

# Supplemental Memorandum

**To:** STATE BOARD MEMBERS

**Date:** April 1, 2003

**From:** Sue Bennett

**Re:** ITEM # 8

**Subject** *Preliminary information for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) using Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) indicators for schools that have fewer than the required minimum number of valid test scores.*

Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 107-110, the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA), the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on the Public School Accountability Act (PSAA) presents as information to the State Board of Education (SBE) *Options for Annual School Performance under ASAM*. These options describe proposed approaches to using ASAM indicators to determine Annual School Performance for California schools participating in the ASAM.

[Attachment I](#): Options for Annual School Performance under ASAM (Pages 1-5)

## Options for Annual School Performance under ASAM

The Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) has provided a means for meaningful accountability of California's well-developed system of specialized schools serving high-risk student populations. The model under development has been carefully designed to meet the spirit of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability expectations. It must now evolve to align with the state's overall NCLB accountability plan yet still be appropriate to the wide array of ASAM schools. The following pages outline options and considerations in the development of an accountability process to determine annual ASAM school success.

Any proposed accountability model for alternative schools must include data indicators that are:

- Contained in the state's primary accountability system (AYP and API),
- Reliable and valid across the range of alternative school populations,
- Feasible at the local level, and
- Representative of performance that reflects success for the goals of alternative schools.

The current state NCLB plan will not hold the large majority of ASAM schools accountable for two important reasons. First, the primarily high-risk student populations that attend ASAM schools will make it nearly impossible for such schools to meet mainstream academic achievement levels. Second, the rapid turnover in student populations that attend ASAM schools will result in many of the schools not meeting the proposed state minimum number standard, resulting in data being rolled up to the local educational agency (LEA) or state level. The models proposed below are intended to guide LEAs in holding their ASAM schools accountable.

### I. Data Elements

The options for calculating annual school performance include considerations of the following information:

- **The State NCLB Accountability Plan**, including both AYP and API methodology and indicators
- **ASAM Data Elements**, providing a "multiple-measure" indicator of school performance:
  - STAR/state test data
  - ASAM additional indicators

### II. Strategies for Calculating Overall School Improvement

Any ASAM school accountability system must be able to adapt to the following atypical circumstances:

- ASAM schools will not all be judged by the same set of indicators
- ASAM schools will not all be judged by the same number of indicators

Each of the options presented below is flexible enough to accommodate these circumstances. The approach to ASAM accountability can be envisioned as a multi-step process, beginning with the attempt to calculate AYP and API results for each school, followed by creation of an ASAM-specific score, ending with merging the two sources of data to classify the performance of each ASAM school.

*Step 1: Report AYP and API Results*

1. For those ASAM schools with student populations that meet California's proposed NCLB-eligibility requirements (i.e., meet the minimum number standard), the AYP and API results should be the primary focus of school accountability.
2. For the great majority of ASAM schools (estimated at 80 percent), no AYP or API score will be reportable. For those schools, accountability must be determined from the ASAM-specific accountability model described below.
3. Even for ASAM schools that are able to attain regular AYP and API results, the State Board may choose to add ASAM-specific accountability information in determining whether the ASAM school met its NCLB expectations

*Step 2: Create an ASAM-specific Rating*

The Alternative Accountability Subcommittee of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee for the Public School Accountability Act (PSAA) proposes that the following model be used to determine whether an ASAM school has met annual performance requirements. The model is comprised of STAR/state test data and ASAM additional indicators. Table 1 details the specifics of the proposed model.

**Table 1: Illustrative ASAM School Rating Scale**

Rating:	STAR/State Test Performance Indicator		Pre-Post Achievement Indicator *		Learning Readiness and Completion Indicators	Number of Goals Met
<b>Commendable</b>						
	Met STAR goals		**	AND	Met goals on all additional ASAM indicator(s)	All goals met
<b>Sufficient</b>						
	Met STAR goals	OR	Met goals on Pre-Post achievement indicator	AND	Met goals on all additional ASAM indicator(s)	2-3 goals met
<b>Low Performing</b>						
	Met STAR goals	OR	Met goals on Pre-Post achievement indicator	OR	Met goal on one or more additional ASAM indicator	1 or more goals met
<b>Very Low Performing</b>						
	Did not meet STAR goals	AND	Did not meet goals on Pre-Post achievement indicator	AND	Met no goals on ASAM indicators	0 goals met

\*Applicable only if the school has chosen pre-post tests as one of its indicators.

\*\* A commendable school must meet STAR goals, independent of performance on pre-post indicators.

Table 1 represents one example of a “mixed model” to determine school performance standards. For schools in the lower performance bands (very low performance, low performance, and sufficient), the system is compensatory. That is, failure to meet standards on one measure can be compensated by success on others. To achieve the top rating of “commendable” performance, however, the requirements are conjunctive. A commendable school must meet all performance standards, including growth on the STAR indicator.

*Step 3: Merge AYP/API and ASAM-specific Data*

The State may elect to use both AYP/API and ASAM-specific accountability information in its ASAM school accountability model. The tables below present different options to accomplish this. Option 1 uses ASAM data to potentially mitigate the final NCLB classification. Option 2 does not affect the NCLB classification; rather, it uses the ASAM data to provide additional information on the school’s performance

**Option 1: MITIGATED NCLB CLASSIFICATION**

AYP/API LEVEL	ASAM LEVEL			
	COMMENDABLE	SUFFICIENT	LOW PERFORMING	VERY LOW PERFORMING
n/a*	meets AYP	meets AYP	fails AYP	fails AYP
4	meets AYP	meets AYP	meets AYP	meets AYP
3	meets AYP	meets AYP	meets AYP or provisional AYP	provisional AYP**
2	meets AYP or provisional AYP	meets AYP or provisional AYP	fails AYP	fails AYP
1	meets AYP or provisional AYP	provisional AYP	fails AYP	fails AYP

\*School does not receive a mainstream AYP level because it fails to meet state minimum number levels or other NCLB requirements. The AYP accountability decision is based solely on ASAM-specific data.

\*\*Provisional AYP: The decision to place school into corrective action is deferred until additional data are available.

**Option 2: ADDITIONAL ASAM CLASSIFICATION**

AYP/API LEVEL	ASAM LEVEL			
	COMMENDABLE	SUFFICIENT	LOW PERFORMING	VERY LOW PERFORMING
n/a*	****	***	**	*
4	*****	*****	****	****
3	****	****	***	***
2	****	***	**	**
1	****	***	**	*

- \*\*\*\*\* = Exemplary
- \*\*\*\* = Commendable
- \*\*\* = On the Move
- \*\* = Some Improvement
- \* = Academic Watch