

State Accountability Systems: Reporting AYP Determinations (as of August 2009)

State Name	Only AYP	Integrated	Separate state Rating/Index	Accountability Systems Beyond AYP
Alabama	1			
Alaska	1			
Arizona			1	Arizona reports on NCLB required indicators as well as the AZ LEARNS state accountability indicators, which provide the results of a state-legislated index based on growth on state AIMS test results.
Arkansas			1	Arkansas reports on NCLB required indicators as well as the Arkansas Gains Model which includes a "status" and a "gains" model (A.C.A. § 6-15-401 et seq.)
California			1	California's accountability system is an improvement model based on student achievement on the California Standards Tests in English language arts, mathematics, science, and history-social science, and the California High School Exit Exam. The Academic Performance Index (API) is a school level accountability measure that ranges from 200 to 1,000. It provides a single measure of a school's academic performance over different grade levels and subject areas. School rankings are also provided.
Colorado			1	Colorado recently passed SB 09-163, which requires a single, accountability system (beyond just AYP). The system is based on four major indicators- growth, status, gaps and post-secondary readiness. The rules for the new accountability system still need to be fully defined and approved by the State Board of Education (slated for winter 2010). Development of the system is beginning, but details are not yet determined.
Connecticut	1			
Delaware		1		Delaware uses an integrated system by calculating Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and it's own State Progress Determination (SPD). The combination of AYP and SPD plus school accountability history determines the current rating.
District of Columbia	1			
Florida		1	1	State Plan -- Florida's A+ Plan, School Grades: School Grades are based on how well students have mastered the Sunshine State Standards – the skills Florida teachers determined our children must learn at each grade level – which are measured by the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Student scores are classified into five achievement levels, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest. Schools earn points based on three things: how well students are doing, how much progress they are making (learning gains), and how much progress struggling readers are making (since reading is essential to success in all subject areas). Integrated Plan -- Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) Program. In 2008, Florida was selected by the U.S. Department of Education as one of six states to initially participate in the Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program, which provides states with greater flexibility in focusing support on schools with more long-standing and pervasive needs for school improvement. Florida's DA system consolidates school grade and AYP information as inputs for categorizing schools. Florida schools th
Georgia		1		Beginning with 2004-05 school year, Georgia implemented its Single Statewide Accountability System (SSAS). The SSAS profile includes AYP, a Performance Index component (on both absolute and growth), and Performance Highlights. The Performance Index recognizes schools with the greatest gains and schools with the highest percentage meeting and exceeding standards, includes Full Academic Year (FAY) student assessment results, utilizes scores from grades 1-8 for all 5 CRCT subjects (reading, English language arts, math, science, social studies), and utilizes scores from 4 GHSGT subjects (English, math, science, social studies) from grade 11 first time test takers. The Performance Index is produced for schools only. The Performance Highlights is produced for districts and schools and showcases top district and school indicators based on State Report Card data and provides recognition beyond student and school assessment results.

State Name	Only AYP	Integrated	Separate state Rating/Index	Accountability Systems Beyond AYP
Hawaii	1			
Idaho	1			In 2009, Idaho transitioned from a strict status percent proficient and advanced to a weighted index system that allows .5 value to be assigned for students scoring in the Basic level. This change allows finer discrimination between schools that are not making AYP. The finer analysis assists in prioritizing schools most in need of assistance.
Illinois	1			Illinois informs districts of their school and district AYP status on an annual basis on whether or not they have achieved adequate yearly progress (how well the schools and districts meet, exceed, or don't meet state standards). This status is determined by student performance; student attendance (at the elementary and middle school level) or student graduation rate (at the high school level); and by student participation. Since the 2006 testing cycle, students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 were assessed. The state assessments currently being used are the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) for grades 3-8; the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE), which incorporates the ACT as one component, for Grade 11; and the Illinois Alternate Assessment (IAA) for students in all tested grades who have significant cognitive disabilities. In 2005-06 Illinois began using a comprehensive Student Information System. The AYP status applies to all schools and districts in Illinois, although only Title I-funded schools have the potential sanctions of providing public school choice and supplemental educational services.
Indiana		1		The State Board of Education places schools in categories of school improvement and categories of school improvement and performance based on: performance based on: Percentage of all students who pass English and Percentage of all students who pass English and math tests (averaged across subjects and grade math tests (averaged across subjects and grade levels). Improvement in passing percentage of Improvement in passing percentage of nonmobile nonmobile cohort group of students (enrolled cohort group of students (enrolled for 70% of school year) based on a three-year rolling average.
Iowa	1		1	Iowa's statewide accountability system is independent from the provisions of No Child Left Behind. Enacted by the Iowa Legislature, the Iowa Administrative Code includes provisions for Iowa instructional delivery systems, as well as assessment and reporting requirements. Districts have multiple measures requirements and are required to publicly report student achievement results annually. Iowa's accountability system focuses on improvement process rather than sanctions and penalties. The recently enacted Iowa Core Curriculum focuses on reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and 21st century skills. Formative and summative assessments will be examined relative to the extent to which students are able to demonstrate mastery for the Iowa Core Curriculum concepts and skills.
Kansas	1			The 2008-09 Report Card will also include Kansas NAEP data.
Kentucky			1	Kentucky's General Assembly and Governor took action in the spring of 2009 to change the model of assessment and accountability in Kentucky. Starting in 2011-2012 a new, long term accountability model will be implemented for both federal and state accountability ratings for all schools. During the interim period of 2009 - 2011, the state will hold all schools, both Title 1 and Non-Title 1, accountable through their NCLB scores.
Louisiana			1	Louisiana uses a measure of growth for each school against its expected growth target, as well as an AYP measure.
Maine	1			When the Maine State Legislature adopted the Learning Results in 1996, it established learning standards for all Maine students educated at public expense. Revised in 2007, Learning Results: Parameters for Essential Instruction reflect the knowledge and skills essential for college, career, and citizenship in the 21st century. Maine's determines Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) by utilizing the Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) for students in grades 3-8, and the Maine High School Assessment (MHSA), which incorporates the SAT as one component, for students in grade 11. Annual status is determined by student participation and performance on state assessments, and by student attendance (elementary and middle school) or student graduation rate (high school). The AYP status applies to all schools and districts in Maine, although only Title I-funded schools have the potential sanctions of providing public school choice and supplemental educational services.

State Name	Only AYP	Integrated	Separate state Rating/Index	Accountability Systems Beyond AYP
Maryland	1			
Massachusetts		1		<p>In Massachusetts, student performance is measured using the Composite Performance Index (CPI), a 100-point index that assigns 100, 75, 50, 25, or 0 points to each student participating in MCAS and MCAS-Alt tests based on their performance (0 points for warning/failing low; 25 for warning/failing high; 50 for needs improvement low; 75 for needs improvement high; and 100 for proficient or advanced). The total points assigned to each student are added together and the sum is divided by the total number of students assessed. The result is a number between 0 and 100, which constitutes a district, school or group's CPI for that subject and student group. The CPI is a measure of the extent to which students have achieved or are progressing toward proficiency in English language arts/reading and mathematics. The CPI is applied to school, district, and state AYP determinations. Results within schools are combined to create a single school score while district-level calculations are made separately for elementary, middle, and high school grade spans.</p> <p>The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) is currently in the process of</p>
Michigan		1		<p>The Michigan Department of Education annually makes a determination of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for all public elementary, middle schools, and high schools in Michigan. AYP evaluates schools and school districts in the areas of academic achievement, participation in state assessment, graduation rate for high schools, and student attendance for elementary and middle schools. In addition, the Department reports on Education YES! - a Yardstick for Excellent Schools, the state school accreditation system under which letter grades are assigned for academic achievement and indicators of school performance to determine state accreditation of Michigan schools.</p>
Minnesota	1			<p>Minnesota's system of school and district accountability is based on its Adequate Yearly Progress measurement. In 2009, this will include for the first time our AYP Growth measurement. In addition to AYP, Minnesota's School Report Card provides additional measures of its schools and districts: Assessment Results; Minnesota's Growth Model, a measure of student growth independent of our AYP Growth measure; Education Strategies information; Safety information; information on Q Comp participation, Minnesota's teacher performance and professional pay program; Professional Development information (School Staffing and Staff Development); Student Enrollment information (Student Teacher Ratios and Demographics); and School Finance information.</p>
Mississippi			1	<p>The state accountability model uses a combination of achievement and growth and graduation rate to assign each school and local education agency (LEA) a school accountability label ranging from failing to Star School/District as well as a Quality of Distribution Index (on a scale ranging from 0 to 300). A statistical methodology is used to combine achievement and growth data across grade levels and academic subjects and arrive at an overall measure of school performance. For those schools with a grade 12, graduation rate and a high school completion index are used in determining the performance level. Rewards and sanctions based on the state accountability model apply to all schools, not just Title I schools.</p>
Missouri	1			<p>The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) is Missouri's accountability system for public school districts. MSIP is designed to promote excellence in the public schools of the state. MSIP evaluates public schools based upon standards in the areas of Resource, Process, and Performance. Resource standards are quantitative in nature and address basic requirements that all school districts must meet. The process standards address the instructional and administrative processes used in schools. Performance standards evaluate multiple measures of student performance including: academic achievement on state assessments, ACT achievement, career preparation, and educational persistence.</p>
Montana	1			
Nebraska		1		<p>Nebraska is transition from a local assessment system to a new centralized testing system, Nebraska State Accountability, NeSA. State legislation in 2007-08 has required state tests to be built on newly revised content standards beginning with reading in 2010, mathematics in 2011, and science in 2012.</p>

State Name	Only AYP	Integrated	Separate state Rating/Index	Accountability Systems Beyond AYP
Nevada	1			In response to the 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA), otherwise known as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the Nevada legislature revised its own accountability statutes through passage of Senate Bill 1 in the 19th Special Session (June 2003). At the heart of both the federal and revised state statutes is a school, school district, and state accountability model working under the auspice of guaranteeing all students the opportunity for and access to a challenging and meaningful educational experience. Toward this end and on an annual basis, schools, school districts, and the state as a whole are judged against a set of adequate yearly progress (AYP) criteria. Judgement of success in making adequate yearly progress is based largely on performance on assessments aligned to state content standards administered on an annual basis, and by attending specifically to the performance of specific student populations. Accountability is one part of a dynamic system of continuous improvement in teaching practice and student learning.
New Hampshire	1			All schools and districts identified as in need of improvement must submit an improvement plan to the State Board of Education. This requirement is for all schools and districts, regardless of whether or not they accept Title I funds. (RSA 193-H, 2003.) [In response to court order to define the opportunity for an adequate education, NH is developing a state accountability system to be implemented in school year 2009-2010].
New Jersey	1			The NJDOE has a state system of district monitoring and accountability. This system, NJ Quality Single Accountability Continuum (NJQSAC), has five areas: instruction, personnel, operations, fiscal and governance. The state system of accountability for districts is integrated with NCLB.
New Mexico	1			The New Mexico's accountability system includes an annual determination of AYP for all public schools, charter schools, State educational institutions, and school districts. New Mexico's accountability system evaluates academic achievement in grades 3 through 8 and 11, participation in the state standards-based assessments, a cohort graduation rate for high schools and student attendance for elementary and middle schools. Schools receive an overall AYP rating and designation and ratings and designations in the academic content areas and the other academic indicator. Districts receive an overall AYP rating and designation and ratings and designations in the academic content areas and the other academic indicator in each of the three grade spans elementary school, middle school, and high school. Schools accreditation and improvement interventions are based in part on AYP determinations. The New Mexico Public Education Department (PED) reports AYP determinations in school and district AYP Accountability Reports that are posted on the agency's webpage. The PED also produces School District Report Cards and State Report Ca
New York	1			Schools that do not receive Title I funding are subject to the same criteria for making adequate yearly progress as Title I schools. All schools that fail to make AYP for two consecutive years on an accountability measure are designated as Schools Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP). Schools that received Title I funds during this time are further designated as Schools In Need of Improvement. NY uses a Performance Index and also compares similar schools.
North Carolina			1	North Carolina's pre-existing School-Based Management and Accountability Program (called the ABCs). The ABCs growth composites benefit from the averaging and weighting that takes place. The averaging helps reduce the volatility that would be more inherent in year to year reporting.
North Dakota	1			
Ohio		1		Ohio gives each school and district a designation of excellent with distinction, excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, or academic emergency based on meeting state standards on all assessments. A performance index score that is a composite of achievement at all levels, a http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?Page=3&TopicRelationID=1
Oklahoma			1	The purpose of the API is to measure success and to initiate growth in school and district performance in our state. The API gives a performance score for all students tested, as well as for individual student groups. Subscores of the API are also used to measure Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as defined in federal No Child Left Behind regulations, for all schools and districts in Oklahoma.

State Name	Only AYP	Integrated	Separate state Rating/Index	Accountability Systems Beyond AYP
Oregon			1	A report card is published for each school and each district in the state. There are state-mandated indicators beyond those required under NCLB that are also included on these reports. Schools with sufficient data receive an overall rating based on a composite of data on student performance (academic achievement based on percent of students meeting, exceeding, and meeting growth model targets); attendance/dropout rates; and participation in statewide assessments. Ratings are Outstanding, Satisfactory, and In Need of Improvement. By statute, schools with a rating of In Need of Improvement must file a revised school improvement plan.
Pennsylvania	1			The Pennsylvania Accountability System applies to all public schools and districts. It is based upon the State's content and achievement standards, valid and reliable measures of academic achievement, and other key indicators of school and district performance such as attendance and graduation rates. For AYP, there is no separate state system.
Puerto Rico				
Rhode Island		1		Rhode Island uses an indexing system that is based on 100 points. Each student contributes 100, 75, 50, 25, or 0 points toward a school's index score based on NECAP or RI's Alternate Assessment. Students contribute 100 points if they are proficient or higher, 75 points if they are partially proficient, 50 points if they are in the upper half of significantly below proficient, 25 points if they are in the lower half of that achievement level, and 0 points if they are at the guessing level. A school's index score is calculated by dividing the sum of the numbers by the total number of students enrolled. The result is an index score for the district, school, or subgroup that can range from 0 to 100. The index score provides an indication of the progress being made toward bringing all students to proficiency. District accountability is calculated in the same manner by aggregating all students at each of three levels, elementary, middle, and high school.
South Carolina			1	A report card is published for each school and each district in the state. There are state-mandated indicators beyond those required under NCLB that are also included on this report. Has five rating terms (excellent, good, average, below average, at risk) as well as a measure of growth.
South Dakota	1			
Tennessee			1	Results from Tennessee's Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) will be used for four purposes: 1) to help Results from Tennessee's Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) will be used for four purposes: 1) to help schools and districts improve their educational programs for all students; 2) to reward schools and districts that meet adequate yearly progress and demonstrate high value-added effects; 3) to determine the level and kind of technical assistance provided to schools and districts that are identified in school improvement status; and 4) to determine the number, the kind, and the level of interventions selected by the State to improve schools or districts identified in school improvement status as required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Education Improvement Act.
Texas			1	The state accountability system in Texas evaluates indicators of performance, including assessment results on the state standardized assessment instruments as well as longitudinal completion rates and annual dropout rates. Districts and campuses must meet the absolute standards for three base indicators or under certain conditions, may raise their rating one level by applying additional features of the accountability system. In addition to evaluating performance for all students, the performance of individual groups of students is held to the rating criteria. The student groups are defined to be the major ethnic groups and the group of students designated as economically disadvantaged. All of the evaluated groups must meet the criteria for a given rating category in order to earn that label. There are two sets of procedures within the state accountability system; one that evaluates standard campuses and districts and another that evaluates alternative education campuses and charter operators that primarily serve students identified as at risk of dropping out of school. The indicators and criteria differ between the alternative education accountability (AE)
Utah			1	The Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) state accountability system school report card is released each year at the same time as AYP. This accountability system includes a growth (value table) measure. Proficiency and growth is based on multiple assessment and indicators.

State Name	Only AYP	Integrated	Separate state Rating/Index	Accountability Systems Beyond AYP
Vermont	1			At this time, Vermont has a single, unified accountability system for student achievement to meet both state and federal statute. Decisions are made for ALL schools using the same criteria. In addition, our state statute holds schools accountable to School Quality Standards. Those standards are being reviewed as part of Vermont's transformation agenda.
Virginia			1	Virginia's accountability system supports teaching and learning by setting rigorous academic standards, known as the Standards of Learning (SOL), and through annual assessments of student achievement. The accountability system is part of a statewide program of support for the Commonwealth's public schools and school divisions. Schools receive two annual accountability ratings based on the performance of students on SOL tests and other statewide assessments. A school's accreditation rating reflects overall achievement in English, mathematics, science, and history/social science. Schools in which students meet or exceed achievement benchmarks established by the Board of Education in these four major content areas are rated as fully accredited. Schools and school divisions are also rated according to the progress they are making toward meeting the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).
Washington	1			Our State Board of Education is currently developing its own accountability system. The new system should be complete by 2010. See http://www.sbe.wa.gov/spa.htm for details.
West Virginia		1	1	West Virginia has an accreditation system for schools and school districts that starts with AYP. Meeting AYP means full accreditation. Schools that do not meet AYP are then able to use a performance index of several measures that can increase their accreditation status if overall scores are acceptable. On-site reviews are conducted for performance audits in low-performing schools and districts at the discretion of the State Board.
Wisconsin	1			
Wyoming		1		In Wyoming, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) annually makes a determination of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for all public elementary, middle/junior high schools, and high schools. Wyoming makes AYP determinations regarding schools and school districts using the academic achievement results on the Proficiency Assessments for Wyoming Students (PAWS) statewide assessment, participation in PAWS, graduation rate for high schools and the reduction in the percentage of students scoring in the below basic performance category in reading for the elementary and middle/junior high schools. The AYP status applies to all schools and districts in Wyoming; however, only Title I-funded schools have the potential sanction of providing public school choice and supplemental education. All districts and school that are designated "in improvement" are required to submit improvement plans to the WDE. In addition to the AYP determination, a rubric with state-determined accountability factors is scored for each of the districts in Wyoming. Depending upon the score on the rubric, a district will be given a Tier 1, 2, or 3 rating. State accre
	25	11	18	

Source: Official Website for State Education Agencies, State Accountability Workbooks and State Education Agencies