

State Accountability Systems and AYP Determinations (as of October 2007)

| State Name | Only AYP | Integrated | Separate state Rating/Index | Accountability Systems Beyond AYP |
|----------------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Alabama | 1 | | | In subsequent years, the State anticipates adding the Alabama Direct Assessments of Writing in Grades 5, 7, and 10 and Science assessments in Grades 5, 7, and along with the accountability requirement of passing all five sections of the Alabama High School |
| 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 | | | |
| 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; the California Achievement Test (Sixth Edition); 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. |
| Colorado | | | 1 | Colorado rates schools based on an academic performance rating. A statistical methodology is then used to combine all the test results into one overall composite score, as defined by state law. The overall composite score is then compared to cut-off scores for the appropriate grade level - elementary, middle or high - to determine which rating each school receives. |
| 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 | 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). |

| State Name | Only AYP | Integrated | Separate state Rating/Index | Accountability Systems Beyond AYP |
|------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Georgia | | 1 | | Beginning with 2004-05 school year, Georgia implemented its Single Statewide Accountability System (SSAS). The SSAS profile will include 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 GHS GT 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. |
| Hawaii | 1 | | | |
| Idaho | 1 | | | |
| 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. As of the 2006 testing cycle, students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 were assessed. The state assessments that will be used as of 2007 will be the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) for grades 3-8; the Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English (IMAGE) for students with limited English proficiency as appropriate; 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 | | | |
| Kansas | 1 | | | |
| Kentucky | | | 1 | At its October 2003 meeting, the Kentucky Board of Education approved reliance on the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS) full accountability index as the other academic indicator, based on input from local districts and LSAC. |
| Louisiana | | | 1 | Louisiana uses a measure of growth for each school against its expected growth target, as well as an AYP measure. |

| State Name | Only AYP | Integrated | Separate state Rating/Index | Accountability Systems Beyond AYP |
|---------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 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. The legislation also required that a new system for assessing student progress be established. This assessment system has both State and local components. The State component includes the Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) which is given to students in grades 4, 8, and 11 and has been aligned with the Learning Results, with individual student scores being reported in English Language Arts (Reading and Writing), Mathematics and Science. |
| Maryland | 1 | | | |
| Massachusetts | | 1 | | <p>To align its existing accountability system with NCLB, Massachusetts has set intermediary performance targets for each 2-year cycle between 1998, when the Massachusetts School & District Accountability System was adopted, and 2014.</p> <p>The State issues Adequate Yearly Progress determinations and Performance and Improvement Ratings each year. The Performance and Improvement ratings are 'big picture' accountability findings that provide context for the year-by-year aggregate and subgroup AYP determinations that are published in school and district Adequate Yearly Progress reports.</p> <p>Student performance is measured using the State's Composite Performance Index (CPI). The CPI is a 100-point index that combines the Proficiency Index, scores of students who participate in standard MCAS ELA and mathematics tests, with the MCAS-Alt Index, scores of those who take the MCAS-Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt). The CPI is a measure of the extent to which students are progressing toward proficiency (a CPI of 100) in ELA and mathematics.</p> |
| Michigan | | 1 | | 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 |
| Minnesota | 1 | | | <p>During the 2007 session, the state legislature eliminated the star rating system based solely on AYP status, which had been used in previous years to evaluate school performance on statewide tests. The Department of Education is establishing a working group to develop a new rating system for schools.</p> <p>MCA - Star Scale: 5 stars = made AYP in school year and met at least 2 of the 4 additional indicators; 4 stars = Made AYP in school year and met 1 of the 4 additional indicators; 3 stars = Made AYP during the school year; 2 stars = Did not make AYP during the school year; 1 star = Did not make AYP for 2 years straight; NA = the school did not submit data. Additional indicators are 1) fewer than 10 % of students scoring in Level 1 and 2 in Reading (Math) MCAs, 2) More than 30 % of students scoring in Level 5 on the Reading (Math) MCAs, 3) Reading (Math) performance was in top 25% of comparable schools this year, and 4) Reading performance was in top 10 % of comparable schools this year.</p> |

| State Name | Only AYP | Integrated | Separate state Rating/Index | Accountability Systems Beyond AYP |
|---------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Mississippi | | | 1 | The state accountability model uses a combination of achievement and growth to assign each school a School Performance Classification (Level 1 through Level 5) as well as an Achievement Level Index (on a scale ranging from 100 through 600). The 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. Rewards and sanctions based on the state accountability model apply to all schools, not just Title I schools. |
| Missouri | 1 | | | 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. |
| Montana | 1 | | | |
| Nebraska | | 1 | | Nebraska's approach to standards, assessment, and accountability: School-based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System, STARS, is firmly grounded in the belief that decisions about student learning should be standards-based and should be based upon classroom knowledge of the student. This process relies upon the professional expertise of Nebraska educators and has been built upon a statewide initiative to develop educator capacity in assessment design and the use of assessment data for improved instruction. The requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act have been integrated into the accountability requirements. |
| 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.) |

| State Name | Only AYP | Integrated | Separate state Rating/Index | Accountability Systems Beyond AYP |
|----------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 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 | | | |
| 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 adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years are designated as Schools Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP). NY uses a Perf 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, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, or academic emergency based on meeting state standards on all assessments and a performance index score that is a composite of achievement at all levels. More details are on their website at: http://www.ode.state.oh.us/accountability/lrc.asp |
| 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. |
| 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 are rated in four areas and receive an overall rating based on a composite of the individual ratings in these areas: Student Performance (academic achievement); Student Behavior (attendance/dropout rates); Improvement (progress over four years in state tests, attendance and dropout rates); and School Characteristics (participation in statewide tests). Ratings are Exceptional, Strong, Satisfactory, Low or Unacceptable in all areas but Improvement. Improvement ratings will be "Improved, Stayed About the Same, or Declined. By statute, schools with ratings of Low or Unacceptable 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. |
| Puerto Rico | | | | |

| State Name | Only AYP | Integrated | Separate state Rating/Index | Accountability Systems Beyond AYP |
|----------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Rhode Island | | 1 | | Uses an Index Proficiency Score and a school classifications (high performing, moderately performing, school in need of improvement) and within improving status several sub-categories (improving, sustaining, high/moderate, with caution, safe harbor, insufficient progress) |
| 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, unsatisfactory) 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 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 | Has separate Academic Excellence Indicator System |
| Utah | | | 1 | Has the U-PASS Report [Utah Performance Assessment System for Students. Added a growth model using values table. |
| Vermont | 1 | | | |
| 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 | | | |
| West Virginia | 1 | | | Annual accreditation of all schools and an approval level for all districts. On-site reviews are conducted for performance audits in low performing schools and districts or others at the discretion of the State Board. |
| Wisconsin | 1 | | | |
| Wyoming | 1 | | | |
| | 28 | 8 | 15 | |

Source: State Education Agency Websites and State Accountability Workbooks