2008 Guide to Calculating
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
Technical Assistance Paper
2007-08

Florida Department of Education
Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner

July 2008

Contact Information:

Evaluation and Reporting Section
Bureau of Research and Evaluation
Florida Department of Education
325 W. Gaines Street, Ste. 445
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400

Phone: (850) 245-0411
Fax: (850) 245-0710

E-mail: evalnrpt@fldoe.org

Table of Contents

(continued)

Table of Contents (continued)

I. Overview

Introduction

The Federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 requires states to evaluate the performance of all students in all public schools in order to determine whether schools, school districts, and the state have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) towards enabling all students to meet the state's academic achievement standards. AYP measurements target the performance and participation of various subgroups based on race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disability, and English proficiency. The goal of NCLB is to have 100 percent of students proficient by 2013-14.

The data used for the foundation of AYP incorporates the assessment results in grades 3-10 from the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) and alternate assessments given to students with disabilities (SWD) and English language learners (ELL). Not making AYP does not mean that a school is failing. It means that the school has not met a certain standard for at least one group of students.

The purpose of this technical assistance paper is to provide a description of the procedures used to determine the AYP designation of Florida schools and districts for the 2008 school year. This paper is intended for knowledgeable audiences who are familiar with the student data collection processes conducted by the Florida Department of Education in conjunction with all Florida school districts. A more general description of NCLB and AYP is available on our Web site at http://www.fldoe.org/NCLB/.

Specific Authority and Responsibility

The NCLB Act of 2001 was signed into law by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002. The NCLB Act details state responsibilities for developing challenging academic standards, assessing students, and determining adequate yearly progress for the schools, school districts, and the state. Resources on NCLB policies, requirements, and federal guidance can be found on the U.S. Department of Education Web site at http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml. The NCLB Act of 2001 is available in its entirety at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html.

The NCLB Act required each state to submit a plan for the implementation of AYP, as outlined in law. The approved accountability plan for the State of Florida (often referred to as the Florida Workbook) provides a detailed examination of Florida's plan for implementation of AYP measures. A link to Florida's approved accountability plan is provided online at http://www.ed.gov/about/contacts/state/fl.html.

Summary of AYP Computations

NCLB requires that every public school and every school district (Local Education Agency) make adequate yearly progress towards state proficiency goals. All public schools must be held to the same criteria, and all students must be included in the determination of AYP. In addition to the school in total, the determination of AYP is based upon the results of 8 subgroups: white, black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, economically disadvantaged, English language learners (ELLs), and students with disabilities (SWDs). The criteria for determining AYP apply to each subgroup only when the number of students is greater than or equal to 30 and represents more than 15 percent of the school's population (in tested grades) or at least 100 students. Schools will be evaluated for AYP if total enrollment is greater than 10. Proficiency results include only students present in the same school or district for a full academic year.

A Florida public school or district makes AYP if the following criteria are met:

- Participation: At least 95% of all students enrolled in a public school participate in the state assessment program. Students must be tested using the FCAT or an appropriate alternate assessment for ELLs or SWDs. This requirement applies to all students and each subgroup for reading and mathematics.

- Reading Proficiency: The state has set annual objectives for reading proficiency based on the ultimate goal to have 100% of all students proficient in reading by 2013-14. For 2007-08, the state objective is to have at least 58% of all students and each subgroup reading at or above grade level. For purposes of AYP determination, students scoring at level 3 and above on the FCAT and the ELL alternate assessment or at level 2 and above on the SWD alternate assessment are considered proficient.

- Math Proficiency: The state has also set annual objectives for math proficiency based on the ultimate goal to have 100% of all students proficient in math by 2013-14. For 2007-08, the state objective is to have at least 62% of all students and each subgroup scoring at or above grade level in math. For purposes of AYP determination, students scoring at level 3 and above on the FCAT and the ELL alternate assessment or at level 2 and above on the SWD alternate assessment are considered proficient.

- Other Criteria: NCLB requires the state definition of AYP to include a graduation rate and at least one additional academic indicator as determined by the state. In Florida, the writing assessment will be used as the additional indicator and school grades will be used as an additional condition. Thus, in addition to the three criteria listed above, schools must meet three other criteria:
  - Improve performance in writing by 1%: All schools must demonstrate a 1% improvement in the percentage of students meeting state standards in writing. For purposes of AYP determination, students scoring at level 3.0 and above on the FCAT and the ELL alternate assessment or at level 2

2

and above on the SWD alternate assessment are meeting state standards. The writing target is also met if the school has a writing performance rate of 90% or better.

- o <u>Improve the graduation rate by 1%:</u> High schools must demonstrate a 1% improvement in their graduation rate. The target is also met if a school attains a rate of 85% or better in the current year.

- o <u>The school is not a D or an F</u>: The A+ School Grades are calculated prior to AYP. If a school receives a D or an F, that school does not make AYP.

- <u>Safe Harbor:</u> A school that has met the requirements for participation as well as the state's other indicators (writing, graduation rate, and school grade) but has not met the reading and/or mathematics proficiency targets can still make AYP through a provision in NCLB called Safe Harbor. Safe Harbor applies only to those subgroups that did not meet the reading or mathematics targets.

  In Safe Harbor, the percentage of non-proficient students must be decreased by at least 10% from the prior year in the subject being evaluated. In addition, the subgroup must meet AYP requirements in writing proficiency and the graduation rate.

- <u>Growth Model:</u> A school that has met the requirements for participation as well as the State's other indicators (writing, graduation rate, and school grade) but has not met the reading and/or mathematics proficiency targets can still make AYP through a provision in NCLB called the Growth Model. The Growth Model applies only to those subgroups that did not meet the reading or mathematics targets through the status model or safe harbor.

  The state has also set annual objectives for reading and math proficiency based on the ultimate goal to have 100% of all students proficient in both reading and mathematics by 2013-14. For 2007-08, the state objective for reading is to have at least 58% of all students and each subgroup "on track to be proficient." For 2007-08, the state objective for math is to have at least 62% of all students and each subgroup "on track to be proficient."

- <u>Students with Disabilities Mathematical Adjustment:</u> A school that has not met AYP solely because the SWD subgroup missed the reading proficiency target will have a mathematical adjustment applied to the percent proficient for that criterion in the SWD subgroup. The formula for the adjustment, as prescribed by the U.S. Department of Education is as follows:

  - Divide the count of SWDs assessed by the count of all students assessed to determine the percentage of SWD examinees in relation to all examinees. The resulting percentage is divided into 2.0%. The quotient of that operation, expressed as a percentage, is the amount of the adjustment. This is a state level calculation.

If the SWD subgroup meets the state proficiency target with the mathematical adjustment applied, then the subgroup will be deemed to have made AYP, which will result in the school meeting AYP. The SWD mathematical adjustment applies only to reading for the SWD subgroup for schools that did not meet AYP solely because of the SWD subgroup performance in reading.

Adequate Yearly Progress Benchmarks in Florida

	Reading	Mathematics
2001-02	31	38
2002-03	31	38
2003-04	31	38
2004-05	37	44
2005-06	44	50
2006-07	51	56
2007-08	**58**	**62**
2008-09	65	68
2009-10	72	74
2010-11	79	80
2011-12	86	86
2012-13	93	93
2013-14	**100**	**100**

II. Process for Calculating Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

This section of the paper describes the processes involved in evaluating the performance of each school to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). These processes are described, as much as possible, in the order in which each step is implemented.

1. Evaluate Student Records

All public school students required to participate in the state assessment program are included in AYP computations. Therefore, all student records for grades 3-10 are evaluated to determine district and school of enrollment and subgroup classification(s).

1.1 Determine district and school of enrollment: From Survey 3, the district number and school number of current enrollment are used to identify the district and school of a student.

1.2 Determine full academic year status: For all proficiency calculations, only students enrolled in the same school for a full academic year are included in that school's AYP status. Likewise, students enrolled in the same district for a full academic year are included in the district AYP calculation. Students are considered

continuously enrolled for a full academic year if they were present in the same school or district, in the case of a district AYP calculation, during the October and February FTE counts. This determination is made by matching the Florida Student Identification Number (SID) and Alias Identification Number (AID) in the Survey 3 file to the Florida SID and AID in the Survey 2 file by district and school.

1.3 Determine student subgroup classifications: AYP measurements target the performance and participation of various subgroups based on race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disability, and English proficiency. The individual record of each student in Survey 3 included in AYP is examined to determine which subgroup(s) apply to each student.

a) Race/Ethnicity: The racial/ethnic group to which the student belongs or with which the student identifies on his/her student record prior to testing is used to disaggregate the following subgroups:

Race="W"   White
Race="B"   Black
Race="H"   Hispanic
Race="A"   Asian
Race="I"   Native American

The Multiracial racial/ethnic category is not addressed in the NCLB Act. The enrollment and assessment data for these students is included in the calculations for the school in total but not for any of the racial/ethnic subgroups.

b) Economically Disadvantaged Students: All students eligible for free or reduced price lunch prior to testing are considered to be economically disadvantaged. In addition, all students in USDA-approved Provision 2 schools are considered to be economically disadvantaged. The Lunch Status category in each student's demographic record is used to determine economically disadvantaged status. The following Lunch Status codes are used to define the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup:

2   students eligible for free lunch,
3   students eligible for reduced-price lunch, and
4   students enrolled in a USDA-approved Provision 2 school.

c) English Language Learner (ELL) Status: An ELL student is one who was not born in the U.S. and whose native language is other than English; or was born in the U.S. but who comes from a home in which a language other than English is most relied upon for communication; or is an American Indian or Alaskan Native and comes from a home in which a language other than English has had a significant impact on his or her level of English language proficiency; and who as a result of the above has sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing or understanding the English language to deny him or her the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms in which the language of instruction is English.

The ELL PK-12 category in each student record is used to define the ELL subgroup. Students who are currently being served in an English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program as well as students who have attained English proficiency for up to two years after exiting the ESOL program are included in the ELL subgroup. These are students classified as "LY" or "LF" on their student record prior to testing.

d) <u>Students With Disabilities (SWD):</u> Students with a disability, other than gifted (L), are included in the SWD subgroup. The Primary and the Other Exceptionality fields are used to define the SWD subgroup for AYP. A list of exceptionalities can be found in the Student Database Manual at http://www.fldoe.org/eias/.

1.4 Identify the grade 10 students who have previously passed the FCAT: Grade 10 students who have previously passed the grade 10 FCAT reading and/or mathematics will not be included in AYP calculations. The identification process is completed separately for reading and for mathematics.

1.5 Obtain updates from the school districts: Student classifications and full-year status are identified by the Department and shared with the school districts in electronic form. Full-year status is established by matching student records from the October (Survey 2) and February (Survey 3) reporting periods. Districts may submit corrections to these records via student database reporting[1] up to a cutoff point for use in accountability reporting (usually by the end of the first week in March). Districts and schools are then given the opportunity to submit updates directly to the Bureau of Research and Evaluation (Evaluation and Reporting section) via a secure web-based application for students whose status changed after the end of the Survey 3 reporting period and before testing. These updates may be submitted <u>daily</u> over a multi-week period during which district and school updates are processed nightly. Any errors that remain after the close of this period cannot be updated during the appeals process. A general description of the update process is provided below.

a. <u>Unmatched Identification Numbers:</u> If there are students who were present for a full academic year, but the student ID on Survey 2 does not match the student ID on Survey 3, this results in unmatched records. Districts are required to resolve these discrepancies by correcting the student ID on submitted records so that the Survey 2 and Survey 3 records can be matched. (Database reporting is overseen by Education Information and Accountability Services.)

b. <u>Non-public school students taking courses at public schools:</u> Home schooled and private school students who receive services from a public school are excluded from calculations if N998 (Home Education) or N999 (Private School) is reported as the primary school number in the "<u>School Number,</u>

---

[1] Procedures for submitting records to the DOE automated student information database are administered by Education Information and Accountability Services (http://www.fldoe.org/eias) and are not coordinated by Evaluation and Reporting.

Current Enrollment" field of Survey 3. For students whose primary instructional school has been misidentified, districts must report the correct school of enrollment number to Evaluation and Reporting.

c. ELL status during FCAT is different from Survey 3: Updated information must be provided for students who enroll in an ESOL program after Survey 3 but before the first day of testing.

d. SWD status during FCAT is different from Survey 3: Updated information must be provided for students who are enrolled in an SWD program after Survey 3 but before the first day of testing.

e. Withdrawal status prior to testing: All students who were withdrawn from school after Survey 3 and prior to the first day of FCAT testing must be identified.

f. 10th grade FCAT graduation requirements met prior to testing: All 10th grade retained students who have passed the reading and/or math FCAT prior to testing are not included in AYP calculations. Districts must ensure that these students are appropriately identified.

g. Inaccuracies in the data reported in Survey 3: Districts are given an opportunity to correct inaccuracies in data reported in Survey 3. These data are used for the school accountability calculations.

1.6 Creation of the Membership File: Upon completion of student data corrections, a final file is created and referred to as the Membership File. The Membership File is used for all accountability calculations, A+ School Grades, and AYP.

2. Obtain the Assessment Scores for Students

Once the assessment records are sent to the Department, another process is needed to match the assessment records with the Membership file created from Survey 3 (step 1 above). The matching process is similar to that used for the creation of the Membership File. After the initial matching process is complete, districts are provided a list of unmatched, non-unique, and blank student records. School districts must return updated information for each student record. The extent to which this step is completed correctly by the school districts affects the Department's ability to include the maximum number of eligible students in the AYP calculation. The matching and corrections processes are briefly summarized below.

2.1 Identify assessment records with blank or non-unique Student IDs: For records with a blank or non-unique FCAT or Alternate Assessment Student ID, districts must provide the matching student ID from the Membership File for inclusion of student results.

2.2 Match the Membership File to the assessment file by district, school, and student ID: The Membership File is matched to assessment files using district,

school, and student ID. Unmatched records are flagged and districts must provide the matching data from the Membership File for inclusion of student results.

2.3 Identify assessment records that have missing prior year assessment data: Any record that does not contain prior year test results will be flagged. Districts must report correct prior year print after scan numbers that are associated with the missing data for Reading, Math, and Writing. Alternately, the district may provide the student's prior year school, prior year district, and prior year SID to assist in locating the prior year print after scan number.

2.4 Update assessment records with district assessment data corrections: Upon completion of assessment data corrections, all students assessed should have a corresponding record in the Membership File. If a student takes the FCAT as well as an alternate assessment for students with disabilities, the FCAT score will be used for proficiency calculations. If a student takes the ELL alternate assessment as well as an alternate assessment for students with disabilities, the SWD alternate assessment will be used for proficiency calculations.

3. Apply the 1% Cap for SWD Alternate Assessments

Under the NCLB Act and Florida Law, only students with significant cognitive disabilities should take assessments based on alternate achievement standards. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities include a small number of students whose cognitive impairments may prevent them from attaining grade-level achievement standards, even with the very best instruction. Rule 6A-1.0943, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), Statewide Assessment for Students with Disabilities, already establishes the requirements and process for determining whether a student with disabilities should participate in an alternate assessment.

In accordance with the NCLB Act, in calculating AYP for schools and school districts, a state may include the proficient scores of students taking alternate assessments provided that the number of those students at the district level who score at the proficient level does not exceed 1% of all students in the grades assessed in reading and in mathematics. Federal regulations prescribe limited conditions under which a state may grant districts a waiver from the 1% cap (e.g., a larger number of students with significant cognitive disabilities are provided services by a district, etc.). NCLB does not limit how many students can be tested with an alternate assessment; it limits only the number of scores based on alternate achievement standards that can be included as proficient in AYP measurement calculations.

While individual schools are not subject to the 1% cap, if a district has more than 1% of its students with disabilities taking the alternative assessment and scoring at the proficient level, then a method for determining which of those proficient students will be reported as non-proficient must be determined. Those students who score at the

proficient level, but will have to be reported as non-proficient for purposes of AYP, will be included as non-proficient at the school level as well.

3.1 Determine the total number of students at the district level: The total number of students assessed who have been in the same district for a full academic year.

3.2 Determine 1% of the total: Calculate 1% of the total in step 3.1.

3.3 Determine the number of proficient alternative assessment test takers: Students taking an alternate assessment for students with disabilities scoring in level 3 or above are considered proficient.

3.4 Determine if a district met its 1% cap: If the number in step 3.3 is equal to or less than the number in step 3.2, then the district has met its cap. Otherwise, the district has exceeded the 1% cap.

3.5 Convert proficient scores to non-proficient scores for the AYP calculation:

Step 1: Convert proficient scores of the following students to non-proficient scores for the purposes of the AYP calculation:
(1) Students with Specific Learning Disabled (SWD Code K) listed as the primary exceptionality and have listed as the other exceptionality Occupational Therapy (SWD Code D), Physical Therapy (SWD Code E), Not Applicable (SWD Code Z), and/or blank.
(2) Students with Occupational Therapy (SWD Code D), Physical Therapy (SWD Code E) or Not Applicable (SWD Code Z) listed as the primary exceptionality and have Specific Learning Disabled (SWD Code K) listed as the other exceptionality.

Step 2: Recalculate the 1% cap based on the conversion of the proficient SLD students to non-proficient.

Step 3: Create a file with the new proficiency scores from steps 1-2 above.

4. Compute the Components of AYP for all Subgroups

There are nine (9) computations made for the school, district, the total population, and the eight student subgroups for use in the AYP calculation. Many of these computations are used only for Safe Harbor, and thus not all of the computations are used in the final determination of AYP.

1. Percent of students tested (section 4.1)
2. Percent of students proficient in writing for the current year (section 4.2)
3. The change in writing proficiency from the prior year to the current year (section 4.2)
4. Graduation rate (section 4.3)
5. The annual change in graduation rate (using the two most recent years) (section 4.3)
6. Percent of students proficient in reading (section 4.4)

7. 10% reduction in percent of students not proficient in reading from the prior year to the current year (section 4.4)
8. Percent of students "on track to be proficient" in reading (section 4.4)
9. Percent of students proficient in math (section 4.5)
10. 10% reduction in percent of students not proficient in math from the prior year to the current year (section 4.5)
11. Percent of students "on track to be proficient" in math (section 4.5)

4.1 Calculate the percent of students tested: The percent of students tested in a school or a district is calculated two ways, as permitted by federal regulations. The percent of students tested is calculated at the school and district level and for each of the eight student subgroups.

4.1.1   The Current Year Percent of Students Tested in Reading and Math: The percent of students tested in Reading in the current year is calculated by dividing the total number of students in the school assessed in reading by the total number of students enrolled in the school. The percent of students tested in Math in the current year is calculated by dividing the total number of students in the school assessed in math by the total number of students enrolled in the school.

        a. Number of Students Assessed in Reading: The total number of students assessed in Reading includes all students taking the Reading portion of the FCAT or an appropriate alternate assessment who were enrolled in the school during Survey 3. Students must have at least one test record to be included in the total number assessed in Reading. Alternate assessments administered after the conclusion of FCAT testing are not included in the count.

        b. Number of Students Assessed in Math: The total number of students assessed in Math includes all students taking the Math portion of the FCAT or an appropriate alternate assessment who were enrolled in the school during Survey 3. Students must have at least one test record to be included in the total number assessed in Math. Alternate assessments administered after the conclusion of FCAT testing are not included in the count.

        c. Number of Students Enrolled: The number of students enrolled includes all students enrolled in the school as determined by Survey 3. Adjustments are made for student withdrawals after Survey 3 and prior to testing for testing invalidations and for retained grade 10 students who have previously taken and passed the FCAT.

Likewise, for the calculation of percent tested at the district level, the number of students assessed and the number of students enrolled are determined at the district level.

4.1.2 Average Percent Tested in Reading and Math: States can use data from the previous years to average the AYP participation rate data for a school and/or subgroup as needed. The average percent tested in Reading is calculated by dividing all students assessed in Reading in the school in the current year and in the prior year divided by the total number of students enrolled in the school in the current year and in the prior year. The average percent tested in Math is calculated by dividing all students assessed in Math in the school in the current year and in the prior year divided by the total number of students enrolled in the school in the current year and in the prior year.

   a. Number of Students Assessed in Reading: The total number of students assessed in Reading includes all students tested in the prior year with the Reading portion of the FCAT or an appropriate alternate assessment combined with all students assessed in the current year as determined in step 4.1.1 above.

   b. Number of Students Assessed in Math: The total number of students assessed in Math includes all students tested in the prior year with the Math portion of the FCAT or an appropriate alternate assessment combined with all students assessed in the current year as determined in step 4.1.1 above.

   c. Number of Students Enrolled: The number of students enrolled includes all students enrolled in the school in the prior year and all students enrolled in the current year as determined in step 4.1.1 above.

Prior-year data is not reconstructed based on new student data or new federal laws and regulations. The number of students assessed and the number of students enrolled for the two years being averaged are independent of each other; thus, prior year corrections will not be permitted.

Likewise, for the calculation of the average percent tested at the district level, the number of students assessed and the number of students enrolled for both years are determined at the district level.

4.2 Calculate writing proficiency: Writing proficiency is calculated at the school and district level for the primary AYP calculation. Writing proficiency is also calculated for each of the eight subgroups, but the data is only used for Safe Harbor provisions.

4.2.1 Determine Writing Proficiency for the Current Year: For purposes of AYP, students scoring 3.0 and above on the essay section of FCAT Writing or 3.0 and above on an ELL alternate assessment or 2.0 and above on the SWD alternate assessment are considered to have met state standards. In addition, only students enrolled in the same school for a full academic year (same district for

the district calculation) are included in proficiency calculations. The percent of students meeting state standards in writing is determined by dividing the total number of students meeting state standards by the total number of students assessed.

4.2.2 <u>Determine Writing Proficiency for the Prior Year:</u> Prior-year data is not reconstructed based on new student data or new federal laws and regulations; thus, prior year corrections will not be permitted. Writing performance for the prior year was determined in the same manner as described in 4.2.1.

4.2.3 <u>Determine the Increase in Writing Proficiency:</u> The percent of students meeting state standards in writing in the prior year is subtracted from the percent of students meeting state standards in writing in the current year to determine the change in writing performance. Writing performance calculations for the two years are independent of each other; thus, no student record matching between the school years is performed for this calculation.

4.3 Calculate the NCLB graduation rate: The NCLB graduation rate is calculated in the Office of Education Information and Accountability Services. The graduation rate used for AYP determinations is slightly different from the Florida graduation rate published on the Florida Department of Education Web site. This is because the federal definition of a regular diploma does not include some of the diploma types we offer in Florida, such as a Special Diploma for students with disabilities. Furthermore, because the AYP calculation is performed prior to the end of summer school, graduation rates used for AYP are based on the prior two years.

The change in graduation rate is calculated at the school and district level for the primary AYP calculation. The change in graduation rate is also calculated for each of the eight subgroups, but the data is only used for Safe Harbor provisions.

4.3.1 <u>Determine the Graduation Rate for 2006-07:</u>
   a. *Number of Expected Graduates:* The number of first-time ninth graders in membership during fall 2003 **plus** incoming transfer students on the same schedule to graduate [i.e., 1st-time 9th graders in 2003-04, 1st-time 10th graders in 2004-05, 1st-time 11th graders in 2005-06, and 1st-time 12th graders in 2006-07] **minus** students from this combined population who transferred out [W03s, W02s, W2As as applicable], students who left to enroll in a private school [W04s], a home education program [W24s], or an adult education program [W26s, W45's], and deceased students [W12s]).
   b. *Number of Graduates:* The number of students receiving a standard diploma or a GED diploma obtained through a GED exit option program from the group described above.
   c. *Graduation Rate:* The graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of graduates by the number of expected graduates, as defined above.

4.3.2   Determine the Graduation Rate for 2005-06: 2005-06 data is not reconstructed based on new student data or new federal laws and regulations; thus, prior year corrections will not be permitted.   The graduation rate for 2005-06 was determined in the same manner as described in 4.3.1.

4.3.3   Determine the Increase in Graduation Rate: The 2005-06 graduation rate is subtracted from the 2006-07 graduation rate to determine the change in graduation rate.

4.4   Calculate reading proficiency: Reading proficiency is calculated at the school and district level and for each of the eight subgroups. In addition, the change in non-proficient students from the prior year to the current year is calculated for the Safe Harbor provision.

4.4.1   Determine Reading Proficiency for the Current Year: For purposes of AYP, students scoring at level 3 and above on FCAT reading and the ELL reading alternate assessment or at level 2 and above on the SWD reading alternate assessment are considered to be proficient. In addition, only students enrolled in the same school for a full academic year (same district for the district calculation) are included in proficiency calculations. The percent of students proficient in reading is determined by dividing the total number of students scoring at the proficient level in reading by the total number of students assessed.

4.4.2   Determine Reading Proficiency for the Prior Year: The prior year's data is not reconstructed based on new student data or new federal laws and regulations; thus, prior year corrections will not be permitted. Reading proficiency for the prior year was determined in the same manner as described in 4.4.1.

4.4.3   Determine if a 10% Reduction in Non-Proficiency Was Met: Among other criteria, Safe Harbor provisions require that the percent of non-proficient students decreases by at least 10% from the preceding year.

a. *Calculate the Prior Year Percent of Non-Proficient Students:* The percent of non-proficient students + the percent of proficient students = 100%. Therefore, the percent of students who are not proficient in reading is calculated by subtracting the percent of proficient students (determined in step 4.4.2 above) from 100%. For example, if 20% of your students score 3 or above in reading, then 80% (100%-20%) of your students are non-proficient.

b. *Determine 10% Target Reduction*: To determine the percent of non-proficient students that a 10% reduction represents, multiply the percent of non-proficient students in the prior year (step a.) by 10%.

c. *Determine the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target:*   Add the target reduction (determined in b. above) to the percent of proficient students in the prior year (determined in 4.4.2 above).

d. *Compare the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target with the Percent of Proficient Students:* To determine whether or not the 10% target reduction was made, compare the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target (determined in c. above) with the percent of proficient students in the current year (determined in 4.4.1 above). The current year proficiency must be greater than or equal to the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target.

Example: In 2006-07, 20% of students score 3 or above in reading = PYP
                In 2007-08, 27% of students score 3 or above in reading = CYP

   a.   *Determine the Prior Year % of Non-Proficient Students:*
         2006-07 Non-Proficient Students: 100% - 20% = 80% = PYNP

   b-c. *Determine the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target:*
         PYP + (10% x PYNP)
         20% + (10% x 80%) =
         20% + 8% =
         28%

   d.   *Determine if the 10% Reduction was Met:*
         Is the 2007-08 % Proficient $\geq$ the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target?
         Is 27% $\geq$ 28%?
         NO

4.4.4 Determine Whether the Reading Growth Target Was Met: The three-year growth trajectory is built based on students' previous test scores compared to proficiency at a later point in time. The Growth Model requires that the percentage of students "on track to be proficient" meets the state's annual objectives for reading proficiency (58% in 2007-08).

a. *Determine the Students Included in the Growth Model Calculation:* The growth model calculation includes students with at least two years of assessment data as well as third grade students with no prior year data. In addition, only students enrolled in the same school for a full academic year (same district for the district calculation) are included in the Growth Model calculations.

b. *Determine Students "On Track To Be Proficient":*

   1. "On track to be proficient" for third grade students, who do not have prior year data, will be determined by proficiency. All third grade students without prior year data will be included in the growth model and considered "on track to be proficient" if they are currently proficient in third grade. If the third grade student is not proficient and does not have prior year data, then

14

the student would be included in the growth model as NOT "on track to be proficient."

2. Students who use alternate assessments are not on the FCAT develop-mental scale and will have growth calculated based on improving achieve-ment levels or maintaining a proficient level. Students may not decrease achievement levels in order to be considered "on track to be proficient." (See Attachment C for additional information on proficient achievement levels for SWD alternate assessments in 2007-08 and 2006-07.)

3. The student has at least two years of assessment data and the student is "on track to be proficient".
   a. Identify the student's prior year Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Developmental Scale Score (DSS). The DSS is a continuous scale used from grade 3 through grade 10.
   b. Locate the student's baseline score based on the grade levels found in Attachment A.
   c. Calculate the difference between the student's baseline score and the target year's proficiency found in Attachment B.
   d. Determine whether the difference between the baseline and target year has been closed by 33% between prior year and current year. The student will be included as "on track to be proficient."

Grades and tests used for trajectory growth and the percent of closing needed per year can be found in Attachment A. The annual measurable DSS scores can be found in Attachment B. See the table below for a sample growth model trajectory.

Growth Model Trajectory and Results Established for a Sample Fourth Grader in 2007 (Fifth Grader in 2008)

Year in Trajectory >	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Grade Tested >	3	4	5	6
Year of Testing >	2006	2007	2008	2009
Student's Actual Reading Developmental Score *	**1205**	1475	**1480**	1675
DSS Score needed for Proficiency	1198	1456	1510	1622
Cut score needed to be "on track to be proficient" -- **Target score** >	NA	1344 (1205 + 1/3 of 417**) ~ (1205 + 139)	1483 (1205 + 2/3 of 417**) ~ (1344 + 139)	**1622** (1205 + 417**)
Is student "on track to be proficient"?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

* The example presumes "actual" scores through Year 3.

** 417 = gap between baseline score (1205) and Year 3 proficiency score (1622).

The target scores for this trajectory would remain in place for the student through Year 3 of the trajectory, contingent on continued enrollment.

   c. *Determine Percent of Students "On Track To Be Proficient":*

     1. Percent = Number of Students "on track to be proficient"
                 Students Eligible for Growth Model

     2. If the percent is at least 58 (the 2008 AMO for reading), then the growth model target has been met.

4.5 Calculate math proficiency: Math proficiency is calculated at the school/district level and for each of the eight subgroups. In addition, the change in non-proficient students from the prior year to the current year is calculated for the Safe Harbor provision.

4.5.1 <u>Determine Math Proficiency for the Current Year:</u> For purposes of AYP, students scoring at level 3 and above on FCAT mathematics and the ELL mathematics alternate assessment or at level 2 and above on the SWD mathematics alternate assessment are considered to be proficient. In addition, only students enrolled in the same school for a full academic year (same district for the district calculation) are included in proficiency calculations. The percent of students proficient in math is determined by dividing the total number of students scoring at the proficient level in math by the total number of students assessed.

4.5.2 <u>Determine Math Proficiency for the Prior Year:</u> Prior-year data is not reconstructed based on new student data or new federal laws and regulations; thus, prior year corrections will not be permitted. Math proficiency for 2006-07 was determined in the same manner as described in 4.5.1.

4.5.3 <u>Determine if a 10% Reduction in Non-Proficiency Was Met:</u> As explained in section 4.4.3, Safe Harbor provisions require that the percent of non-proficient students decrease by at least 10% from the preceding year. Safe Harbor is performed separately for Reading and Math.

   a. *Calculate the Prior Year Percent of Non-Proficient Students:* The percent of non-proficient students + the percent of proficient students = 100%. Therefore, the percent of students who are not proficient in math is calculated by subtracting the percent of proficient students (determined in step 4.5.2 above) from 100%. For example, if 30% of your students score 3 or above in math, then 70% (100%-30%) of your students are non-proficient.

   b. *Determine 10% Target Reduction*: To determine the percent of non-proficient students that a 10% reduction represents, multiply the percent of non-proficient students in 2006-07 (step a) by 10%.

   c. *Determine the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target:* Add the target reduction (determined in step b. above) to the 2006-07 percent of proficient students (determined in 4.5.2 above).

d. *Compare the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target with the 2007-08 Percent of Proficient Students:* To determine whether or not the 10% target reduction was made, compare the 2006-07 Safe Harbor Proficiency Target (determined in c. above) with the percent of proficient students in 2007-08 (determined in 4.5.1 above). The current year proficiency must be greater than or equal to the Safe Harbor Proficiency Target.

See the example in section 4.4.

4.5.4 <u>Determine Whether the Mathematics Growth Target Was Met:</u> The three-year growth trajectory is built based on students' previous test scores compared to proficiency at a later point in time. The Growth Model requires that the percentage of students "on track to be proficient" meets the state's annual objectives for mathematics proficiency (62% in 2007-08)

a. *Determine the Students Included in the Growth Model Calculation:* The growth model calculation includes students with at least two years of assessment as well as third grade students without prior year data. In addition, only students enrolled in the same school for a full academic year (same district for the district calculation) are included in the Growth Model calculations.

b. *Determine Students "On Track To Be Proficient":*

1. *"*On track to be proficient" for third grade students (who do not have prior year data) will be determined by proficiency. All third grade students without prior year data will be included in the growth model and considered "on track to be proficient" if they are currently proficient in third grade. If the third grade student is not proficient and does not have prior year data, then the student would be included in the growth model as NOT "on track to be proficient."

2. Students who use alternate assessments are not on the FCAT developmental scale and will have growth calculated based on improving achievement levels or maintaining a proficient level. Students may not decrease achievement levels in order to be considered "on track to be proficient." (See Attachment C for additional information on proficient achievement levels for SWD alternate assessments in 2007-08 and 2006-07.)

3. The student has at least two years of assessment data and the student is "on track to be proficient."
   a. Identify the student's prior year Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Developmental Scale Score (DSS). The DSS is a continuous scale used from grade 3 through grade 10.
   b. Locate the student's baseline score based on the grade levels found in Attachment A.
   c. Calculate the difference between the student's baseline score and the target year's proficiency found in Attachment B.

17

       d. Determine whether the difference between the baseline and target year has been closed by 33% between prior year and current year. The student will be included in the percent "on track to be proficient".

         Grades and tests used for trajectory growth and the percent of closing needed per year can be found in Attachment A. The annual measurable DSS scores can be found in Attachment B.

   c. *Determine Percent of Students "On Track To Be Proficient":*

     1. Percent = Number of Student's "on track to be proficient"
                    Students Eligible for Growth Model

     2. If the percent is at least 62, then the growth model target has been met.

4.6 Determine the A+ School Grade for each school: School grades are determined prior to the calculation of AYP. For more information regarding the determination of school grades, please visit our Web site at: http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/.

5. Compute Adequate Yearly Progress

Based on the federal No Child Left Behind Act, schools must meet 39 criteria for adequate yearly progress to have been made at that school. Districts must meet the same criteria as schools, except that school grades are not taken into consideration. If one or more of the 39 criteria are not met, the school has not made adequate yearly progress under the federal accountability plan.   Below are the 39 cells that are evaluated to determine AYP.

AYP STATUS	YES			
Writing Criteria Met	YES			
Graduation Criteria Met	YES			
School Grade Not D or F	YES			
	Reading 95% Tested	**Math 95% Tested**	**Reading Criteria Met**	**Math Criteria Met**
Total	YES	YES	YES	YES
White	YES	YES	YES	YES
Black	YES	YES	YES	YES
Hispanic	YES	YES	YES	YES
Asian	YES	YES	YES	YES
American Indian	YES	YES	YES	YES
Economically Disadvantaged	YES	YES	YES	YES
Limited English Proficient	YES	YES	YES	YES
Students with Disabilities	YES	YES	YES	YES

1. Participation: **Did the school in total and each subgroup test at least 95% of students?** If the current year participation rate (section 4.1.1) or the average participation rate (section 4.1.2) for the subgroup being

evaluated is 95% or more, then the participation criterion has been met.

2. Writing Criteria: **Did the school demonstrate a 1% improvement in the percentage of students proficient in writing?** If the increase in writing proficiency (section 4.2.3) is at least 1% or if the school has a writing proficiency rate (section 4.2.1) of 90% or better, then the writing criterion has been met.

3. Graduation Rate: **Did the school demonstrate a 1% improvement in graduation rate?** If the increase in graduation rate (section 4.3.3) is at least 1% or if the school has a graduation rate (section 4.3.1) of 85% or better, then the graduation rate criterion has been met.

4. School Grade: **Is the school grade a D or F?** If a school is graded D or F for the current year, then the school grading criterion has not been met.

5. Reading Criteria: **Did the school in total and each subgroup meet the reading proficiency target, Safe Harbor provisions, or Growth Model provisions?** If the school and all subgroups have at least 58% of students scoring at the proficient level in reading, then the school has met the reading criterion. Those subgroups not meeting the reading proficiency target may still demonstrate adequate yearly progress if Safe Harbor provisions are met or the Growth Model provisions are met.

Safe Harbor: The school must meet the participation criterion (#1 above), the writing criterion (#2 above), the graduation rate criterion (#3 above), and the school grade criterion (#4 above) in order for any subgroup to be eligible for Safe Harbor provisions. If any of the first 4 criteria above are not met, then Safe Harbor may not be applied to any group not meeting proficiency targets. If all of the first 4 criteria are met, then the group or subgroup evaluated must demonstrate the following:

a. the percent of non-proficient students have decreased by at least 10% from the preceding year <u>and</u>

b. the group has met the writing criteria (the increase in writing proficiency is at least 1%, or the school has a writing proficiency rate of 90% or better) <u>and</u>

c. the group has met the graduation rate criterion, (the increase in graduation rate is at least 1%, or the school has a graduation rate of 85% or better).

Growth Model: The school must meet the participation criterion (#1 above), the writing criterion (#2 above), the graduation rate criterion (#3 above), and the school grade criterion (#4 above) in order for

any subgroup to be eligible for Growth Model provisions.   If any of the first 4 criteria above are not met, then the Growth Model may not be applied to any group not meeting proficiency targets. If all of the first 4 criteria are met, then the group or subgroup evaluated must demonstrate the following:

a. the percent of students "on track to be proficient" in three years or less in reading is at least 58% <u>and</u>

b. the group has met the writing criterion (the increase in writing proficiency is at least 1% or the school has a writing proficiency rate of 90% or better) <u>and</u>

c. the group has met the graduation rate criterion (the increase in graduation rate is at least 1% or the school has a graduation rate of 85% or better).

If the school and all subgroups either meet the reading proficiency or meet Safe Harbor provisions or the Growth Model provisions, then the reading criterion has been met.

6. Math Criteria: **Did the school in total and each subgroup meet the math proficiency target, Safe Harbor provisions, or the Growth Model provisions?** If the school and all subgroups have at least 62% of students scoring at the proficient level in math, then the school has met the math criterion. Those subgroups not meeting the math proficiency target may still demonstrate adequate yearly progress if Safe Harbor provisions are met or the Growth Model provisions are met.

Safe Harbor: The school must meet the participation criterion (#1 above), the writing criterion (#2 above), the graduation rate criterion (#3 above), and the school grade criterion (#4 above) in order for any subgroup to be eligible for Safe Harbor provisions.   If any of the first 4 criteria above are not met, then Safe Harbor may not be applied to any group not meeting proficiency targets. If all of the first 4 criteria are met, then the group or subgroup evaluated must demonstrate the following:

a. the percent of non-proficient students has decreased by at least 10% from the preceding year <u>and</u>

b. the group has met the writing criterion (the increase in writing proficiency is at least 1% or the school has a writing proficiency rate of 90% or better) <u>and</u>

c. the group has met the graduation rate criterion (the increase in graduation rate is at least 1% or the school has a graduation rate of 85% or better).

Growth Model: The school must meet the participation criterion (#1 above), the writing criterion (#2 above), the graduation rate criterion

(#3 above), and the school grade criterion (#4 above) in order for any subgroup to be eligible for Growth Model provisions. If any of the first 4 criteria above are not met, then the Growth Model may not be applied to any group not meeting proficiency targets. If all of the first 4 criteria are met, then the group or subgroup evaluated must demonstrate the following:

a. the percent of students "on track to be proficient" in three years or less in math is at least 62% <u>and</u>

b. the group has met the writing criterion (the increase in writing proficiency is at least 1% or the school has a writing proficiency rate of 90% or better) <u>and</u>

c. the group has met the graduation rate criterion (the increase in graduation rate is at least 1% or the school has a graduation rate of 85% or better).

If the school and all subgroups either meet the math proficiency or meet Safe Harbor provisions or the Growth Model provisions, then the math criterion has been met.

7. Adjustment: **Did the school not make AYP solely because the SWD subgroup did not make the reading criterion?** If the school did not make AYP solely because SWD subgroup missed its proficiency target in reading, a mathematical adjustment is applied to the percent proficient. See p. 3 for a description of the formula for the adjustment. If applying the mathematical adjustment increases the SWD percent proficient to meet or exceed the state proficiency target, the SWD subgroup will be considered to have made AYP. The mathematical adjustment does not apply to participation, proficiency in math, writing, or the graduation rate.

If a school does not have at least 10 students in the Membership File (section 1) and 10 assessments records that can be matched to the Membership File (section 2) for both reading and math, then the school is not given an AYP determination; the school is classified as "Too Small to be Assessed." K-2 schools will be given the AYP status of the school into which the majority of their students feed. District AYP is determined in the same manner as prescribed above using data matched at the district level instead of the school level.

AYP results are published on the Florida Department of Education Web site via the School Accountability Report at http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/default.asp.

6. Identify Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINIs)

Title I schools not making adequate yearly progress in the same content area for two years in a row must implement Florida's NCLB Genuine Choice Options (more information regarding choice options can be found at http://www.bsi.fsu.edu/schoolchoice/index.htm). Schools miss one content area if all criteria are met except Math or Reading proficiency. The Math or Reading content area is missed if any one subgroup fails to make adequate yearly progress as determined in Step 5. This provision does not apply if the school (or district) missed a participation, writing, graduation, or school grade criterion in either year.

Example 1: Sea Shell School misses one content area, Math, in 2006-07. Sea Shell School misses the other content area, Reading, in 2007-08. Therefore, Sea Shell School is not identified as a Title I school in need of improvement.

Sea Shell School	2006-07			Sea Shell School	2007-08		
AYP STATUS	NO			AYP STATUS	NO		
Writing	YES			Writing	YES		
Grad Rate	YES			Grad Rate	YES		
School Grade	YES			School Grade	YES		
	95% Tested	Reading	Math		95% Tested	Reading	Math
Total	YES	YES	YES	Total	YES	YES	YES
White	YES	YES	YES	White	YES	YES	YES
Black	YES	YES	YES	Black	YES	YES	YES
Hispanic	YES	YES	NO	Hispanic	YES	YES	YES
Asian	YES	YES	YES	Asian	YES	YES	YES
American Indian	YES	YES	YES	American Indian	YES	YES	YES
Econ. Disadv.	YES	YES	YES	Econ. Disadv.	YES	NO	YES
ELL	YES	YES	YES	ELL	YES	YES	YES
SWD	YES	YES	YES	SWD	YES	YES	YES

(continued)

Example 2: Conch Elementary School, a Title I school, misses one content area, Math, for two years in a row. Therefore, Conch Elementary School is identified as a SINI.

Conch Elem. Schl. 2006-07				Conch Elem. Schl. 2007-08			
AYP STATUS	NO			AYP STATUS	NO		
Writing	YES			Writing	YES		
Grad Rate	YES			Grad Rate	YES		
School Grade	YES			School Grade	YES		
	95% Tested	**Reading**	**Math**		**95% Tested**	**Reading**	**Math**
Total	YES	YES	YES	Total	YES	YES	YES
White	YES	YES	YES	White	YES	YES	YES
Black	YES	YES	YES	Black	YES	YES	YES
Hispanic	YES	YES	NO	Hispanic	YES	YES	YES
Asian	YES	YES	YES	Asian	YES	YES	YES
American Indian	YES	YES	YES	American Indian	YES	YES	YES
Econ. Disadv.	YES	YES	YES	Econ. Disadv.	YES	YES	YES
ELL	YES	YES	YES	ELL	YES	YES	NO
SWD	YES	YES	YES	SWD	YES	YES	YES

7. Review of AYP Determinations

The Federal No Child Left Behind Act requires that a 30-day review process be provided after AYP determinations have been announced during which schools and districts may review the AYP determinations and submit requests for a formal review along with data to support the investigation of reported data discrepancies. AYP calculations rely completely on the accuracy of the data submitted by the school districts to the Florida Department of Education. The accuracy of the district number, school number, student identification number, grade level, demographic information, school lunch status, SWD code, and ELL code among surveys and on all assessment records, where applicable, are critical in ensuring correct accountability results. Errors in the data reported by districts to the state will affect state accountability calculations.

Districts have several opportunities prior to the 2007-08 school grade and AYP calculations to ensure that state student data is accurate:

- Survey data – 0607 and 0708 survey data submitted to the Florida Department of Education is certified by the district superintendent and a lengthy time period is given to districts to amend their data (nine months from the date of submission).
- The Evaluation and Reporting section presents to each district a copy of all data used for accountability calculations that is submitted to the state by the district through the survey data collection process. Districts are then given the opportunity to amend the data.

- The Evaluation and Reporting section presents to each district a copy of all mismatched student identification numbers between the 2008 Survey 3 student records and all assessment records. Districts are then given two weeks to match and correct student identification numbers.
- The Evaluation and Reporting section presents to each district a copy of school type assignments for accountability purposes. Districts are given an opportunity to review and appeal school type assignments.

Because of the many opportunities for districts to review and amend all of the data used for accountability calculations, information presented during the several rounds of data corrections offered by Evaluation and Reporting and Education Information and Accountability Services are not grounds for an appeal following the release of AYP. If the school district determines that a different AYP performance designation should be assigned because of the omission of student data, a data miscalculation, or special circumstances that might have affected the AYP designation assigned, a request for a state review of the data may be submitted in a manner prescribed by the Department.

Attachment A – Calculation of Growth Model Trajectory Benchmarks

Table 1. Grades and Tests Used for Trajectory Growth and the Percent of Closing Needed Per Year

Grade Of Enrollment	Test Used As The Basis For Trajectory	Test Used As Target For Proficiency	Years In Trajectory	Percent Of Difference Closed Per Year
3	3	6	3	33%
4	3	6	3	33%
5	4	7	3	33%
6	5	8	3	33%
7	6	9	3	33%
8	7	10	3	33%
9	8	10	3	33%
10	9	10	2	50%

The trajectory benchmarks are built individually for students and separately for reading or mathematics. Therefore, a student will have a trajectory based on their baseline mathematics score and the proficiency cut score for mathematics which is separate from reading.

The following table displays the performance expected of students to be counted as on trajectory for inclusion in the proposed method of comparing school performance to AMO targets.

Table 2. The Amount of Improvement in Terms of Decrease in the Distance Between Baseline Performance and Proficiency Benchmark in the Target Grade

Year In State-Tested Grade	Decrease From Baseline Assessment In Performance Discrepancy
1	33% of original gap
2	66% of original gap
3	Student must be proficient

[intentionally blank]

Attachment B – Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Developmental Scale Score

The FCAT vertical developmental scale score accounts for an increased score for the "same" performance level cut point at every higher grade. Please refer to charts below:

Reading developmental scale scores (86 to 3008) for each achievement level on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Grade	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
3	86-1045	1046-1197	1198-1488	1489-1865	1866-2514
4	295-1314	1315-1455	1456-1689	1690-1964	1965-2638
5	474-1341	1342-1509	1510-1761	1762-2058	2059-2713
6	539-1449	1450-1621	1622-1859	1860-2125	2126-2758
7	671-1541	1542-1714	1715-1944	1945-2180	2181-2767
8	886-1695	1696-1881	1882-2072	2073-2281	2282-2790
9	772-1771	1772-1971	1972-2145	2146-2297	2298-2943
10	844-1851	1852-2067	2068-2218	2219-2310	2311-3008

Mathematics developmental scale scores (375 to 2709) for each achievement level on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

Grade	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
3	375-1078	1079-1268	1269-1508	1509-1749	1750-2225
4	581-1276	1277-1443	1444-1657	1658-1862	1863-2330
5	569-1451	1452-1631	1632-1768	1769-1956	1957-2456
6	770-1553	1554-1691	1692-1859	1860-2018	2019-2492
7	958-1660	1661-1785	1786-1938	1939-2079	2080-2572
8	1025-1732	1733-1850	1851-1997	1998-2091	2092-2605
9	1238-1781	1782-1900	1901-2022	2023-2141	2142-2596
10	1068-1831	1832-1946	1947-2049	2050-2192	2193-2709

[intentionally blank]

Attachment C – Achievement Levels and Proficiency Status for SWD Alternate Assessments in 2006-07 and 2007-08

The table below provides a comparison of achievement levels, including the proficiency status for each level, that were used in reporting results for the 2006-07 Florida Alternate Assessment Report (FAAR) and the 2007-08 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).

Achievement Levels and Proficiency Levels on the FAAR and FAA

FAAR Achievement Level	Proficiency Status	FAA Proficiency Level	Proficiency Status
0	Not Proficient		
1	Not Proficient	1	Not Proficient
2	Not Proficient	2	Proficient
3	Proficient	3	Proficient
4	Proficient		

The tables below show which combined pairings of achievement levels from the 2006-07 FAAR and the 2007-08 FAA satisfy the requirement for growth (on track to be proficient) in the AYP growth model calculations and which pairings of achievement levels do not satisfy the growth requirement.

FAAR (2006-07) to FAA (2007-08) Growth Combinations

2006-007 FAAR Achievement Level	2007-08 FAA Achievement Level	Satisfies Growth Requirement?
0	2	Yes
0	3	Yes
1	2	Yes
1	3	Yes
2	2	Yes
2	3	Yes
3	2	Yes
3	3	Yes
4	3	Yes

FAAR (2006-07) to FAA (2007-08) No-Growth Combinations

2006-007 FAAR Achievement Level	2007-08 FAA Achievement Level	Satisfies Growth Requirement?
0	1	No
1	1	No
2	1	No
3	1	No
4	2	No
4	1	No

Florida Department of Education
Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commissioner