 PI placement upon regaining Title I, Part A funding; and so on. This rule is applicable for up to three years only, unless the school or LEA makes AYP for two consecutive years. If a school or LEA makes AYP for two consecutive years, it will exit PI when it regains funding. A school or an LEA with a break in funding of three years or longer would begin with a designation of “Not in PI” once it regains Title I Part A funding, regardless of the PI status and placement prior to the break in funding. Thus, a school or LEA could not be identified for PI again until it missed AYP for two consecutive years.

## Changes to PI Status

Each year, various data review and correction processes are provided for LEAs to correct demographic data errors that occur as part of statewide testing and the subsequent reporting of accountability data. The CDE revises the accountability reports after it receives demographic corrections from the test publisher. In addition, updates and corrections to accountability reports also occur due to other reasons, such as late testing by LEAs, appeal decisions, or other testing and accountability processes. The following describes regularly scheduled updates to the PI status information for 2010–11:

**November 2010** AYP reports updated to incorporate STAR Program data changes for late testing LEAs, CAHSEE data corrections, and appeal decisions.

PI status information updated following revision of AYP reports.

**February 2011** AYP reports updated to incorporate data corrections made through the test contractor.

PI status information updated following revision of AYP reports.

When data are re-released, the appeal window opens for schools or LEAs with changes in AYP or PI status. Some schools or LEAs may be identified for PI after the September 9, 2010, release. In these cases, the school or LEA must immediately implement the required PI activities.

# CDE Contacts and Related Internet Pages

Topics	Contact Offices	Web Pages
<p>Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) and ESEA Title I Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ESEA Title I Accountability Requirements, AYP Appeals, Accountability Workbook, and Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM)</li> <li>• API and AYP Calculations and ESEA Title III Accountability</li> <li>• API Awards Programs</li> <li>• ESEA Title III Accountability</li> <li>• STAR Program – CST, CMA, and CAPA</li> <li>• CAHSEE</li> </ul>	<p>Assessment, Accountability, and Awards Division 916-319-0869 <a href="mailto:psaa@cde.ca.gov">psaa@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p>Evaluation, Research, and Analysis Unit 916-319-0875 <a href="mailto:evaluation@cde.ca.gov">evaluation@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p><a href="mailto:asam@cde.ca.gov">asam@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p>Academic Accountability and Psychometrics Unit 916-319-0863 <a href="mailto:aau@cde.ca.gov">aau@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p><a href="mailto:amao@cde.ca.gov">amao@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p>Awards Unit 916-319-0866 <a href="mailto:awards@cde.ca.gov">awards@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p>CELDT and Title III Accountability Programs Unit  916-319-0863 <a href="mailto:amao@cde.ca.gov">amao@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p>Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program Office 916-445-8765 <a href="mailto:star@cde.ca.gov">star@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p>CAHSEE Office 916-445-9449 <a href="mailto:cahsee@cde.ca.gov">cahsee@cde.ca.gov</a></p>	<p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/pa/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/pa/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/sa/wb.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/sa/wb.asp</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/am/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/am/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/api/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/api/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/sr/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/sr/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/api/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/api/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ayp/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/t3/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/cmastar.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/cmastar.asp</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/capa.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/capa.asp</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/hs/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/hs/</a></p>
<p>ESEA Title I, and Program Improvement (PI)</p>	<p>District and School Improvement Division 916-319-0926</p>	<p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/</a></p>

Topics	Contact Offices	Web Pages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ESEA Requirements for PI and Technical Assistance for Schools in PI</li> <li>• Technical Assistance for LEAs in PI LEAs in Years 1 and 2 of PI LEAs in Year 3 or 3+ of PI</li> <li>• Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA)</li> </ul>	<p>District and School Improvement Division School Support and Title I Basic Office 916-319-0854 <a href="mailto:SES@cde.ca.gov">SES@cde.ca.gov</a></p> <p>District Improvement Office  Lisa McClung 916-324-2897 Syma Solovitch 916-319-0476</p> <p>Regional Coordination and Support Office 916-319-0833 Jim Alford 916-319-0226</p>	<p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/programimprov.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/programimprov.asp</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/technicalassist.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/technicalassist.asp</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/programimprov.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/programimprov.asp</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/qe/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/qe/</a></p>
Educational Options	Learning Support and Partnerships Division Educational Options Office 916-322-5012	<a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/eo/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/eo/</a>
Special Education Programmatic Issues Related to Assessment	Special Education Division Assessment, Evaluation, and Support Office 916-445-4628	<a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/</a>
Graduation Rate for ESEA and Corrections of Graduation Rate and Dropout Data	Data Management Division Educational Demographics Unit 916-327-0219 <a href="mailto:eddemo@cde.ca.gov">eddemo@cde.ca.gov</a>	<a href="http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/">http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/</a>
Charter Schools	Charter Schools Division 916-322-6029 <a href="mailto:charters@cde.ca.gov">charters@cde.ca.gov</a>	<a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cs/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cs/</a>

# Acronyms

<b>AAAD</b>	Assessment, Accountability, and Awards Division
<b>AAP</b>	Academic Accountability and Psychometrics Unit
<b>AMAO</b>	Annual Measurable Achievement Objective
<b>AMO</b>	Annual Measurable Objective
<b>API</b>	Academic Performance Index
<b>APR</b>	Accountability Progress Reporting
<b>ASAM</b>	Alternative Schools Accountability Model
<b>ASL</b>	American Sign Language
<b>AYP</b>	Adequate Yearly Progress
<b>CAHSEE</b>	California High School Exit Examination
<b>CALPADS</b>	California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System
<b>CAPA</b>	California Alternate Performance Assessment
<b>CBEDS</b>	California Basic Educational Data System
<b>CDE</b>	California Department of Education
<b>CD Code</b>	County-District Code
<b>CDS Code</b>	County-District-School Code
<b>CELDT</b>	California English Language Development Test
<b>CMA</b>	California Modified Assessment
<b>COE</b>	County Office of Education
<b>CST</b>	California Standards Test
<b>EC</b>	<i>Education Code</i>
<b>ED</b>	U.S. Department of Education
<b>EL</b>	English Learner
<b>ELA</b>	English-language Arts
<b>ERA</b>	Evaluation, Research, and Analysis Unit
<b>ESEA</b>	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
<b>IDEA</b>	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
<b>IEP</b>	Individualized Education Program
<b>LEA</b>	Local Educational Agency
<b>NCES</b>	National Center for Education Statistics

<b>NPR</b>	National Percentile Rank
<b>NRT</b>	Norm-referenced Test
<b>NSLP</b>	National School Lunch Program
<b>NSS</b>	Numerically Significant Subgroup
<b>PI</b>	Program Improvement
<b>PSAA</b>	Public Schools Accountability Act
<b>RFEP</b>	Reclassified Fluent-English-Proficient
<b>SBE</b>	State Board of Education
<b>SL</b>	Schoolwide or LEA-wide
<b>SSID</b>	Statewide Student Identifier
<b>STAR Program</b>	Standardized Testing and Reporting Program
<b>STC</b>	Special Testing Conditions
<b>SWD</b>	Students with Disabilities
<b>SWP</b>	Schoolwide Program
<b>TAS</b>	Targeted Assistance School