

**The Council of Chief State School Officers**

**THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT  
AYP BLUEPRINT SURVEY**

The U.S. Department of Education's (the Department's) Consolidated State Plan Requirements (May 2002) require that each state submit to the Department its definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP) by January 31, 2002. This includes: (1) describing how the state's starting points were calculated, based on 2001-02 data; (2) defining AYP with regard to starting points, timeline, intermediate goals, annual objectives, and other academic indicators; and (3) establishing the minimum number of students that will be required before a school (or district) will be held accountable by subgroup. States face substantial challenges in meeting these requirements, including the fact that the Department's regulations regarding AYP are still in development.

On October 16, 2002, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) will convene a small, multidisciplinary team of state and national experts to identify and discuss key questions related to defining AYP, with a focus on issues that are presenting real and immediate challenges to states. The working group will seek to identify options that may address those questions in ways that are legally consistent with the NCLB, educationally consistent with state standards reform goals, and technically feasible.

To support the October 16 meeting, we are providing the survey below, which reconceptualizes the evolving legal standards regarding AYP into a series of action steps and key questions that each state likely must address to define AYP. We are providing these questions prior to the CCSSO's October 16 meeting of the AYP working group to (1) help guide your thinking in preparation for that meeting and (2) collect preliminary information regarding the issues that are most important for discussion (i.e. questions for which the answers are least clear). Following the October 16 meeting, we hope to generate a brief blueprint with questions and answers that can help state AYP efforts.

Note that some of the questions below likely have easy answers, while others have no clear answers. We purposely included the full spectrum to give you the full picture of AYP issues. Moreover, while this document focuses on the core AYP issues, it is important to keep in mind that AYP is only part of the still larger picture regarding NCLB implementation in state accountability systems, which should be thought of holistically to the fullest extent possible.

For each question below, we ask you to indicate (1) whether your state has addressed the question and (2) whether the question should be a priority for discussion on October 16. **Please note that you are not expected to answer the Key Questions themselves prior to the October 16 meeting.**

Please review and return this survey by **Thursday, October 10, 2002**. You may fax your survey back to \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_. We will incorporate your feedback into the agenda for the October 16 meeting and provide additional context at that time.

**Prepared by  
Scott R. Palmer  
Arthur L. Coleman  
of  
Nixon Peabody LLP**

CCSSO Action Steps Survey on Defining AYP/Draft/Nixon Peabody LLP/Privileged and Confidential/October 3, 2002

Key Questions on Defining AYP	Has Your State Resolved the Question(s)?	Should the Question(s) Be a Priority for Discussion on 10/16?
<b>I. Define AYP Assessment Indicator(s).</b>		
1. What assessment(s) will be used as the primary indicator(s) of AYP in reading/language arts and mathematics? Is the state planning to use CRTs exclusively, or NRTs and/or local assessments as well?	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
2. Is there sufficient evidence that each assessment is valid for this purpose, aligned w/ state standards, etc. (including information from the test publisher)? What is that evidence?	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
3. Is the assessment(s) also used for individual student accountability, such as promotion or graduation? (Related question: What are the consequences of that?)	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
4. What cutscore(s) have been/will be set to indicate “proficiency”?	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
5. Is there sufficient evidence that those cutscores are valid, appropriate, etc.? What is that evidence (including the process used)?	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
6. How will 95% inclusion of students be calculated (i.e., by what formula)? (Related question: Can states have parental opt outs?)	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
7. How will the state define “full academic year” to determine when individual students are to be included/excluded from school/district AYP?	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
8. How will/should ELL students and students w/ disabilities be counted for AYP purposes given that students often leave those categories as test scores improve?	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
9. What accommodations policies are in place for students w/ disabilities/ ELLs? (Related question: To what extent are test modifications allowable?)	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
10. What alternate assessment(s) is available for the small number of students w/ disabilities who need one? (Related question: What percentage of students will be permitted to take alternate assessments?)	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
<b>II. Establish Starting Points.</b>		
1. How many starting points will the state have? For what subjects will states have starting points? How will the state define gradespans for starting points? How can data be validly combined across gradespans? (Related question: Can states set separate starting points for subgroups (if advisable), including separate 20 <sup>th</sup> percentile calculations?)	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N
2. Where will starting points be set given the mathematical formula? (Related question: Is 20 <sup>th</sup> percentile school far above lowest performing subgroup(s)?)	Y N <b>Partially</b>	Y N

CCSSO Action Steps Survey on Defining AYP/Draft/Nixon Peabody LLP/Privileged and Confidential/October 3, 2002

Key Questions on Defining AYP	Has Your State Resolved the Question(s)?	Should the Question(s) Be a Priority for Discussion on 10/16?
<b>III. Set Timeline to 100% Proficiency.</b>		
1. What year will be set as the end point by which proficiency will rise to 100% of students to demonstrate AYP? [Presumably 2013-14, but could be earlier.] (Related question: What are implications of Safe Harbor/Progress Measure (discussed below), by which schools may never reach 100% proficiency?)	Y N Partially	Y N
<b>IV. Set Intermediate Goals.</b>		
1. Where will/should the state set intermediate goals by which AYP bar must rise? [Presumably every 2-3 years, but could be annual.]	Y N Partially	Y N
<b>V. Establish Annual Measurable Objectives.</b>		
1. At what level will/should the state set annual objectives? Linear? Stairstep?	Y N Partially	Y N
2. For subgroups below AYP bar, what progress should be sufficient to show AYP? Is 10% Safe Harbor workable?	Y N Partially	Y N
3. Can states establish school-based and/or subgroup based models w/ separate annual objectives from current performance to 100% proficiency? (Related questions: How can states vary interventions depending on extent of AYP failure? If two different subgroups miss AYP in two consecutive years (once each), has the school met AYP or not?)	Y N Partially	Y N
4. Can states establish cohort models where Progress Measure is based on value added for students from grade to grade?	Y N Partially	Y N
5. What policy will/should the state set re averaging scores from prior years to show AYP? Can states adopt policy of examining <i>both</i> single-year data and two/three year averaged data to show AYP? (Related question: How can states deal w/ student variance across cohorts?)	Y N Partially	Y N
<b>VI. Choose/Define Other Academic Indicators.</b>		
1. What indicator(s) beyond test scores will/should be required for AYP in elementary/ middle schools?	Y N Partially	Y N
2. How will/can graduation rates be measured consistent with the NCLB definition?	Y N Partially	Y N
3. What annual objectives are required to be set for other academic indicators? Can states set school-specific objectives?	Y N Partially	Y N
4. How many additional indicators will/should the state include given implications for use of AYP 10% Safe Harbor? (Related question: Can state include in AYP “progress in any of several indicators”?)	Y N Partially	Y N

CCSSO Action Steps Survey on Defining AYP/Draft/Nixon Peabody LLP/Privileged and Confidential/October 3, 2002

Key Questions on Defining AYP	Has Your State Resolved the Question(s)?	Should the Question(s) Be a Priority for Discussion on 10/16?
5. Is there sufficient evidence that the full accountability system is valid for its purpose?	Y N Partially	Y N
<b>VII. Establish Minimum Number for Subgroup Accountability.</b>		
1. What minimum number will/should required to protect student privacy?	Y N Partially	Y N
2. What minimum number will/should be required to ensure statistical significance/reliability? (Related question: Is minimum number relevant to statistical significance or are other corrections more appropriate given nature of possible error?)	Y N Partially	Y N
3. What consequences will/should apply to schools w/ regard to performance of subgroups below the minimum number?	Y N Partially	Y N
<b>VIII. Single State Accountability System</b>		
1. How can states maintain their current state accountability systems <i>and</i> meet federal AYP requirements while maintaining a “single statewide accountability system”? Presumably, states can adopt a “one look” system in which federal AYP is fully incorporated into current state accountability measures, but can states have a “two look” system in which schools are evaluated by both the state composite <i>and</i> federal AYP requirements (with schools that are lowest performing on both targeted for the most severe consequences)?	Y N Partially	Y N

<p><b>Other Key Questions.</b> Please identify any additional AYP questions that should be considered.</p>	1.
	2.
	3.
<p><b>Highest Priorities.</b> Please identify, in order, the 3 questions that should be the highest priority for discussion at the 10/16 meeting.</p>	1.
	2.
	3.