

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

The State of Florida is submitting a comprehensive and unified plan for accountability that includes all required aspects of NCLB and that relies on and compliments current state assessment and accountability provisions initiated by Governor Jeb Bush and the Florida Legislature. All public schools in the state will be included in the NCLB accountability program. Florida statutes do not differentiate between public schools for purposes of accountability.

Florida will adopt a single statewide accountability system for all public schools that includes multiple measures. These are: adequate yearly progress as defined by federal law, school grades as defined by state law, individual student progress towards annual learning targets to reach proficiency, and a return on investment measure that links dollars spent to student achievement. All schools will be rated on each of these measures. Schools meeting all standards will be designated as highly effective and efficient.

Some schools do not contain grade levels presently assessed by the existing statewide assessment program, such as a K-2 school. In these cases, the school will be assigned the AYP classification of the school to which it sends students.

Links to Supporting Evidence: See Sections [1000.03](#) and [1000.04](#), F.S. for definitions of public education, public schools, and governance thereof.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> 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>		
<p>All public schools will be judged according to the requirements of NCLB when making AYP decisions, subject to limitations of cell size discussed elsewhere. The AYP decisions will be made on the basis of “status comparisons” required in law.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendices A and E attached hereto.</p>		

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, 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, 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>		
<p>The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) uses five Achievement Levels, numbered 1-5 with 1 the lowest level and 5 the highest level. For purposes of NCLB implementation, Level 1 is "Below Basic," Level 2 is "Basic," Levels 3 and 4 are "Proficient," and Level 5 is "Advanced." FCAT results will continue to be reported with the original numbering system, but all NCLB reports will include references to the titles required in federal legislation.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix B, Table 5 attached hereto.</p>		

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.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner</p>	<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>	<p>Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The FCAT is administered in late February and early March with test results available to schools prior to the end of the school term in May. The data are released in waves with the first release describing district and state summary data and the second wave providing student-by-student test results. To expedite the release of student level data, the Department’s test support contractor provides the means whereby districts can access their data electronically from a secure server prior to shipment of the printed reports. State summary data are available in early May and can be used to determine if the state objective targets have been met.</p> <p>As soon as the final data files have been produced in early May, work can begin on assembling the information with which to determine school and district AYP. The reports will be available in time for parents to make informed “school choice” decisions prior to the beginning of the following school year in August.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix B attached hereto. Also, see Section 1008.22, F.S.</p>		

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>		
<p>For many years, Florida has released school, district, and state level student assessment results. Each district is required to prepare an annual report that must include information about student achievement and other relevant information. State, district and school reports provide data similar to those required by NCLB. Additional required elements will be included to become fully compliant. The Department is committed to the release of a State Report Card that meets the requirements of NCLB. The data elements found in Appendix A of this document will be included, and the report will be available by the beginning of the school academic year.</p> <p>The state reports will be available through the Department’s Internet web site. As Spanish is the second most used language in Florida, the State Report Card also will be available in this language.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See chart in Appendix A attached here to. Also, see Section 1008.385, F.S. and the following web site: http://info.doe.state.fl.us/fsir/.</p>		

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

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)].

Florida law provides for various rewards and sanctions, depending on performance results. Section 1002.31, F.S., mandates a “school choice” program for each district. Section 1002.38, F.S., provides “opportunity scholarships” for students attending a school rated “failing” for two years in any four-year period. Parents may choose to enroll these children in other public or private schools. Section 1008.32, F.S., gives the State Board of Education the authority to monitor educational quality and take firm steps to intervene in any school district, if needed. See also Rule 6A-1.09981, FAC, for a description of actions that can be taken for schools that do not perform well within the A+ Plan.

The School Recognition Program recognizes the high quality of many of Florida's public schools. As authorized, the program provides greater autonomy and financial awards to schools that demonstrate sustained or significantly improved student performance. Schools that receive an "A" or schools that improve at least one performance grade category are eligible for school recognition.

The 2002 Legislature appropriated funds for the District Lottery and School Recognition Program in Item 4 of the General Appropriations Act. Of the \$306,925,000 appropriated for this purpose, \$122,770,000 or 40% can be used to fund financial awards for the Florida School Recognition Program. Each eligible school receives \$100 per student.

Florida will implement the requirements found in Sections 200.32 – 200.34 of the NCLB rules mandating school classifications of “school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.” Title I schools not meeting AYP will be subject to interventions and sanctions defined by federal law. These will not be applied to schools or districts not receiving Title I funds; however, schools not meeting standards for individual student progress toward proficiency and schools falling below the return on investment standard shall be designated as in need of assistance in these areas.

Links to Supporting Evidence: See the following web site address: <<http://www.firn.edu/doe/bosi/home0006.htm>>. Also, see Sections [1002.31](#), [1002.38](#), [1008.32](#), [1008.345](#) and [1008.36](#), F.S; and Rule 6A-1.09981, FAC, available at < <http://www.firn.edu/doe/rules/6a-1-11.htm> - [6A-1.09981](#)>.

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?</p>	<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>	<p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		

All students are included in the NCLB accountability system. The vast majority of students take the FCAT in grades 3-10. LEP students who have been enrolled in an approved English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program for 12 months or less for whom it is determined on an individual basis that the FCAT is not an appropriate measure of academic proficiency are assessed using other measures of academic performance. The Department has implemented a system of locally-developed alternate assessments for those students with disabilities for whom the Sunshine State Standards and participation in the FCAT are not appropriate. Districts report the results of these assessments to the state in terms of students who are at different levels of proficiency. This allows the state to aggregate information about how many students are "Proficient or Above" in terms of the assessments they took.

Florida statute requires that school districts operate educational programs for students in juvenile justice centers and programs. Each such program has a unique school number and will be treated as a school. If the school is too small to produce valid student performance data, then students served in these programs shall be included in the district performance rating. All students shall be assessed and included in the state accountability system.

All students who are "mobile," meaning they attend more than one school during the year, shall be included in the statewide assessment system and included within the district and/or state AYP calculation.

Links to Supporting Evidence: See the following web address for information about alternate assessments: < <http://www.firn.edu/dae/commhome/pub-home.htm>>.

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>		
<p>For the purposes of calculating school accountability under NCLB, students who are enrolled and in attendance by the fall term as documented in Survey 2 conducted the second week of October and Survey 3 conducted the second week of February will be included in the analyses.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix E attached hereto.</p>		

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>		

For many years, Florida has had a student identification system that assigns a unique number to each student upon initial enrollment. Because the number follows the student throughout his/her academic career, an opportunity is available to analyze achievement data in terms of community demographic variables, school characteristics, staff characteristics, and the enacted curriculum.

An individual student often enrolls in one school and then transfers to another school during the school year. These students' data will be used for district AYP but will not be assigned to a given school for school-level AYP unless the student transferred after the March testing window has concluded.

Students enrolled in the district during that period, but not at the same school, will be assessed and included in the district calculation of AYP. Students enrolled in the state during that period, but not in the same district will be assessed and included in the state calculation of AYP.

Links to Supporting Evidence: See Section [1008.386](#), F.S., for information about the student identification numbering system.

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>		
<p>The Department has prepared a schedule for improvements in academic achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics that begins with the "starting point" and concludes with 100% of the students being "Proficient or Above" at the end of the 2013-14 academic year. See also the response to question 3.2a.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendices C and D attached hereto.</p>		

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.

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

The state plan includes the criteria that are part of the NCLB authorization. A school will meet AYP if all of its subgroups meet the state targets. If one or more subgroups do not meet the state measurable objectives in reading or mathematics, the “safe harbor” criteria will be applied. This requires that the school demonstrate that, for each of the subgroups that did not meet the state objectives, the proficiency level of those subgroups must have improved by 10%. In addition, the school must have made progress of at least one percent increase on the state’s “other indicators” and must have attained at least 95% participation in the assessment.

For example, if School A did not meet the state objectives in reading and if, for example, its Hispanic minority students showed growth from 50% to 57% “Proficient and Above” and if the Hispanic subgroup made improvement of at least 1% in the “other” indicator, it would be classified as meeting AYP. Note: the school would be expected to improve the reading scores of the Hispanic subgroup by 5% (10% of the base of 50%), which results in 7% improvement (57% minus 50%).

However, the Florida unified approach includes an additional criterion for a school to meet AYP. Under the terms of the Florida A+ Plan for Education, each school is given a grade ranging from “A” to “F.” No school rated within this system as either “D” or “F” will be determined to be meeting AYP. This feature enhances the accountability of the overall program since the Florida A+ Plan includes a measurement of academic growth for students in the lowest 25%. Even the most capable school must show growth of its lowest achieving students within the A+ system. See Appendix F.

The State has adopted a system whereby the performance for any single year will be the average of that year and the one immediately preceding it—e.g., 2003-04 will be combined with 2002-03 and reported in the summer of 2004. This will have the effect of stabilizing any wide differences in the student population from year to year.

If a school does not meet the 10% growth “safe harbor” as described above, the progress of its non-Proficient students will be examined. If the school demonstrates that more than half of the non-Proficient students have grown more than their individual growth expectation from last year to the current year, AYP will have been met. The State will establish the growth expectations on the basis that non-Proficient students will become Proficient or Above over time.

Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendices E and F attached hereto.

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>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The Department analyzed the FCAT results from the academic year 2001-02 according to the requirements of NCLB. The results can be found in Appendix C to this document. The data were analyzed by both methods specified in law, and the higher level was determined to be the starting point.

Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix C attached hereto.

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>		
<p>The State's annual objectives for improvement in reading and mathematics are shown in Appendix D. Florida has developed and is implementing a science assessment but the performance standards have not yet been established. Science has not yet been included in the analysis of measurable objectives.</p> <p>In the event that the Florida Board of Education chooses to adopt higher expectations for the FCAT at one or more grade levels, this schedule may be changed.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix D attached hereto.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<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		
<p>The state plan provides intermediate goals as shown in Appendix D. These have been designed to permit increases every three years using 2001-02 as the base year. This system provides four increases leading to the final expectation of 100% proficiency.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix D attached hereto.</p>		

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
<p>4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?</p>	<p>AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually.⁴</p>	<p>AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>AYP decisions for each public school and school district will be made annually using the system described in Appendix E and the schedule shown in the response to Critical Element 3.2c.</p> <p>Data will be collected from the FCAT and the alternate assessment systems, combined, and disaggregated. State level, district, and school data will be available. For each school and each school district, the results will be compiled and analyzed in accordance with the AYP plan.</p> <p>Data will be averaged across two academic years as described in the response to Critical Element 3.2.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix E attached hereto.</p>		

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>		
<p>For each school and district, the Department will report the assessment results through a two-dimensional matrix illustrated in Appendix E.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix E attached hereto.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The Department's system for determining AYP requires that progress be made within the specified subgroups for AYP to be achieved at the school and district level. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All students 2. Economically disadvantaged students 3. Students with disabilities (SWD) 4. Limited English proficient students (LEP) 5. White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian students (separately) <p>Data for the above subgroups will be reported contingent upon group size limitations discussed in Critical Element 5.5.</p> <p>Students who initially are classified as SWD or LEP and who subsequently leave that official classification will no longer be considered as SWD or LEP for accountability purposes and will be considered in the total group as well as in their race/ethnic or economically disadvantaged group, if applicable.</p>		

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>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The Florida assessment program, FCAT, emphasizes the participation of ALL students. Students with disabilities are provided a wide variety of accommodations. Students with disabilities who do not participate in FCAT are assessed with an alternate assessment process, the results of which are merged with the FCAT proficiency ratings.</p> <p>Florida's program expects schools to provide the opportunity to learn for students with disabilities and for LEP students with the intent of preparing them for graduation with a regular diploma.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<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>	<p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>See also the response to Critical Element 5.3.</p> <p>The academic achievement of all students classified as limited English proficient will be measured and reported. LEP students are required to participate in the FCAT assessment program. The scores of LEP students participating in the FCAT are included in the accountability system and affect the calculation of AYP.</p> <p>On an individual basis, it may be determined that the FCAT is not an appropriate measure of academic performance for LEP students who have been enrolled in an approved English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program for 12 months or less. However, the academic achievement of these students is measured and reported. See Appendix B for complete description of Florida's process and for a discussion of how LEP students are accommodated, including language assistance, when taking the FCAT.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See the following web sites for further information about assessing LEP students: < http://www.firn.edu/doe/omsle/dps97054.htm> and <http://www.firn.edu/doe/omsle/omspubpg.htm>.</p>		

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>		
<p>The Department will utilize the following minimum group sizes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 For public reporting purposes, there shall be no fewer than 10 students in a cell. 2 For accountability purposes, the minimum group size shall be 30 students. <p>These values have been in use for many years in reporting statistical data collected by the Department. The value of 30 for group reporting has been incorporated in State Board of Education Rule. See Rule 6A-1.09981, FAC.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Rule 6A-1.09981, FAC, available at http://www.firn.edu/doe/rules/6a-1-11.htm - 6A-1.09981>.</p>		

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

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		
<p>The Florida educational data system protects the identity of all student information. See Rule 6A-1.0014, FAC, language below:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Each school district and the Department shall develop and implement an automated information system component which shall be part of, and compatible with, the statewide comprehensive management information system. Each information system component shall contain automated student, staff and finance information systems and shall include procedures for the security, privacy and retention of automated records. The procedures for the security, privacy and retention of automated student records shall be in accordance with the requirements of 20 U.S.C. 1232g(b)(3), 34 CFR Part 99 and Section 228.093, Florida Statutes.</p> <p>FCAT test results likewise are protected from disclosure to unauthorized persons. Any individual wishing to use Florida student data for research or contract purposes must adhere to the provisions of Florida’s statutes and rules related to disclosure of sensitive information.</p> <p>In addition, performance levels within a reporting cell will be reported only if the performance is less than 5% and more than 95%. By not specifically reporting very small or very large percentages, student identity is further protected.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Rule 6A-1.0014, FAC, available at http://www.firn.edu/doe/rules/6a-1-1.htm#6A-1.0014.</p>		

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.

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
<p>6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?</p>	<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>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The Florida accountability program for NCLB will be based primarily on the results of student academic assessments. Other indicators will be used in accordance with the requirements of NCLB.</p> <p>See also Appendix E for a discussion of the “other indicators.” For elementary and middle schools, the results of the statewide writing assessment will be used. For high schools, the grade 10 writing assessment and the high school graduation rate will be used.</p>		

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

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>

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

In Florida, the number of graduates from a four-year adjusted cohort is divided by the total number of students in the adjusted cohort. The adjusted cohort (denominator) is determined through a multi-step process in which we subtract from the 9th grade cohort the students who transfer out of the school or are deceased and add the students transferring into the school who, at the time of their enrollment, are on the same schedule to graduate as students from the first group. This definition is more accurate than the definition created by the National Center for Education Statistics.

For NCLB, we propose to use the prior year graduation rate for the calculation of AYP and the state report card. This is necessary because many districts graduate students during summer school, and the deadline for AYP calculations and public reporting can occur prior to summer school conclusion for some districts.

The NCLB graduation rate will vary slightly from the graduation rate that Florida publishes annually because NCLB excludes GED recipients. At this time, all Florida high school students receiving a GED from the Florida Department of Education are included in our published graduation rate.

For the purposes of calculating the graduation rate, the classification of students in grade 9 will follow them throughout their high school career. For example, if a student is classified as SWD in grade 9 but then by grade 11 is no longer considered to be SWD, he/she will still be counted as if the classification had not changed.

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>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The Florida plan will utilize the results of the FCAT writing assessment in grades 4, 8, and 10 as “other indicator.” In addition, for grade 10, the high school graduation rate will be an “other indicator.”</p> <p>The FCAT writing assessment is described in Appendix B.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendix B attached hereto.</p>		

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

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>		
<p>Reading, writing, and mathematics are separately measured and reported as part of the FCAT system. The data from each of these is used in the AYP calculations. See Appendix E.</p> <p>Florida also is using its A+ Plan for Education “school grades” as an additional criterion for the “safe harbor.” See Critical Element 3.2. The A+ school grading system is described in Appendix F. In the calculation of school grades, a school earns points according to the degree to which students are Proficient or Above in reading, writing, and mathematics in a <u>compensatory</u> fashion. That is, the points are merged and a school can be relatively high or low across the various measures. The results of the A+ Plan are used only as described in Critical Element 3.2.</p> <p>Florida will provide an additional measure in safe harbor that measures each student’s individual progress toward proficiency. Annual targets will provide for expedited individual instructional targets and enrich the system.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Appendices E and F.</p>		

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>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>The Florida assessment and accountability programs take great pains to provide reliable results. The FCAT student tests are annually evaluated for reliability using several different methods. The Department triangulates data quality control so that no data are released unless three independent parties agree on the accuracy of the processing, analysis, and reporting. The A+ school grading system includes various quality control steps as well as a formal appeal process available to each school.</p> <p>Data are not reported for low n-count data cells, and the individual student results are maintained in a secure manner, not subject to inappropriate release. Each student’s test score is reported using confidence intervals based on the standard error of measurement. Test answer sheets for grade 12 students who are just a few points from earning passing scores are routinely hand scored in addition to being computer scored. If there are any questions about missing or inaccurate data, the agency immediately investigates the situation and takes corrective action as may be appropriate.</p> <p>The assessment results that form the basis for the AYP decisions will be averaged over a two-year period to create more stability in the system. Use of the “safe harbor” further provides a safeguard for schools and districts that are making good progress with their students.</p>	

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		
<p>Schools and districts will be evaluated separately for reading and mathematics performance. A school or district could fail to meet its AYP requirements in reading one year, improve in reading the second year, and become deficient in mathematics the second year. If this occurs, the school or district will not be subjected to the requirements of Sections 200.32-200.34 of the NCLB rules because it has not had two consecutive years of poor performance in the <u>same content area</u>. If a school or district fails to meet its AYP requirements in the same content area (e.g., reading) for two consecutive years, it will be subjected to the requirements of Sections 200.3-200.34.</p> <p>According to the requirements of NCLB, before a school can be identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the school district must provide the school with the opportunity to review the data on which such a decision will be made. Under the law, this responsibility is assigned to districts, not the state agency. The state agency will provide leadership and technical assistance to districts in the creation of appropriate processes whereby schools can appeal decisions about their AYP status.</p> <p>With regard to its A+ school grading system, the state agency has a process whereby schools and districts can appeal their accountability results. The appeals process is initiated immediately upon receipt of the accountability findings, and the school or district must submit its counter evidence within thirty days. The agency reviews the data, clarifies anything that is not clear, and issues a final finding. Previous experience has shown that appeals are often based on (1) incorrect student identification, (2) inaccurate student classifications, and (3) missing student answer documents.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Rule 6A-1.09981, FAC, located at: http://www.firn.edu/doe/rules/6a-1-11.htm - 6A-1.09981 for information about the A+ school grading system.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> 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>		

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.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
		<p>Changes in the FCAT program already are underway in that the new science assessment will be in operation in the spring of 2003. Student performance on the science test will be incorporated into the NCLB system in accordance with law and will require definition of cut-scores, calculation of a starting point, and determination of annual improvement objectives. Because the FCAT score scale has been stabilized and vertically equated (reading and mathematics) and because new items are constantly added to the item pool, the system can be sustained indefinitely. A revision of the Sunshine State Standards is expected to be completed over the next two years, but slight changes in the content standards should not lead to significant changes in the statistical system underlying the FCAT.</p> <p>New public schools are opened annually, and their inclusion will present no difficulties for the overall system. Each school district will be responsible for the performance of students in any new schools, and each individual school will be included in the AYP system as soon as its student assessment data are available. Status information will be available as a result of the first administration of FCAT, and gain information will be available after the second administration.</p>

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>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>In the school year 2001-02, Florida implemented a new procedure whereby each student is accounted for at the time the FCAT was administered. With the student identification number and the other information about the subgroup to which an individual student belongs, it will not be difficult to determine the participation rates for each school and district. The State is committed to the goal of assessing all eligible students.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?</p>	<p>State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.</p>	<p>State does not have a procedure for making this determination.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>The Department's policy is that 95% participation is required and reported as long as the group size is 30 or more eligible students. For 30 students, 95% is 29, so only one student could miss the assessment activity.</p> <p>The n = 30 policy is in current State Board of Education policy in Rule 6A-1.09881, FAC.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Evidence: See Rule 6A-1.09981, FAC, at http://www.firn.edu/doe/rules/6a-1-11.htm - 6A-1.09981>.</p>		