

ALASKA

Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

Revised Plan Submitted
June 9, 2003

Amended, with approval, critical elements 1.6, 2.1, 3.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 10.2
June 7, 2004

Amended, with approval, critical elements 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 3.2a - 3.2c, 5.4, 6.1, 7.3,
9.3
June 15, 2005

Amended, with approval, critical elements 3.2, 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, 9.1
July 2006

Amended, with approval, critical elements 2.1, 5.2, 5.4
December 2006

Amended, with approval, critical element 5.3
March 2007

Amended, with approval, critical element 3.2
June 2007

Amended, with approval, critical element 1.6, 5.2, 5.3, 7.1
December 2007

Revised Plan Submitted
December 7, 2010



U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

**Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems**

Status	State Accountability System Element	Page
<u>Principle 1: All Schools</u>		
P	1.1 Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state.</i>	7
P	1.2 Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria.</i>	9
P	1.3 Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards.</i>	11
P	1.4 Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner.</i>	13
P	1.5 Accountability system includes <i>report cards.</i>	15
P	1.6 Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions.</i>	17
<u>Principle 2: All Students</u>		
P	2.1 The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>	21
P	2.2 The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year.</i>	23
P	2.3 The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students.</i>	25
<u>Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations</u>		
P	3.1 Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14.</i>	26
P	3.2 Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress.</i>	28
P	3.2a Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point.</i>	34
P	3.2b Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives.</i>	36
P	3.2c Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals.</i>	38
<u>Principle 4: Annual Decisions</u>		
P	4.1 The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.	40

STATUS Legend:
F – Final state policy
P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval
W – Working to formulate policy

<u>Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability</u>			Page
P	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups.</i>	41
P	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups.</i>	42
P	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities.</i>	43
P	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students.</i>	45
P	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.	47
P	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.	49
<u>Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments</u>			
P	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments.</i>	51
<u>Principle 7: Additional Indicators</u>			
W	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools.</i>	53
P	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</i>	55
P	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.	57
<u>Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics</u>			
P	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics.</i>	58
<u>Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability</u>			
P	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions.</i>	59
P	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions.</i>	61
P	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population.</i>	62
<u>Principle 10: Participation Rate</u>			
P	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.	64
P	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.</i>	66

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval

W– Working to formulate policy

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

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

1.1- The State of Alaska defines a school in Alaska Administrative Code AAC 05.900(5). A school is also being defined under the revised regulations governing Report Cards to the Public. Charter schools, correspondence schools, alternative and special mission schools are included as public schools. Alaska's accountability system treats all these types of schools the same way in determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The accountability system produces an AYP decision for each public school in the state. Schools with any and all combinations of grade configurations are included in calculating AYP and making an AYP decision in the same manner.

The standards-based student assessment system in Alaska consists of testing all students in grades 3 to 10 annually. The AYP calculation will aggregate test data across grade levels within each school. The **Performance Score** (overall percent of students enrolled

for the full academic year who are proficient across grades) will be compared to the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for each year. More details on determining AYP are presented in later parts of this plan.

All schools in Alaska participate in the assessment system with the exception of a few schools that only serve students in grades K-2. The AYP decision made on the school that receives students from the K-2 schools will be applied to the K-2 school, so that all schools (including the K-2 schools) will receive an annual AYP determination.

Charter schools are considered public schools in Alaska and are required to participate in the state's assessment system and will receive an annual AYP determination. Alternative, Special Mission, Correspondence, Boarding schools, and schools located in youth correctional facilities also participate in state assessments and will receive an annual AYP determination using the same procedures as for all other schools.

Alaska continues to study the validity of the statewide accountability system when applied to Alternative and Special Mission Schools. The accountability system changes have provided data to inform our practice and improve the system for these schools. As we continue our study, and if the results indicate that the accountability system is not valid for these types of schools, Alaska will propose an alternate system to the US Department of Education. Until that occurs, these schools will receive an annual AYP determination using the same system as other schools.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?</p>	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

1.2 - Alaska is proposing a single statewide accountability system that will be applied to all public schools and districts in the same manner. Alaska will establish rules, definitions, and criteria that will apply to all public schools and districts in the accountability system. As described in more detail later in this plan, there will be a single model for all schools.

Alaska has a number of districts that have developed a standards based educational program and do not assign students to grade levels. In compliance with NCLB, the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED) has developed a policy that students be assessed in relation to the content standards for the grade that the student is enrolled or would be enrolled based upon the years the student has been enrolled in school. This policy effectively prohibits out-of-level testing in the statewide assessment program. The department has developed guidance to districts that requires each student be assessed using the grade-level test that corresponds to the number of years the child has been enrolled in school. (See Guidance Memo below)

A Performance Score consisting of the percent of students who participate in state assessments that are proficient shall be calculated separately for the reading/writing/language test score and the mathematics test score for each school and school district in Alaska. Separate Performance Scores shall be calculated for the school-/or district-as-a-whole and for each subgroup within each school or district.

Consecutive years of failing to make adequate yearly progress shall be based on failing to meet the annual measurable objective (AMO) on the Performance Score in the same subject area ("Language Arts" and mathematics) for consecutive years. If a school-as-a-whole (or any subgroup) in a given year fails to meet the AMO for the Performance Score in a particular subject area ("Language Arts" or mathematics) and in the next year the school-as-a-whole (or any subgroup) fails to meet the AMO for the Performance Score in the same subject area, the school has failed to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two consecutive years. If, however, the school meets the AMO on the Performance Score (for the school-as-a-whole and each subgroup) in the second year in

the subject area they failed in the first year, then the timeline restarts. If a district (or any subgroup) does not meet the AMO in all three grade spans in language arts or in mathematics for two consecutive years, then the district is in improvement status.

During the 2003/2004 school year the Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development incorporated these provisions into state regulation. The board also adopted regulations that prohibit out of level testing, and addressed testing for those students who are enrolled in non-graded schools.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

1.3- In 1998, Alaska developed a set of content and performance standards to define expectations for what students should know and be able to do at four key benchmark age spans: 5-7, 8-10, 11-14, and 15-18. In 2003 and 2004 Alaska developed grade level expectations for students in grades 3-10 for reading, writing and mathematics which were approved by the State Board of Education in March 2004. In 2005 those grade level expectations, along with the science grade level expectations, will be taken back to the board for approval as state regulations. In February 2004 Alaska awarded an RFP for design of new assessments for accountability to Data Recognition Corporation (DRC). DRC has used the grade level expectations to design standards based assessments for grades 3-9 which will be operational in spring 2005, and to design the 10th grade exam for operational purposes in spring 2006. Student performance in relation to established proficiency scores on the Alaska exams is reported in terms of four performance levels (Far Below Proficient, Below Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced). The Alaska Standards Based Assessments and High School Graduation Qualifying Exams measure Alaska standards in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics annually.

For the purposes of determining AYP, the reading and writing scores will be combined (summed) into a single score for each student. The "cut scores" for proficiency (established separately for the reading and writing tests) will also be summed for these two tests and each student's summed reading and writing score will be compared to the summed proficient "cut

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

score". Hence, in calculating AYP for each school and district, two subject areas will be used: "Language Arts" and Mathematics.

Alaska implemented a unique student identifier system in the 2002-2003 school year. The unique identification number allows for the more effective use of student assessment results and the linking of demographic information. This system assists teachers in designing their instructional strategies around the needs for each and every child. This assists schools in meeting AYP goals. All test results are disaggregated among all required student sub-populations to provide schools and districts with information to assist in determining AYP and in meeting AYP goals in future years.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

1.4- Currently Alaska has a testing window that begins during the first week of April each year. Test results are returned in late May each year. The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED) is committed to providing required assessment and accountability information to districts by early summer each year.

**Timeline for Making Accountability Decisions
In 2005 and Beyond**

April (first week)	State assessments administered, and Enrollment and full academic year data collection
April / May	Full academic year data verification
May	Assessment results returned to state and districts
May	Assessment results published
July (first week)	Preliminary AYP determinations sent to districts and schools
July (third week)	Notice of appeal from districts and schools must be received by EED
August (first week)	Public reporting of district and school accountability

The ADEED has been publishing Report Cards to the Public for twelve years and have systems in place to collect data from districts electronically (the ADEED's Data Handbook for the fall electronic submission is referenced below). To meet the additional requirements of the

NCLB act the ADEED is increasing required data submissions from districts. Because of their small size many of the districts in Alaska do not have the capacity to fully meet these new requirements during the summer of 2003. In addition, the accountability system required under NCLB will require districts to provide and verify data during the summer months. Due to size, budgetary constraints (including a statutory cap on administrative costs) and negotiated agreements many districts in Alaska will not have staff available during the summer of 2003 to provide and verify the required information. The department has begun to address this issue by communicating with districts regarding the need to have staff available during the summer months to analyze data and create school and district report cards. The ADEED is committed to ensuring that all districts address this issue by the 2004-2005 school year.

In order to assure timely notification of schools prior to the beginning of the 2003-04 school year, those schools that have failed to meet AYP in the 2001-02 school year will have the AYP determination for 2002-03 made as a first priority. The second priority for making the AYP determination will be for all Title I schools statewide, and finally for the remaining public schools. This is done to ensure that schools that need to notify parents of school choice or the availability of supplemental services can do so prior to the beginning of the school year.

In addition to addressing the capacity issues of districts, the state must address a serious capacity issue at the ADEED. In order to comply with the many provisions of NCLB the ADEED must be provided with additional staff and resources required to assist districts and to implement the provisions of the accountability system. The ADEED is working on this, but concerns about the size of state government and the current budget situation in the state make this a serious challenge.

The links to the data handbook used for collecting data can be found by selecting OASIS Project in the pull down menu at <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/forms/home.cfm>.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

1.5- The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED) currently produces a report entitled "Alaska's Public Schools: A Report Card to the Public" in compliance with Alaska Statute A.S. 14.03.120. The report card to the public, reporting on the performance of each public school in the state, is published by January 15 annually. The State Board of Education and Early Development adopted revisions to the regulations governing the report card to the public to incorporate the additional elements required under NCLB and require reports for school and district performance are made public prior to the start of each school year as required under NCLB.

The ADEED has been publishing "Report Cards to the Public" for twelve years and has systems in place to collect data from districts electronically. To meet the additional requirements of the NCLB act the ADEED is increasing required data submissions from districts.

In addition to addressing the capacity issues of districts the state must address a serious capacity issue at the ADEED. In order to comply with the many provisions of NCLB the ADEED must be provided with additional staff and resources required to assist districts and to implement the provisions of the accountability system.

Assessment results are reported at the state, district, school and individual student level annually. Extensive information, including aggregated and disaggregated student assessment results at the state and district levels, and downloadable, print-ready versions of district and school report cards have been developed for the 2001/2002 school year and are currently

reported on the ADEED website. These reports can be accessed at the following websites:
<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/results.html>
<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/stats/home.html>

The target date for release for the first version of these NCLB compliant report cards is the third week of August 2003. Beginning with the 2002/2003 report cards, student subgroup achievement information, as well as aggregate achievement information, AYP determinations, and other NCLB required information will be included in all report cards.

Alaska has developed a report card that is understandable and uniform in format. During the 2003/2004 school year Alaska will study the feasibility of translating report cards into languages other than English to meet the requirements of NCLB that the state provide reports “to the extent practicable” in a language that the parents can understand.

In December 2002, the ADEED published on its web site lists of schools in need of improvement. In January 2003 the ADEED published on its web site a list of districts in need of improvement. Beginning with the 2002-03 report cards, this information will be included on each school or district report card.

http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/pdf_files/Title1ImprovementSitesTable.pdf

http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/pdf_files/TitleIDistrictImproveTable.pdf

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs? ²	State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

1.6- State law (A.S. 14.03.123 School Accountability) provides that a school determined to be under-performing (deficient or in crisis) must prepare a school improvement plan to improve student performance. Schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress are designated as either deficient or in crisis in the state accountability system. A separate law, Alaska statute 14.03.125, establishes a fund for the improvement of school performance. The fund may be used by the Commissioner to make grants to a district in the state for the purpose of improving school performance.

As required under IASA, the State has been annually evaluating the performance of all Title I schools and districts receiving Title I funds. Schools and districts that failed to make adequate yearly progress were identified for improvement or corrective action.

Under NCLB, any school that does not meet AYP in the same subject area for two consecutive years will be required to submit a school improvement plan to the district and the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED). In addition, Title I schools are subject to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB (see **Overview of Consequences**, beginning on the next page). Consistent with U.S. Department of Education guidance, when a local education agency is too isolated to practically offer school choice, the LEA may offer supplemental education services. Schools that continue to fail to demonstrate AYP that do not receive Title I funds will be subject to external evaluation by the district and the ADEED.

Any district that does not meet AYP in the same subject area or additional indicator and in all three grade spans (K-5, 6-8, 9-12) for two consecutive years will be subject to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB (see **Overview of Consequences**, on the next

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

page) and is required to submit a district improvement plan to the ADEED. Districts in this category (failing AYP for two consecutive years in the same subject area and all three grade spans) are considered as being in their first year of improvement status. Under NCLB, districts in their first year of improvement status are required to develop a district improvement plan within three months after identification. District improvement plans must be developed in consultation with parents, school staff, and others. District improvement plans must:

- Incorporate scientifically based research strategies that strengthen the core academic program in the schools served by the district;
- Identify actions that have the greatest likelihood of improving the achievement of participating children in meeting the state’s student academic achievement standards;
- Address professional development needs of the instructional staff;
- Include specific measurable achievement goals and targets for each of the groups of students identified in the disaggregated data;
- Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools of that agency, and the specific academic problems of low achieving students, including a determination of why the local educational agency’s prior plan failed to bring about increased student academic achievement;
- Incorporate, as appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during an extension of the school year;
- Specify the responsibilities of the state educational agency under the plan, including specifying the technical assistance to be provided by the state; and
- Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school.

Districts identified for improvement that do not demonstrate AYP by the end of the second year of improvement will be subject to corrective action. The State will take an approved corrective action appropriate to the reason the district has failed to make AYP and consistent with state law.

Overview of Consequences

Sanctions for Schools Receiving Title I Funds-In compliance with NCLB, the following sanctions shall apply to schools that receive Title I funds:

Level 1	“Alert” – Fails to meet AYP one year. Technical assistance available to develop and implement a school plan.
Level 2	“School Improvement, Level 1” – Fails to meet AYP two years in a row, in the same content area. School must submit a School Improvement Plan to the district that is forwarded to the Department. Provide school choice or supplemental services if choice is not available and inform parents.
Level 3	“School Improvement, Level 2” – Fails to meet AYP an additional year after Level 2, in the same content area. Continue to revise and implement school improvement plan, continue to provide school choice and supplemental services and inform parents.
Level 4	“Corrective Actions” – Fails to meet AYP an additional year after Level 3, in the same content area. Continue to revise and implement school improvement plan, continue to provide school choice and supplemental

services and inform parents. District required to take one of the following actions: replacement of staff, implementation of a new curriculum, decrease management authority at school level, appoint an outside expert, extend the school day or year, restructure the internal organization of the school.

Level 5 “Restructuring, Year 1” – Fails to meet AYP an additional year after Level 4, in the same content area. Continue to revise and implement improvement plan, continue to provide school choice and supplemental services, inform parents, and implement corrective action. District required to prepare an alternative governance plan to take one of the following actions: reopen school as a public charter school, replace all or most of the staff, enter into a contract with a management company, turn over operation of the school to the state, or any other major restructuring of the school’s governance that makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school’s staffing and governance, that will improve student academic achievement and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make AYP. District will submit the alternative governance plan to the department.

Sanctions for Schools That Do Not Receive Title I Funds-The following sanctions shall apply to schools that do not receive Title I funds:

Level 1 “Alert” – Fails to meet AYP one year. School must develop and implement a school plan.

Level 2 & higher “School Improvement” – Fails to meet AYP two or more years in a row, in the same content area. School must prepare and implement a school plan and consult with its district and the department.

Sanctions for Districts-In compliance with NCLB, the following sanctions shall apply to districts that receive Title I funds:

Level 1 “Alert” – Fails to meet AYP one year. State will provide technical assistance to district to identify and seek to remedy situation causing failure to make AYP.

Level 2 “District Improvement, Level 1” – Fails to meet AYP two years in a row, in the same content area or other indicator, in all three grade spans (K-5, 6-8, 9-12). District must submit a district plan to the Department.

Level 3 “District Improvement, Level 2” – fails to meet AYP three years in a row in the same content area in all three-grade spans (K-5, 6-8, 9-12). District must submit a District Improvement Plan to the Department.

Level 4 “Corrective Action” – Fails to meet AYP four years in a row in the same content area in all three grade spans (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12). State will take an approved corrective action appropriate to the reason the district has failed to make AYP and consistent with state law. The state will establish a monitoring plan with the district.

Recognition For Schools- The state of Alaska has developed a system of rewards that includes distinguished schools. The system recognizes schools that have significantly closed the achievement gap, exceeded adequate yearly

progress, or have made the greatest gains in student achievement. The recognition is based on specific criteria that constitutes a significant gain in student achievement.

The gains will be measured by analyzing two years of data, and no school or district will be recognized unless they demonstrate the required performance.

Distinguished schools and districts will receive certificates of distinction and public recognition for the distinguished status.

Recognition For Districts- Recognition shall be provided for districts that meet AYP and are designated as Distinguished. Alaska will recognize high performing districts by instituting a Distinguished District Award Program. Districts that have a majority of the schools in the district designated as distinguished will receive this award.

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

2.1- All school age children in Alaska being educated with the use of public funds are enrolled in an Alaska public school (see section 2.2 regarding students who take only one hour or less of elective classes). All public schools in Alaska are included in the accountability system.

All students enrolled in public schools are required to participate in the Alaska Comprehensive System of Student Assessments (CSSA). The CSSA includes the Standards Based Assessment exams and the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam (HSGQE). Most students participate by taking the standard form (paper and pencil) of tests. A variety of accommodations are available to permit Limited English Proficient, and nearly all students with disabilities to participate in the standard form of the test.

The district may excuse the student from participation in the state assessment in reading and writing; and elect not to include the student’s performance in any state assessments in the determination of school and district adequate yearly progress if:

- a.) the district enrolls a student who qualifies as an LEP pupil under 4 AAC 34.090(2), and
- b.) the student is new to the United States and enrolled in school during the twelve calendar months prior to the current year test administration, but after the previous year’s test administration.

If a school excuses a new immigrant student from participation in reading and writing assessments they must have the student participate in statewide English language proficiency assessments.

A district may, on a case-by-case basis, exempt an individual student from an assessment if an unexpected severe medical condition prevents the student from participating in the administration of the assessment. The student will not be included in the determination of adequate yearly progress performance or participation rate. The district shall retain documentation regarding the exemption, including medical records of the condition, with the student’ permanent record and provide it to the department upon request.

Students with severe cognitive disabilities, for whom participation in the standard form of the exams is not feasible or educationally inappropriate, participate in the Alternate Assessment

program. The Alternate Assessment program includes grades 3 – 10.

Beginning with the March 2003 test administration, all students enrolled at the time of testing are expected to participate in the Alaska Comprehensive System of Student Assessments. Make up sessions are given for students absent from school on scheduled testing dates for the standards based assessments in grades 3-9. To ensure the security of the high stakes HSGQE make up sessions are not offered.

In order for a student to be considered "participating" in each content area in the assessment system, the student must have a valid test score on either the reading, writing/language or mathematics tests. The school's/subgroup's Participation Rate is calculated by dividing the number of students participating by the number of students enrolled in grades 3 to 10 on the first day of the week of testing for schools and subgroups of 40 or more students. A single Participation Rate is computed for each school-/or district-as-a-whole, and for each subgroup within the school or district that has more than 20 students enrolled on the first day of testing. Student participation may be averaged for two or three consecutive years, including the current year to equal the ninety-five percent participation rate.

The ADEED has implemented a unique student identification number system for the 2002-2003 school year. Currently Alaska assigns a unique identification number to each student enrolled in a public school in the state. Districts are required to submit names and state ID numbers of students enrolled during the fall count period (for funding purposes) and on the first day of testing (in February or March). Data about student characteristics (subgroup membership), enrollment, and mobility are collected electronically through the state's electronic reporting system. The department will use this data to determine the students enrolled in a school and district for a full academic year. The ADEED is also developing a statewide assessment database.

Participation Guidelines- <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/accommodations.html>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?</p>	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

2.2- Alaska defines “full academic year” for the purposes of NCLB school and district accountability to be all students in continuous enrollment from October 1 through the first day of the annual test administration.

Student data provided during the October enrollment accounting period determines the allocation of state funds to each district. ADEED has established an additional data collection on the first day of testing for the Spring 2003 assessments. Utilizing the state's unique student identifier system, ADEED is able to send to districts a list of students enrolled in each school on October 1 and the first day of testing. Districts will review the list, verify continuous enrollment and return the list to the department by May15 of each school year. This verified list will then be used to determine which students to include in calculating AYP for schools, districts, and the state.

Students are not considered continuously enrolled if during the October 1 to first day of testing time span they:

- transferred to another school, district, or state, or
- dropped out of public education, or
- had a break in enrollment (were withdrawn, and re-enrolled).

Any student who meets the definition of being continuously enrolled for a full academic year in the same school will be included in that school's calculation of AYP. Any student who was not continuously enrolled in the same school during this time span, but was continuously enrolled for a full academic year in the same district during this time, will be included in the district calculation of AYP. Any student who meets the definition of continuous enrollment for a full academic year within the state will be included in the state's accountability results. Any student who was not continuously enrolled in a public school in the state for the defined period will not be included in the state accountability results.

Alaska allows schools and districts to "share" students. Public school students may be enrolled at more than one school (including correspondence schools or other specialized schools) across the state; however, students may only be enrolled up to one "full-time equivalency (FTE)" for the purposes of state funding. The following rules have been developed for the administration of assessments and the allocation of student testing results for students who are enrolled in more than one public school.

- Students will be assessed and student results will be allocated to the school that claims the school for the largest amount of FTE (calculated for funding purposes).
- Students enrolled by two schools on a 50/50 basis will be assessed and student results will be allocated to the school at which the student receives instruction in Reading/Language Arts.

Non-public, home-schooled students and private school students often attend public schools on a limited part-time basis (1 hour or less per day) usually for the purpose of participating in elective subjects (art, music, band, etc.). These students are not considered public school students for the purposes of school accountability since they do not usually receive public school instruction in Language Arts, or Mathematics.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

2.3- Section 2.2 (above) explains how "continuously" enrolled is determined. A summary is presented below.

The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED) has implemented a unique student identification number system beginning in the 2002-2003 school year. Currently Alaska assigns a unique identification number to each student enrolled in a public school in the state. Districts are required to submit names, state ID numbers, and school ID numbers of students during the fall enrollment count period. In addition, a second electronic data submission of student's names, ID numbers, and school ID numbers occurs on the first day of testing in the spring. Data about student characteristics (subgroup membership), enrollment, and mobility are also collected electronically through this system. The ADEED uses this data to determine the students enrolled in the same school, same district and state for a full academic year.

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

3.1- The method of determining whether a school or district has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is outlined in this section. Other sections of this plan provide more detail on specific topics that are included in making the AYP determination.

In order for a school to meet AYP each year, a series of 31 possible individual tests must be satisfied. The method described here applies to all public schools in Alaska whether they are small K-12 rural schools or large urban high schools.

Alaska will use both a "Language Arts" and a mathematics score on state assessments in grades 3 to 10. Section 1.3 explains how the reading, writing, and language test scores will be combined to create a single "Language Arts" score for AYP purposes.

The initial analysis will be to determine how many subgroups meet the minimum N requirement and will be included in determining AYP for each school or district. For each subgroup meeting the minimum N requirement and for the school-as-a-whole, the following tests will be made:

- A) there are 10 possible tests of whether the school-as-a whole and each of the 9 subgroups (that have an enrollment of more than 20 students) have met the Participation Requirement in assessment, and
- B) there are 10 possible tests of whether the school-as-a-whole and each of the 9 subgroups (that meet or exceed the minimum N) have met the performance requirement (i.e. the percent of "full academic year" students who are proficient is equal to or greater than the annual measurable objective for that year) for the "Language Arts" Performance Score, and
- C) another 10 tests for the mathematics Performance Score (similar to the

³ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

"Language Arts" Performance Score), and

D) finally, one test as to whether the school-as-a-whole has met the threshold level on the other academic indicator (graduation rate for schools that have 12th grade, or student attendance for all other schools) or has shown improvement over the previous year.

When comparing the Performance Score for a school/subgroup to the Annual Measurable Objective, a confidence interval approach will be used to ensure reliable decisions (see section 3.2).

If a school or district fails to meet the performance requirement, then the school or district may utilize the "improvement/safe harbor" provision (see section 3.2), and if that provision is met, then the subgroup is determined to have made AYP.

If the school-/or district-as-a-whole and all applicable subgroups meet the AYP requirements in a given year, the school will be determined to have met AYP.

The performance requirement for each year from 2002-03 and 2013-14 was determined by calculating the "starting point" (separately for "Language Arts" and for mathematics) based on spring 2002 statewide assessment data, and incremented to 100% proficiency in the 2013-14 school year. The starting point will be established with a new baseline in 2005 based on the new Standards Based Assessments. The Intermediate Goals and annual performance requirements are also known as "annual measurable objectives" (AMOs) and are discussed in section 3.2b and 3.2c.

The state's definition of Adequate Yearly Progress will require all students to be proficient in the 2013-14 school year since the goal for that year is 100% proficiency in both "Language Arts" and in mathematics. By holding schools and districts accountable for student results each year and slowly incrementing the annual measurable objective to 100%, all students will become proficient.

Section 3.2b shows the timeline and the AMOs for each year from 2003-04 to 2013-14.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

3.2- Each subgroup in the school with more than 20 members (25 members beginning in 2007) enrolled for a full academic year must meet (for both the content areas of Reading/Writing/ Language and Mathematics) at least one of two performance conditions: 1) the Performance Score exceeds the AMO or is within the 99% confidence interval around the AMO, or 2) the school, LEA or a subgroup has made improvement over the previous year (safe harbor) or is within a 75% confidence interval around the number that represents the percentage of students in the subgroup, school, or district.

The 9 subgroups identified by the state for purposes of the AYP school accountability system include:

- Limited English Proficient,
- Students with Disabilities,
- Economically disadvantaged,
- Caucasian,
- Alaska Native/American Indian,
- Asian/Pacific Islander,
- African-American,
- Hispanic (Not White), and
- Multi-Ethnic.

Subgroup Participation Rate

Each subgroup in the school with more than 20 members enrolled on the first day of testing must meet the Participation Rate requirement for students in the state assessments program. Section 10.1 explains the Participation Rate requirement. Participation rates shall be calculated separately for each subgroup. Only a single Participation Rate will be calculated for each subgroup.

Subgroup Performance Score (% Proficient)

For each subgroup with more than 20 members (25 members beginning in 2007) enrolled in grades 3 to 10 for a full academic year, the percentage of students who are proficient will be computed. The numerator shall consist of all students in grades 3 to 10 enrolled for a full academic year in the subgroup who score at the "proficient" or "advanced" performance level on the state assessment in "Language Arts" (and separately for Mathematics) appropriate for the student's grade level. The denominator shall consist of all students in grades 3 to 10 enrolled for a full academic year who have participated in state assessments in either "Language Arts" or Mathematics. Separate calculations for each subgroup shall be made for "Language Arts" and for the mathematics content areas. For "Language Arts" the numerator shall consist of the number of students proficient on the "Language Arts" composite score, and for mathematics the numerator shall consist of the number of students proficient on the mathematics score. For both Performance Scores the denominator is the same and shall be the number of students who have participated in state assessments in each content area as appropriate.

In order to reliably conclude the subgroup has not met the AMO, a 99% (one-tailed) confidence interval around the Annual Measurable Objective for each subject area for each year shall be calculated. The formula for calculating the confidence interval is:

99% confidence interval:

$$\text{AMO} - 2.33 \times \sqrt{\frac{pq}{N}}$$

where:

- p is the proportion proficient specified in the AMO,
- q is the proportion not proficient specified in the AMO,
- N is the number in the subgroup for a particular school/district who have participated in state assessments and were enrolled for the full academic year, and 2.33 is the Z score corresponding to a one-tailed 99% confidence interval (a one-tailed confidence interval is used since the error to be minimized is a false negative - i.e. the performance score is below the AMO).

The AYP decision rule for a subgroup is: If the observed subgroup Performance Score (calculated % proficient) falls within the 99% confidence interval around the AMO (for the subject area in question), the subgroup is said to have met the AMO for the year. Only if the Performance Score (calculated % proficient for a subgroup) falls outside the lower bound of the 99% confidence interval can it be reliably concluded (with only 1% chance of error) that the subgroup did not meet the AMO.

The confidence interval is used because we cannot reliably conclude that the observed performance score is accurate with small samples. By using a one-tailed confidence interval (at $p = .01$) we can confidently conclude that the subgroup did not meet the AMO for that year if the subgroups performance score lies outside the confidence interval of the AMO. Because of the many small schools in Alaska and the high-stakes associated with the decision to that the subgroups has or has not made AYP, we want to minimize "false-negatives" and hence have chosen the 99% confidence interval to enhance the reliability of our decision.

Improvement/"Safe Harbor"

If the calculated Performance Score of a group fails to fall within the confidence interval of the AMO in a particular content area, the group can be said to have made adequate yearly progress if the group performance score shows a reduction of at least 10% in the percent of students not proficient from the previous year's Performance Score in that content area for that group. To improve reliability of the improvement provision Alaska will implement a 75% confidence interval ($p = .25$) around the number that represents the percentage of students in the subgroup, school, or district that are not proficient or higher in the subject area for that year.

If the calculated Performance Score of a group fails to fall within the confidence interval of the AMO in a particular content area, but that group did meet the improvement condition for safe harbor, that group must also meet the threshold level (or show improvement from the prior year) on the other academic indicator appropriate for the grade configuration of the school. For schools with grade 12 that other indicator is graduation rate, for all other schools the other indicator is student average daily attendance.

Alaska will collect impact data on the results of the use of a 75% confidence interval on safe harbor, and use this data to study the longitudinal impact of this application. The data will be

analyzed by the Accountability Unit at the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development, presented to the State Board of Education, and made available upon request to the U. S. Department of Education.

Using a confidence interval increases the validity of the safe harbor application as in any given year the schools may perform at different rates, however before a designation occurs Alaska wants to be assured the school did not meet adequate yearly progress, and reduce any chance of false negatives.

Growth in student academic performance

The growth calculation for each school or subgroup, and district or subgroup, will be made by adding the number of students that are “on track to becoming proficient” to the number of students that already are proficient, multiplying by 100 and then dividing that result by the number of students eligible to be included. The students eligible to be included are the full academic year students as defined the currently approved accountability system. This section operationally defines the process by which the decision will be made of whether a student is “on track to becoming proficient.”

Students take a standards-based assessment (SBA) at the end of each school year in grades 3-10. The first year that a student is tested on an SBA is considered the student’s “base year,” and the student’s scaled score on that test is the student’s “base score.” If the student’s base year is grades 3-6, the student is given four years to become proficient. If the base year is grade 7 or higher, then the student is given the difference between the base year and 10; so, for example, if the student’s base year is grade 7, the student is given 3 years to become proficient, and if the student’s base year is grade 9, the student is given 1 year to become proficient. Students must be proficient by the end of grade 10 to count positively for their school.

Using the student’s base score, a student will be assigned a “target score” to be achieved each of the subsequent years the student has to become proficient. If the student’s observed scaled score on the SBA is equal to or higher than the target score, and equal to or higher than the score from the previous grade level, the student will be considered to be “on track to becoming proficient” for that school year. If the observed scaled score on the SBA is less than the target or less than the score from the previous grade level, the student will be considered to not be on track and therefore will not count positively for his/her school.

The target score will be calculated by first estimating the student’s true score (using classical measurement theory) for the base year. Making those calculations requires the grand mean for the state and the reliability of the SBA taken in that base year. Table 1 provides those values, as published in the Technical Report for the SBA in 2006.

Table 1

Means and Reliabilities for the SBA Tests, by Subject by Grade,
As Reported in the 2006 SBA Technical Report

Grade	Test			
	Mathematics		Language Arts	
	Mean	Reliability	Mean	Reliability
3	355	.91	728	.95
4	348	.90	735	.95
5	342	.91	724	.95
6	337	.92	704	.95
7	327	.92	701	.95
8	331	.92	719	.95
9	315	.92	699	.95
10*	327	.87	708	.92

*Tenth grade added for reference only, but not used in growth calculations.

A student's estimated true score (ETS) is calculated as follows:

$$\text{ETS} = \text{Grand Mean} + \text{Reliability} * (\text{Observed Score} - \text{Grand Mean})$$

Thus, for example, if a student has an observed score on the grade 3 mathematics test of 200, then the student's ETS for that test is $355 + .91 * (200 - 355)$, or 214.

Note that the language arts score is a combination of the reading score and the writing score, consistent with the approved Alaska Accountability Workbook. It takes a score of 300 to be proficient in reading or in writing; therefore, for the purposes of AYP it takes a score of 600 to be considered proficient. Table 2 provides data on the mean score for each separate subject and the mean composite, which is the language arts score in Table 1.

Table 2

Grade	Mean reading	Reading Reliability	Mean writing	Writing Reliability	R - W Corr	Mean Composite	Composite Reliability
3	368	0.91	360	0.92	0.847	728	0.95
4	369	0.91	366	0.89	0.845	735	0.95
5	366	0.92	358	0.89	0.857	724	0.95
6	356	0.91	348	0.89	0.859	704	0.95
7	357	0.9	344	0.9	0.84	701	0.95
8	368	0.9	351	0.9	0.859	719	0.95
9	354	0.91	345	0.89	0.856	699	0.95
10*	360	0.88	348	0.84	0.795	708	0.92

*Tenth grade added for reference only, but not used in growth calculations.

The target for each subsequent year is the original ETS, incremented by the annual required gain. The annual required gain is the difference between 300 and the ETS, divided by the number of years a student has to become proficient. To continue our example above, the

student's ETS is 86 points short of 300, and the student has four years to become proficient. Thus, the annual required gain is $86/4$, or 21.5 points. Thus, the target for this student in grade 4 would be $214 + 21.5$, or 236; for grade 5, the target would be $214 + 2 * 21.5$, or 257; for grade 6, the target would be $214 + 3 * 21.5$, or 279. For grade 7, the fourth year the student is in the system, the target would be 300—and it would remain at that value for as long as the student remains in the accountability system.

Note that all these targets are established in the base year, and remain the targets regardless of the student's performance (up or down) in subsequent years. Thus, continuing our example, our student must have a scaled score of 257 or higher on the grade 5 SBA to count positively for his/her school; it is immaterial what score the student attained in grade 4.

If a student's base year is in a grade other than grade 3, the calculations are identical; the only changes are that the grades for the targets are appropriately incremented, and the divisor (the number of years the student has to become proficient) is a value less than 4 if the student's base year is grade 7 or higher.

Thus, for example, if a student's base year is grade 6, and he/she has an observed scaled score of 200 on the mathematics SBA, then the ETS for the student's base year is $337 + .92 * (200 - 337)$, or 211. The annual required gain in this case is $(300 - 211)/4$, or 22.25. Thus, the student's target for grade 7 is 234, for grade 8 is 256, and for grade 9 is 278. For grade 10, the fourth year the student is in the system, the target is 300.

If a student's base year is grade 8, and he/she has an observed scaled score of 200 in the mathematics SBA, then the ETS for the student's base year is $331 + .92 * (200 - 331)$, or 210. Since the student has only two years until grade 10, the annual required gain is 45. The student's target score for grade 9 is 255, and for grade 10, it is 300.

If a school has any proficient students whose scores have declined for any reason other than regression to the mean, the school will address what measures will be taken to ensure that students remain proficient in future years.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...).</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

3.2a- Alaska will implement new standards based assessments in the spring of 2005 in grades 3-9, and a 10th grade exam in spring of 2006. Alaska will use a standards validation method to set proficiency levels on the new assessments, therefore impact data based on the benchmark exams previously used for accountability will provide a level of consistency as the state changes assessments. Alaska will set a new baseline starting in 2005 calculated using the 20th percentile school method. All students with a valid test score on one or more of the tests (reading, writing or mathematics) will be considered participating and included in computing the percent proficient for each school.

The percent proficient for the school with the 20th percentile student in "Language Arts" subject area was **71.48%**. For mathematics, the percent proficient for the school with the 20th percentile student was **57.61%**.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

3.2b- The following table shows the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for each school year from 2002-03 to 2013-14.

School Year	Annual Measurable Objective in "Language Arts"	Annual Measurable Objective in Mathematics
2002-03	64.03 %	54.86 %
2003-04	64.03 %	54.86 %
2004-05	71.48%	57.61%
2005-06	71.48%	57.61%
2006-07	71.48%	57.61%
2007-08	77.18%	66.09%
2008-09	77.18%	66.09%
2009-2010	77.18%	66.09%
2010-11	82.88%	74.57%
2011-12	88.58%	83.05%
2012-13	94.28%	91.53%
2013-14	100.00 %	100.00 %

The annual measurable objectives are derived from the Intermediate Goals presented in the next section.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. •Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

3.2c- The intermediate goals are established to ensure that 100% of the students become proficient in "Language Arts" and in mathematics by the 2013-14 school year. The basic procedure used was to subtract the starting point percent proficient from 100% and divide the result by six to create six equal sized increments in the percent proficient. This procedure was done separately for the "Language Arts" content area and for the mathematics content area.

For "Language Arts" the following computations were performed:

Starting point = 71.48 %
 Difference from 100% = 28.52 %
 Divided by 5 = 5.70 % per increment

For Mathematics the following computations were performed:

Starting point = 57.61 %
 Difference from 100% = 42.39 %
 Divided by 5 = 8.48 % per increment

The results of this analysis generated the following intermediate goals:

Increment	Year in which the increment is required	Reading/Writing/ Language	Mathematics
1st Increment	2007-08	77.18%	66.09%
2nd Increment	2010-11	82.88%	74.57%
3rd Increment	2011-12	88.58%	83.05%
4th Increment	2012-13	94.28%	91.53%
5th Increment	2013-14	100.00%	100.00%

Alaska's plan allows schools and districts to build the capacity for change during the first several increments. With current restraints on educational resources, both financial limitations and human resource limitations, the state must establish the capability to provide the technical assistance necessary to ensure all students become proficient. Once this capacity is established, the ability to meet the later intermediate goals becomes realistic.

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

4.1- AYP decisions will be made annually for each public school and LEA in Alaska using the methods described in section 3, and according to the timeline described in section 1.4 of this workbook.

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?</p>	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	<p>State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

5.1- Alaska currently disaggregates assessment results at the state and district level. Disaggregated results are posted on the ADEED website at: <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/results.html>. The Commissioner of Education has charged districts with the responsibility of disaggregating results for each school. Alaska will report disaggregated results in the State Report Card for the 2002-2003 school year.

Alaska has developed state regulations for the school/district report card that requires the reporting of disaggregated assessment results for all student subgroups specified under NCLB- including major racial/ethnic subgroups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, gender, and migrant status.

All public schools and districts will be accountable for the performance of student subgroups through the AYP determination, provided the subgroup is large enough to protect the confidentiality of individual students and provide for a reliable decision (see section 5.5).

Each spring (within two weeks after the first day of testing) districts are required to submit to the Department of Education & Early Development a data file for each individual enrolled student, which includes the above demographic information, through an electronic submission. All enrolled students are assigned to the subgroup that they are classified into on the day of testing. The categories of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient will include students that are currently served or eligible to be served.

The Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development adopted definitions for disaggregated groups by regulation.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

5.2- All subgroups within a school or district with more than 20 students (25 students beginning in 2007) shall be included in the accountability determinations annually. All students in subgroups excluded from the accountability determination because of small subgroup size are still included in the accountability determination since they are included in the "school/district-as-a-whole" AYP determination.

The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED) has implemented a unique student identification system and is currently developing a statewide assessment database. Using information gathered from the Online Alaska Student Information System (OASIS) and assessment results from our test contractor the department will be able to match student data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups. For each school and district grade span, subgroup AYP determinations will be issued using the same procedures for students in the aggregate.

Students will be assigned to the subgroup that they are classified into on the day of testing. The category of Students with Disabilities will include students that are currently served, eligible to be served or those who have exited within the prior one or two years (see section 5.3). The category of Limited English Proficient will include students that are currently served or eligible to be served and LEP students in monitoring status who have exited from LEP services during the past one or two years (see section 5.4).

The Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development will adopt regulations providing that each student subgroup must meet annual objectives on the School Performance Score for a school or district to make adequate yearly progress.

OASIS Web site- <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/OASIS/faqs.html>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

5.3- Alaska requires all students with disabilities to participate in the statewide assessment program by taking the regular assessment without accommodations, by taking the regular assessment with approved accommodations, or taking the alternate assessment. Students will be assigned to the subgroup that they are classified into on the day of testing. The category of students with disabilities will include students that are currently served in this program, students currently served with a transition plan for exiting Special Education, and students who have exited within the prior one or two years.

Alaska believes it is appropriate to measure achievement of students with severe cognitive disabilities, to this end the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED) has developed Alternate Assessments for students with severe cognitive disabilities. The Alternate Assessments measure student performance on alternate performance standards in "Language Arts" and in mathematics and are administered to students in grades 3, 6, 8, and 11. The Alternate Performance Standards are aligned with the state's content standards and are specified individually for each student to represent, in the professional judgment of the IEP team, the highest possible learning standards for those students. As specified below, the proficiency scores for students with disabilities who take the Alternate Assessment will be included in the assessment data in the accountability system.

Not more than 1% of the statewide enrollment of students in the grades assessed will participate in the alternate assessments and these students' results will be included in calculating the performance score for the AYP determinations. Students in excess of 1% participating in alternate assessments will be included in calculating the Participation Rate and will be included as not proficient in the calculation of the Performance Score.

For the 2003-04 school year and thereafter, assuming the federal regulations are clarified on this issue, the ADEED will review how students participating in alternate assessments are counted in the accountability system in order to ensure that department practices are within the parameters defined

by federal statute and regulations. The state will monitor future guidance from USED regarding alternate assessments.

The ADEED has developed a new Alternate Assessments for students with severe cognitive disabilities that will be administered to students enrolled in grades 3-10. This was field tested in 2006 and operational in 2007. The Alternate Assessment has gone through the peer review process and been approved.

The ADEED has implemented a unique student identification system and is currently developing a statewide assessment database. Using information gathered from the Online Alaska Student Information System (OASIS) and assessment results from our test contractor the department will be able to match student data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups.

Participation Guidelines-

http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/participation_guidelines/ParticipationGuidelinesSept2007.pdf

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All LEP students participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

5.4- All limited English proficient (LEP) students participate in statewide assessments. Alaska does not currently offer foreign or native language versions of the Standards Based Assessments. Accommodations for LEP students are provided on tests used for accountability.

The district may excuse the student from participation in the state assessment in reading and writing; and elect not to include the student's performance in any state assessments in the determination of school and district adequate yearly progress if:

- a.) the district enrolls a student who qualifies as an LEP pupil under 4 AAC 34.090(2), and
- b.) the student is new to the United States and enrolled in school during the twelve calendar months prior to the current year test administration, but after the previous year's test administration.

If a school excuses a new immigrant student from participation in reading and writing assessments they must have the student participate in statewide English language proficiency assessments.

The subgroup of students with limited English proficiency will include students that are currently served or eligible to be served and LEP students in monitoring status who have exited from LEP services during the past one or two years (the set of requirements are listed below). Each year LEP students must participate in the English Language Proficiency (ELP) test. Students who obtain a proficiency score on the ELP test in the overall category (includes all domains) at the proficient level or higher will no longer be considered as having limited English proficiency.

The Department will define LEP in accordance with NCLB-Section 9101 (25):

The term 'limited English proficient', when used with respect to an individual, means an individual—

- who is aged 3 through 21; **and**
- who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school; **and**
- who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English; **or**
- who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; **or**
- who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant

impact on the individual's level of English language proficiency; **or**

- who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; **and**
- whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual
 - the ability to meet the State's proficient level of achievement on State assessments described in section 1111(b)(3), **or**
 - the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; **or**
 - the opportunity to participate fully in society.

The ADEED has implemented a unique student identification system and is currently developing a statewide assessment database. Using information gathered from the Online Alaska Student Information System (OASIS) and assessment results from our test contractor the department will be able to match student data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p>	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

5.5- Alaska shall use both a minimum "n" size and a confidence interval approach to ensuring reliable decisions are made for determining AYP for both the school-/or district-as-a-whole and for subgroups. All of the explanations below apply to AYP calculations for both schools and for districts.

Subgroups with 20 or fewer students enrolled on the first day of testing shall not be included in calculating a participation rate. Subgroups, except for LEP and SWD, with 20 or fewer students enrolled for the "full academic year" shall not have the performance score (percent proficient) computed. Students with disabilities and limited English proficient student subgroups with 40 or fewer students enrolled for the "full academic year" shall not have the performance score (percent proficient) computed. Beginning in 2007 (assessment results from 2006-2007 school year) performance will not be calculated for subgroups when there are 25 or fewer students enrolled rather than the differentiated minimum group size of 20 and 40 for SWD and LEP.

When considering the school-/ or district-as-a-whole, total school enrollments in grades 3 to 10 on the first day of testing all students will be included in the calculation of AYP both for the participation rate and the performance score (percent proficient), but not for any subgroups with fewer than 20, and fewer than 40 for SWD and LEP (25 students for all subgroups beginning in 2007). This is done to ensure that all schools in Alaska are included in the accountability system.

For the school-/ or district-as-a-whole and for subgroups that have an enrollment on the first day of testing of more than 20 "full academic year" students (25 students beginning in 2007), a 99% confidence interval around the AMO shall be calculated and used to determine if the subgroup met the AMO (see also section 3.2). If the school/district Performance Score for a given year falls outside the lower bound of the confidence

⁵ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

interval around the AMO, then we can reliably conclude that the school did not make AYP. The confidence interval approach helps to ensure that "false negative" decisions are minimized.

Very small schools or districts with 20 or fewer students (25 or fewer students beginning in 2007) enrolled for the "full academic year" on the first day of testing shall also use the confidence interval approach when determining if the school-/or district-as-a-whole has met AYP, the same decision rules as used for subgroups (see section 3.2) shall apply for determining whether or not the school--as-a-whole and district-as-a-whole has made AYP.

Alaska is very committed to including as many students, subgroups, schools, and districts as possible in a reliable and valid manner. Alaska reviewed available literature, participated in discussions sponsored by CCSSO and other professional groups, held extensive discussions with in-state advisory groups (the Assessment and Accountability Technical Review Group and the School Designator System Committee), and drew upon work done by contracted consultants from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment. It is clear that there is a balance between validity and reliability. These accountability systems are not technically able to do everything we would like them to do—we would like to be able to make reliable and valid judgments about every district, every school, every subgroup, every student, every year, and every test. However, there are limits—very real technical limits—to our ability to make those judgments accurately and fairly.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

5.6- Reporting Accountability Decisions -To ensure confidentiality of individual student information about AYP determinations Alaska will not report accountability results for subgroups of 20 or fewer students (25 or fewer students beginning in 2007) enrolled for a full academic year for either the school AYP calculation or the district AYP calculation.

Reporting Assessment Results (in the School/District Report Cards) - Due to the small sizes of most of our schools and some of our districts, Alaska has developed a reporting protocol that is used to provide the public with information relating to the performance of schools and districts on state assessments. This protocol allows for the reporting of assessment results when five or more students are tested (irrespective of full academic year).

Protocol for Reporting Assessment Results-Two Categories of Achievement (if the numbers of students are sufficient) results will be reported for all four performance levels of achievement, otherwise the data will be aggregated into two categories of achievement - below proficient or proficient or above)

- Complete results will be reported as long as at least 3 students are reported in any cell.
- If either proficiency level (cell) contains 0,1, or 2 students the number of students will be eliminated and the percentage of students at each achievement level will be reported as a range. In reporting a range of performance the following rules will apply.

Number of Students Tested	Achievement Level Reported
5	60% or more proficient (or not proficient) 40% or fewer not proficient (or proficient)
8	75% or more proficient (or not proficient) 25% or fewer not proficient (or proficient)
10	80% or more proficient (or not proficient) 20% or fewer not proficient (or proficient)

⁶ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

20	90% or more proficient (or not proficient) 10% or fewer not proficient (or proficient)
40 (or more)	95% or more proficient (or not proficient) 5% or fewer not proficient (or proficient)

NOTE: No results will be reported if fewer than 5 students are tested. Alaska will continue to use the protocol above for reporting assessment results and a minimum “n” size of 20 (minimum “n” of 25 beginning in 2007) for reporting accountability decisions.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

6.1 - The following assessments are used to make accountability decisions:

Reading/Writing/Language and Mathematics Assessments

Grade	Examination	Subject Areas
Grade 3	Standards Based Assessment Alternate Assessment	Reading, Writing, Mathematics
Grade 4	Standards Based Assessment Alternate Assessment	Reading, Writing, Mathematics
Grade 5	Standards Based Assessment Alternate Assessment	Reading, Writing, Mathematics
Grade 6	Standards Based Assessment Alternate Assessment	Reading, Writing, Mathematics
Grade 7	Standards Based Assessment Alternate Assessment	Reading, Writing, Mathematics
Grade 8	Standards Based Assessment Alternate Assessment	Reading, Writing, Mathematics
Grade 9	Standards Based Assessment Alternate Assessment	Reading, Writing, Mathematics
Grade 10	Standards Based Assessment Alternate Assessment	Reading, Writing, Mathematics

Results from each of the above assessments administered at the grade levels enrolled at the school will be used to calculate the Performance Score (percent proficient). As can be seen all of the assessments are measures of academic skills. Assessments were specifically designed to measure the Alaska content standards. The 10th grade assessment was changed in 2006 to incorporate additional items from the grade 10 grade level expectations for accountability

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

purposes.

Alaska's assessment system includes separate tests in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. In order to calculate AYP for the "Language Arts" subject area, the scale scores for reading and writing will be summed for each student to obtain an overall reading/writing score. Proficiency level cut scores will also be summed for reading and writing to compute an overall proficiency cut score for reading/writing. Students will be identified as proficient if their combined (summed) reading and writing score meets or exceeds the combined (summed) proficiency cut score (see section 1.3).

The ADEED recently developed a new Alternate Assessments for students with severe cognitive disabilities that is administered to students enrolled in grades 3-10. Alaska received approval through the peer review process on October 5, 2007.

While not a part of the AYP calculation, Alaska is implementing a standards based assessment for science in grades 4, 8 and 10 in compliance with NCLB. The science assessment is based on academic content standards in science that were developed by Alaska educators and adopted by the State Board of Education & Early Development. Science assessment items were piloted with Alaska students in 2006, field tested in 2007, and the first operational form will be used to implement the assessment in April 2008. An independent alignment study was conducted in fall 2007, and will be submitted for peer review in spring 2008. The standard setting will take place in May 2008 followed by State Board action to approve the standards in summer 2008. The first technical report regarding the science assessment will be delivered to the ADEED in September 2008.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p>	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, • Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and • Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁸ to make AYP.</p>	<p>State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

7.1- As specified in NCLB graduation rate will be the additional academic indicator for secondary schools issuing diplomas. This other academic indicator will be used in schools that enroll a combination of elementary, middle and secondary students (grades K-12) or middle and secondary students (grades 7-12).

⁸ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

The threshold rate established using the above method is: **85.00 %**

The graduation rate is the Four-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate:

$$\text{Graduation Rate} = \frac{\text{\# FY 20011 Graduates who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma}}{\text{\# of students who entered high school four years earlier, adjusting for transfers in and out, émigrés and deceased students.}}$$

The above definition is used for calculating graduation rates in the 2010-11 school year. Since the 2003-2004 school year, Alaska has not awarded high school diplomas without the passage of the High School Graduation Qualifying Examination (HSGQE). Students who do not pass all parts of the HSGQE shall be issued a Certificate of Achievement.

For the 2010-11 graduation rate definition, the Department of Education & Early Development will add “# of students Receiving a Certificate of Achievement” to the denominator. Only students receiving a standard secondary school diploma will be counted as a graduate. Non-standard diplomas, certificates or GEDs are not included as graduates when calculating graduation rates and these students are considered Grade 12 retentions.

For purposes of AYP the calculation of the graduation rate will apply to the school building, the district level and the subgroup levels within the school building and district level. School buildings, districts and subgroup levels will have met the other indicator for the purposes of calculating AYP when:

- they achieve or exceed the threshold for the graduation rate; or
- those that are below the threshold improve their graduation rate by 2.0% when compared to the previous year; or
- average graduation rate for two or three consecutive years, including the current year, meet or exceed the threshold.

In addition to the Four-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate Alaska will also calculate an Extended Five-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation.

For purposes of AYP the calculation of the Extended Five-year Adjusted Graduation Rate will apply to the school building, the district level and the subgroup levels within the school building and district level. School buildings, districts and subgroup levels that have not met the Four-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate will have met the other indicator for the purposes of calculating AYP when:

- they achieve or exceed the threshold for the graduation rate; or
- those that are below the threshold improve their graduation rate by 3.0% when compared to the previous year; or
- average graduation rate for two or three consecutive years, including the current year, meet or exceed the threshold.

If the school does not meet the graduation rate as described above, and that school has 25 or fewer students in the denominator of the fraction used to computer the graduation rate, it can meet the other indicator if;

1. the school's graduation rate data for consecutive years, including the current year, when aggregated,
 - a) contain a large enough group size so that the denominator of the graduation rate fraction aggregated is larger than 25; and
 - b) the aggregated graduation rate for those consecutive years equals or exceeds 85.00 percent; or

2. when the ADEED has insufficient data to make a determination for graduation rate the department finds
 - a) the schools graduation rate for four consecutive years, including the current year, demonstrates progress toward the graduation rate threshold; and
 - b) the school's inability to meet the graduation rate in the current year is attributable to two or fewer students.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

7.2- Alaska will use an average daily attendance rate to meet the NCLB requirement for states to select another academic indicator for all public elementary school students.

The attendance rate is computed by taking the aggregate daily attendance during the regular school year and dividing by the aggregate daily membership for the school year, the result being expressed as a percentage; the aggregate daily attendance is the sum of the days present of all students when school is in session during the school year; the aggregate daily membership is the sum of the days present and absent of all students when school is in session during the school year; in-service days are not included in the computation; for the purposes of this paragraph, a student is considered present if physically present at the school or engaged in a school activity even if the activity is away from the school

Alaska's initial threshold for attendance rate is **85%**. This percent was chosen since attendance below this level represents too much school missed to learn the reading, writing, and mathematics standards at the proficient level. Not all schools currently exceed this threshold rate of attendance, but will need to do so to meet AYP.

For purposes of making an AYP determination (other than "safe harbor"), the calculation of the attendance rate will apply to the school-/or district-as-a-whole, but not to the subgroup level. Schools and districts that achieve or exceed the threshold for attendance, as well as those that are below the threshold but improve their attendance rate when compared to the previous year, will have met the other academic indicator requirement for meeting AYP for each content area.

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

In addition to being part of the definition of AYP, schools and districts will be required to meet the attendance rate threshold or improve their attendance rate as a requirement for invoking the “safe harbor” provision for a subgroup that fails to meet the AMO with the performance score. Due to lack of capacity at the district and state level Alaska will not be able to disaggregate attendance rates for the 2002-2003 school year, but will collect student level attendance information during the 2003-04 school year so that disaggregated attendance information can be used next year and thereafter.

At its August 2003 meeting the Alaska Board of Education & Early Development adopted a regulation specifying the inclusion of attendance as an additional indicator in the accountability system for elementary and middle schools. Alaska has many schools that enroll students in grades K-12, 1-12, or 7-12, the graduation rate will be used as the other academic indicator for schools that award a diploma and graduate students.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?</p>	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

7.3- The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED) has implemented a unique student identification number system for the 2002-2003 school year. Currently Alaska assigns a unique identification number to each student enrolled in a public school in the state. Districts are required to submit names and state ID numbers of students during the fall and spring enrollment count period. Data about student characteristics (subgroup membership), enrollment, and mobility are collected electronically through the data for the first day of testing. The reliability of data reporting has been greatly enhanced through implementation of our electronic system. Hence enrollment and demographic information about students are reliable and valid.

Alaska's graduation rate calculation complies with national standards and is consistent with the methodology recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics. Hence, graduation rate is a valid indicator.

Both the graduation and attendance rates are subject to audit and verification at the state level. The ADEED will review data submitted by school districts relative to the graduation and attendance rates to identify data that represent substantial change from past performance. The ADEED will require individual school districts to verify data that represents substantial change from past performance. The ADEED will need to increase its capacity in order to conduct these audits.

The Alaska Standards Based Assessments are being designed as valid and reliable measures of student achievement. Technical reports from our testing contractor are available following test administrations and will indicate the reliability and validity of state assessments. Technical reports are posted on the ADEED web site to make the program transparent.

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

8.1- Alaska will measure academic achievement in "Language Arts" and mathematics separately for determining AYP.

Alaska's assessment system includes separate tests in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. In order to calculate AYP for the "Language Arts" subject area, the scale scores for reading and writing will be summed for each student to obtain an overall reading/writing score. Proficiency level cut scores will also be summed for reading and writing to compute an overall proficiency cut score for reading/writing. Students will be identified as proficient if their combined (summed) reading and writing score meets or exceeds the combined (summed) proficiency cut score. (See section 1.3)

¹⁰ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State’s standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State’s evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

9.1- Alaska is very committed to including as many students, subgroups, schools, and districts as possible in a reliable and valid manner. Alaska reviewed available literature, participated in discussions sponsored by CCSSO and other professional groups, held extensive discussions with in-state advisory groups (the Assessment and Accountability Technical Review Group and the School Designator System Committee), and drew upon work done by contracted consultants from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment. It is clear that there is a balance between validity and reliability. These accountability systems are not technically able to do everything we would like them to do—we would like to be able to make reliable and valid judgments about every district, every school, every subgroup, every student, every year, and every test. However, there are limits—very real technical limits—to our ability to make those judgments accurately and fairly. The key issue is the number of students. A straightforward application of statistical sampling theory reveals that it would require hundreds of students in a subgroup—as many as 740—to make a decision about whether a school had or had not improved sufficiently, with an acceptable likelihood of error of one in a hundred. Using a minimum-n of 40 would exclude from accountability consideration a very large proportion of subgroups in schools in the state.

Alaska’s school and district accountability system has two main features to allow reliable accountability decisions to be made while including as many subgroups as possible. First, we propose using a minimum N of 20 students (25 students beginning in 2007) in a subgroup, to assure a sufficient number of students are included in the analysis of subgroups.

Second, we propose using a confidence interval approach to ensure decisions are acceptably reliable. A confidence interval approach makes it possible to include all schools, regardless of size. In addition to using the confidence interval approach with the school-as-a-whole performance score (percent proficient), the confidence interval will also be used with subgroup performance scores (percent proficient) when the subgroup has more than 20 students (25 students beginning in 2007).

By using the proposed system with a confidence interval approach we will include in the accountability system virtually every school—even those with only two or three students per grade level. The combination of the proposed system and a confidence interval approach also helps mitigate the untenable position of acknowledging that a decision is unacceptably unreliable for a subgroup, but still making an accountability decision for the school as a whole that is no more reliable.

Alaska has worked closely with our testing contractor to ensure the reliability of assessments at every step in the development process. As documented in the technical reports, Benchmark Exams and the HSGQE meet requirements for acceptable reliability. Parents may have their child's test rescored on demand. Constructed response items on the HSGQE are scored twice. Alaska's new test contractor will be completing technical reports as a deliverable for the contract. Technical reports can be viewed on ADEED's website at <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/techreports.html>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

9.2- Using data from state assessments, the electronic data submissions and additional information collected from districts the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (ADEED) will apply the accountability and AYP calculation procedures outlined in this workbook to each school, district and subgroup in the state. The ADEED will notify districts of the results from that analysis according to the timelines provided in section 1.4.

Under NCLB any school or district may appeal decisions made regarding AYP to the state and/or school district. In the case of AYP decisions regarding schools, the school district must consider the appeal and render a final decision within 30 days, after the submission date of the appeal. Similarly, if a district appeals a decision regarding AYP, the ADEED must make a final determination within 30 days of the date of the appeal.

The State Board of Education will establish an appeal process that is similar to the language in ESEA Section 1116(b)(2). Providing that a school or district may appeal its category placement based on objective factors the school or district considers relevant because the annual assessment data does not provide an accurate picture of school improvement and performance, including significant demographic changes in the student population, errors in data, or other significant issues.

The ADEED will provide ongoing technical assistance to districts regarding the calculation of a school designation and school improvement and corrective action activities, including appeals regarding AYP decisions.

The ADEED recognizes the need for additional resources and support to develop the capacity to implement a research agenda to determine the reliability of accountability decisions and the validity of the accountability system.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p>	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

9.3- Alaska has established content and performance standards covering age spans that are assessed at grades 3, 6, 8, and 10. ADEED developed grade level expectations for grades 3-10 meet the requirements specified in the final regulations for assessments under NCLB. The State Board of Education & Early Development approved grade level content expectations in February 2004.

While Alaska has already implemented assessments at grades 3-8 as, required under NCLB, the ADEED found it necessary to develop new standards based assessments at each grade level to ensure we had a valid measure of the Alaska standards. In the fall of 2001, Alaska worked with the Northwest Regional Educational Lab to complete an alignment study of our statewide assessment program. ADEED will used the grade level content standards and information from the alignment study to make the decision that new assessments would create a system with greater validity. New assessments have been developed in grades 3-9 and put in place in 2005. In 2006 a new assessment was put into place for grade 10.

The ADEED recently developed a new, and received peer review approval of our Alternate Assessment for students with severe cognitive disabilities that is administered to students enrolled in grades 3-10.

¹¹ Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

All of the assessments used in Alaska have undergone independent alignment and been approved through the U.S. Department of Education peer review process.

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

10.1 The Participation Rate for each school, district, and for the state as a whole, as well as for each subgroup, will be based on the enrollment of students during the first day of testing each year (spring testing). Participation rates will be calculated for schools, districts and subgroups by comparing the number of students with test results (one or more valid test scores) to the number of enrolled students. Alaska shall apply a single participation rate for each school/subgroup. Participation is defined as a student who takes one or more of the three tests (reading, writing/language, or mathematics).

The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development has established an additional data collection on the first day of testing for the Spring 2003 assessments to gather information to accurately calculate participation rates (and to collect information on subgroup membership). This data collection will occur annually on the first day of testing.

The following rules shall apply to meeting the Participation Rate requirement for the AYP determination:

- Schools or subgroups with 40 or fewer eligible students will meet the participation requirement if all but two or fewer students are assessed.
- Schools or subgroups with 41 or more eligible students will meet the participation requirements if 95% of the enrolled students (rounded up to the nearest whole number) are assessed.

The federal requirement for a participation rate of 95 percent allows little room for

extenuating circumstances when small groups of students are involved. Due to the small size of many Alaska schools the 95 percent participation requirement means that all students must be tested when the school enrollment numbers are less than 20; no more than one student can miss the test when the subgroup size is between 20 and 39. Even schools and districts that are very aggressive about test participation will encounter circumstances that prevent students from taking the test for example, extended illness or injury. The rules that the department has proposed provide schools with a cushion against failing the participation requirement for reasons that are beyond their control.

By August 2003 the State Board of Education & Early Development approved regulations establishing the definition and method of calculating participation rates.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

10.2 - The Participation Rate requirement applies to the school-as-a-whole and district-as-a-whole calculations irrespective of total numbers of students enrolled.

For subgroups: if the number of students enrolled in a subgroup is 20 or fewer, then the participation rate shall not be calculated and that subgroup shall not be included in the AYP determination for the school or district. For subgroups between 21 and 40 in size, the subgroup will be said to have met the Participation Rate requirement if all but 2 students were assessed. For subgroups over 40 students, the percent will be calculated based on the number participating in assessment divided by the number enrolled.

Student participation may be averaged for two or three consecutive years including the current year to equal the ninety-five percent participation rate.