MISSOURI

Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

DUE: JANUARY 31, 2003
Updated December 21, 2004
Updated July 5, 2005

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
D. Kent King, Missouri Commissioner of Education

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which 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.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

F: State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.

P: State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).

W: State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

Status		State Accountability System Element
Principle 1: All Schools		
F	1.1	Accountability system includes *all schools and districts in the state*.
F	1.2	Accountability system holds *all schools to the same criteria*.
F	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the *academic achievement standards*.
F	1.4	Accountability system provides *information in a timely manner*.
F	1.5	Accountability system includes *report cards*.
F	1.6	Accountability system includes *rewards and sanctions*.
Principle 2: All Students		
F	2.1	The accountability system includes *all students*
F	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of *full academic year*.
F	2.3	The accountability system properly includes *mobile students*.
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations		
F	3.1	Accountability system expects *all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14*.
F	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether *student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress.*
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a *starting point*.
F	3.2b	Accountability system establishes *statewide annual measurable objectives*.
F	3.2c	Accountability system establishes *intermediate goals*.
Principle 4: Annual Decisions		
F	4.1	The accountability system *determines annually the progress* of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:
F – Final state policy
P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval
W – Working to formulate policy

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

F	5.1	The accountability system *includes all the required student subgroups*.
F	5.2	The accountability system holds *schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups*.
F	5.3	The accountability system includes *students with disabilities*.
F	5.4	The accountability system includes *limited English proficient students*.
F	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
F	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based *primarily on academic assessments*.

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

F	7.1	Accountability system includes *graduation rate for high schools*.
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an *additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools*.
F	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

F	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for *reading/language arts* and *mathematics*.

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

F	9.1	Accountability system produces *reliable decisions*.
F	9.2	Accountability system produces *valid decisions*.
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing *changes in assessment and student population*.

Principle 10: Participation Rate

F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the *rate of participation* in the statewide assessment.
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for *applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.*

STATUS Legend:
F – Final policy
P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval
W– Working to formulate policy

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
1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?	Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System. State has a definition of "public school" and "LEA" for AYP accountability purposes. 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).	A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System. State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Every public school, including public school districts and charter schools, will be included in Missouri's accountability system. State schools administered by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) that serve severely disabled, blind and deaf students will be included and all students will be assessed through the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP). Data for schools that do not meet the minimum cell size will be aggregated over the most recent three years. Data for students in alternative schools and students in special school districts will be aggregated to sending schools or schools of residence except for severly disabled students in self-contained buildings in Special School District in St Louis County. Those students will be included in their school of attendance for AYP purposes . Charter schools are considered public schools and will be included in the accountability system for AYP purposes. Public schools, such as K-2 buildings that do not have grades that are assessed on the MAP, will be linked with and receive AYP determinations on the basis of test results of the schools their students attend in subsequent years.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination. If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All public schools and districts are rated on performance or improvement (safe harbor) using the same criteria when making AYP determinations. Criteria are based on Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) results and attendance at the elementary and middle school levels and graduation at the high school level. The definition and determination of AYP are integrated into our State accountability system on an annual basis through the Annual Performance Report (APR). See next page for an example of how AYP will be reported on a high school APR.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of *basic*, *proficient* and *advanced* student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?	State has defined three levels of student achievement: *basic*, *proficient* and *advanced*.[1] Student achievement levels of *proficient* and *advanced* determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the *basic* level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the *proficient* and *advanced* levels.	Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Missouri's accountability system is based mostly on the results of the MAP. MAP is a custom-designed assessment based on Missouri's Show-Me Standards. MAP results are reported in five levels: Step One, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced. See the following pages for descriptions of what students are expected to know and do at the various performance levels for communication arts and math.

[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
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year. 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.	Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The MAP is administered during an April/May test window each year so that students have the benefit of most of the school year before learning is assessed. Districts, buildings, and the State receive results for all the students and for the disaggregated subgroups as required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) from Missouri's assessment contractor by August 20 of each year. A process that districts and buildings can use to determine if they have made AYP will be posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) web site, which will allow districts and buildings to determine whether they made AYP as soon as they receive their data. Districts can then notify parents of children who are in Title I schools that have not made AYP for two consecutive years of their school choice options and arrangements for alternative school choices can be arranged if requested.

Timeline

July 1, 2003 – Process for districts and buildings to calculate AYP is put on DESE web site.
August 20 -- Districts and buildings receive data needed to calculate AYP. Schools identified for school improvement based on that data.
August 25 -- Parents notified if their child's Title I school is in school improvement.
August 30 and Ongoing -- Arrangements made for school choice as requested.
First day of school – Choice and/or supplemental services begin.
October 1 – Districts and schools receive a running record of their AYP progress as part of the Annual Performance Report that all districts and buildings receive each year.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?	The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements]. The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year. The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible. Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups	The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements. The State Report Card is not available to the public.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State of Missouri publishes a state report card annually. Every district is also required to publish a report card that includes district information and information for each building. Much of the information required by NCLB is already included in these report cards. DESE includes on its website downloadable, print-ready information that is currently required for districts and buildings. Missouri's report card rule will be revised and go to the State Board in April 2003, to include all of the elements required by NCLB in the 2003 report card. See page 41 for analysis of additions needed. For detailed data used in the Missouri Public School Accountability Report, visit DESE's website (www.dese.state.mo.us/planning/profile/state02.html).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?[2]	State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are: • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs.	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Sanctions: Missouri calculates Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for every public school district and building and includes results in the Annual Performance Report (APR), along with disaggregated detail. Title I districts and buildings, including charter schools, are subject to the requirements of section 1116 of No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

Currently, state regulations require that the lowest-performing schools be designated as Academically Deficient (AD) based on performance indicators reported on the Annual Performance Report. Audit teams of master educators visit AD schools to confirm that they should be designated as AD. Management Teams visit AD schools on an ongoing basis to make recommendations for school improvement and to assist and support implementation of strategies to improve student achievement.

Rewards: Districts – A district is recognized as "Distinguished in Performance" if it meets all of the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) performance measures on the most recent APR. Buildings – Title I and non-Title I buildings are recognized as distinguished if they make AYP for four consecutive years.

The Missouri Deputy Commissioner of Education has convened a work group to study NCLB and state regulations to consolidate state regulations and align with federal requirements by January of 2004.

[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)].

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

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System. 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.	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Section 160.011(6) defines "public school" as all elementary and secondary schools operated at public expense. Charter schools are considered public schools within the district of location. Missouri has 524 districts that include all of the public schools in the state.

All students enrolled in public schools are required to participate in the MAP. Most students take the standard form of the MAP. Appropriate modifications are available for students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency. Students with severe disabilities who cannot participate in the MAP under standard administration or with modifications participate in the MAP-Alternative (MAP-A).

Beginning in the spring of 2006, an alternate assessment aligned with the Show-Me Standards, but designed to assess the level of skill and knowledge acquisition of students with limited English proficiency, will be implemented. In the meantime, students with limited English proficiency who are in their first year in the country will take the English Language Acquisition Assessment and the math assessment with appropriate accommodations. The communications art assessment will be optional for those children, and none of the scores will be included in AYP calculations for those children.

With the exceptions in the previous paragraph, all students will be included in Missouri's accountability system and in calculation of AYP.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define "full academic year" for identifying students in AYP decisions?	The State has a definition of "full academic year" for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP. The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.	LEAs have varying definitions of "full academic year." The State's definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade. The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

"Full academic year" is defined as being enrolled on the day that the initial enrollment count is reported to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This is the definition that is used on the student profile for the MAP and in the Core Data Manual for reporting purposes. All LEAs and buildings use this date. This date is the last Wednesday in September of each year. Students will be considered enrolled for the full academic year and included in AYP calculations if they are enrolled the last Wednesday in September and are enrolled in the same building or district when the MAP is administered.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
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?	State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year. 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.	State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability. State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability. State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Student profile information is collected from schools each year as part of the administration of the MAP. The student profile includes a designation for "in building less than a year" and "in district less than a year." Students with this designation will be assessed and results will be given to schools and parents. However, results for children in building less than a year will not be included in building AYP, and students in district less than a year will not be included in district AYP data. Children who were enrolled in the district for a full academic year, but not in the same building, will be included in district AYP calculations, but not in building AYP calculations.

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
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?	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 arts[3] and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.	State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014. State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Missouri has determined an AYP time line that requires all students to meet or exceed the State's proficient level in communication arts and math not later than 2013-2014. AYP calculations will be made for all public schools and districts and for all required subgroups in communication arts and math based on performance or improvement (Safe Harbor) toward meeting the 100% goal.

Adequate Yearly Progress – Missouri		
Year	**Communication Arts**	**Math**
2014*	100	100
2013*	91.8	90.8
2012*	83.7	81.7
2011*	75.5	72.5
2010*	67.4	63.3
2009*	59.2	54.1
2008*	51.0	45.0
2007*	42.9	35.8
2006*	34.7	26.6
2005*	26.6	17.5
2004	20.4	10.3
2003	19.4	9.3
2002	18.4	8.3

*Intermediate Goal.

[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
3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?	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. 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.	State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2 Through the student profile sheet for the MAP, children are identified in all of the appropriate subgroups required for NCLB (see next page for an example of the student profile sheet). Data is disaggregated for all subgroups. The following will be included in calculations for AYP purposes: all students, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Indian, White, free-reduced lunch, IEP, and LEP. Participation Rates – Enrollment will be compared to participation of all students and of disaggregated groups to determine participation rates. School districts and buildings with participation rates of less than 95 percent or with any subgroup with a participation rate of less than 95 percent will not meet the AYP standard, providing that the subgroup meets the minimum cell size. If the subgroup does not meet minimum cell size, then a participation rate of less than 95 percent for that subgroup will not result in failure to meet the AYP standard. Uniform Averaging Procedure – Missouri will aggregate data across grades in a building with groups smaller than 30 to determine the percent proficient and above. The calculation will be done separately for communication arts and math. In addition, scores will be aggregated for the most recent three years. This data will be compared to the most recent year and the highest score will be used for AYP purposes. This approach minimizes the possibility of falsely inferring that a building or district did not make AYP. It also has the potential of rewarding districts and buildings for efforts that result in strong, single-year achievement gains. Safe Harbor Provisions – If a building or district or a subgroup of either fails to meet the measurable annual objective, then the building or district makes AYP if all of the following are met: 1) the percentage of tested students in the pertinent group below the proficient level decreases by at least 10 percent from the preceding year. 2) students in the district, building or subgroup make progress on the "other indicator." 3) at least 95 percent of the students in the district, building, or subgroup participate in the assessment. Confidence Intervals – Missouri will apply the >.99 confidence interval band for each group in buildings and LEAs that meet the cell size of 30 requirement. This will be done to provide additional validity and reliability to the data and therefore to decisions made based on that data. Confidence intervals will not be used for LEP children and children with disabilities. Additional validity and reliability for these groups will be provided by using a cell size of 50. Confidence intervals will be applied to performance data for AYP at the .99 level and for Safe Harbor at the .75 level. They will not be applied to attendance, graduation or participation data.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?	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. 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. 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…).	The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2a Starting points were calculated as prescribed by NCLB. 2002 data was used. Buildings at the 20th percentile for enrollment were higher performing in both communication arts and math than the lowest-performing subgroup. The starting point for communication arts is 18.4, and the starting point for math is 8.3. The same starting point will be used for all districts and for all buildings, no matter what the level.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	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. The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline. The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.	The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives. The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Annual targets have been established separately for communication arts and math that are consistent with the intermediate goals and that identify the percent required for proficient or above for each year from 2002-2014. Meeting these annual objectives will result in having 100 percent of our students proficient by 2014. The annual objectives are the same for every district, building, and subgroup in the state.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline. • The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. • Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.	The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals. The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Missouri has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments until 100 percent of students are proficient by 2014.
Intermediate goals occur in 2004-2005 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014.

See page 16 for a chart of AYP requirements.

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
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually.[4]	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

MAP data for all children and for disaggregated groups is received from the assessment contractor every August. The grid shown after page 8 is calculated and printed for every building, district, and for the State. AYP decisions will be indicated on each building and district grid. The grid will also indicate if a building or district will be in school improvement for the coming school year. School improvement decisions for buildings will be based on not meeting the AYP annual objective for two consecutive years in the same content area – communication arts or math. School improvement decisions for districts will be based on not meeting the AYP annual objective for two consecutive years in the same subject at all grade spans in the district.

[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
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency. Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.	State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The AYP portion of the Annual Performance Report indicates which subgroups make AYP, as well as whether or not all students make AYP. Subgroups included in AYP decisions are Asian, Hispanic, Black, Indian, White, IEP, LEP, and free-reduced lunch. MAP data has been available for subgroups since the 1994 requirements of IASA were implemented. The student profile form that is part of the MAP administration identified students in appropriate subgroups which allows data to be disaggregated.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	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.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Missouri requires that buildings and districts report student race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and economic status on student profile sheets. That information is turned into the test contractor who then reports disaggregated data to districts and to the State. The State uses this data to publish the state report card and to determine AYP for subgroups. This information is given to buildings and districts through the Annual Performance Report.

For each building and LEA, the State will determine, for each group of sufficient size, whether or not the annual objective was made or, if not, whether the group met the “safe harbor” provision, met the 95% participation rate criteria, and made progress on the “other indicator.”

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	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. State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.	The State Accountability System or state policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments. State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
All students with IEPs are included in Missouri's definition of Adequate Yearly Progress in one of the following ways: 1) Students' disabilities are such that they are able to take the MAP without accommodation, and receive a score that is valid and reliable. 2) Students are capable of taking the MAP with accommodations. See list of accommodations on the next page. 3) Students with severe disabilities are assessed on the MAP-A. The MAP-A will be revised in the next two years to be aligned with the Show-Me Standards, and results will be reported in corresponding levels to the MAP. Results will then be integrated in AYP determinations. In the interim, students being assessed with the current MAP-A will be placed in Step One, the bottom achievement level on the MAP.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	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. State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.	LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
Beginning in 2003, all LEP students will participate in the MAP with or without accommodations and regardless of how long they have been in the district and in the country except those children who have been in the country less than a year. Although the Math Map is required for those children, the Communication Arts assessment is optional and neither score will be included in AYP calculations. These children will take the English Language Proficiency Assessment. All other results are included in determining AYP for the building, district, and subgroup. Beginning in 2006, LEP students will take an alternative assessment designed to measure language and content acquisition. Results will be included in school and district determinations using achievement levels designed specifically to measure results on the alternative assessment tool. The only other LEP students who have not been enrolled in the building for a "full academic year" will be excluded from the accountability determinations for AYP purposes.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.[5] Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.	State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes. Definition is not applied consistently across the State. Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Missouri plans to use 30 as the minimum number of students in a subgroup for reporting purposes. This number is considered large enough to include valid data about significant subgroups being reported to the community and yet will protect the privacy of individual children.

The required number of students in a subgroup for accountability purposes is 30. Analysis indicates that measurement precision is substantial with groups of 30 compared to smaller groups. Increases in cell size beyond 30 yield improvement in measurement precision, but at a much less significant rate than with groups of 30.

In order to provide more validity and reliability to decisions about AYP based on subgroups, Missouri will use a cell size of 50 for students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities.

[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

Subgroup size for reporting will be a minimum of 30. However, any group that has 0 percent or 100 percent in a category will not be reported in order to keep individual students from being identified.

[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
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.[7] Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
In Missouri AYP decisions are based initially on MAP results for percent of students at proficient or above as compared to annual objectives. Then the 95 percent participation requirement is considered. "Safe Harbor," if applied, is based on MAP results. One other indicator, attendance, is added for elementary and middle schools. Graduation rate is the "other indicator" for high schools.

[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 *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	State definition of graduation rate: • 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. Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause[8] to make AYP.	State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.

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

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
Graduation Rate: Missouri uses the definition of graduation rate from the National Center for Education Statistics. The following is the statutory definition of Graduation Rate in Missouri. "Graduation rate," the quotient of the number of graduates in the current year as of June thirtieth divided by the sum of the number of graduates in the current year as of June thirtieth plus the number of twelfth-graders who dropped out in the current year plus the number of eleventh-graders who dropped out in the preceding year plus the number of tenth-graders who dropped out in the second preceding year plus the number of ninth-graders who dropped out in the third preceding year. Students who obtain a GED are counted as dropouts in this calculation. The goal for the additional indicator of graduation rate is to improve each year until the rate of 85 per cent is reached. Once 85 per cent is reached the goal is to at least maintain at that level each year.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
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?	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] 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.	State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Missouri will use attendance as the additional indicator for elementary and middle schools. The attendance rate will be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{\# of hours attended}}{\text{\# of hours enrolled}}$$

Districts and buildings and subgroups, for AYP and for purposes of Safe Harbor, will have met the indicator if they increase the rate over the previous year.

Once a building or district has reached 93 percent on the additional indictor of attendance, it will be expected to at least maintain that level in order to make AYP or Safe Harbor.

[9] NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable. State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.	State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Both graduation and attendance data are reported electronically by districts through DESE's Core Data System. Both are subject to local audit and verification at the state level.

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education reviews data submitted by school districts and identifies data that represents substantial change from past performance. DESE staff contact districts to verify data that represent substantial changes from the preceding year. These audits are conducted by the school finance office for attendance since that data affects funding. The core data staff monitor graduation data since it affects accountability.

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics. [10] AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The MAP includes separate assessments for math and communication arts. Score reports include data for buildings, districts, required subgroups, and the State for each content area.

The AYP calculation will examine separately the proportion of students proficient in communication arts and math for buildings, districts, the State, and for required subgroups at all of those levels. Missouri will also examine participation rates separately for communication arts and math for each building, district, and for each subgroup.

[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
9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?	State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions. State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice. State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions. State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.	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. State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters. State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Missouri will use three years of data to increase reliability. The comparison of three years of data to the most recent year's performance will increase consistency of decisions about AYP and the validity of inferences drawn. The use of Safe Harbor will allow schools and districts to receive credit for strong gains in areas where annual objectives are not met to decrease invalid identification. Predicating decisions on not making AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area will allow for more consistent decisions.

As the new definition of AYP is implemented, DESE will examine data on validity and reliability and share this information with the public. This information will also be used to refine the system as appropriate.

Technical analysis of the MAP indicates that it is valid and reliable at an acceptable level. In addition, there is an appeals process for parents and districts if they feel that data may not be correct.

Missouri has considered questions suggested in "Making Valid and Reliable Decisions In Determining Adequate Yearly Progress" in determining validity, reliability, policy, and practicability in its accountability system.

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

DESE has established appeal processes for parents, buildings, and districts that believe there is a mistake in the data used to make AYP determinations or in the inferences made on the basis of that data. In such cases, data and decisions are reviewed by appropriate staff at DESE and a final resolution is made within 30 days of the receipt of the appeal.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	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] State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System. State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.	State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP. State does not have a plan for handling changes, e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

New assessments in grades 3-8 for math and communication arts will be incorporated into the Accountability System by 2005-2006. Since Missouri is aggregating results across grades in a building and district, it will be possible to include scores from additional grades into that calculation. However, academic achievement standards will be reviewed at the time that new assessments are added and may be revised. If a revision occurs, annual objectives will be recalculated using the requirements in NCLB, but the goal will still be to have all students at or above proficient by 2014. New calculations of validity and reliability will be made as needed.

[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.

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
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate). State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate). Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.	The State does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments. Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Participation rates for the MAP have been calculated and reported on the score report since 1997. Enrollment data (disaggregated) and participation data (disaggregated) are gathered as a part of the MAP administration. Participation rate is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{\# of students with test results}}{\text{\# of students enrolled}}$$

Students participating in alternative assessments are currently included in the number of students without results (Level Not Determined). Starting in 2006, alternate results will be available in the same achievement levels as the MAP and will, therefore, be included in the numerator of the calculation.

Participation rates will be calculated for districts, buildings, the State, and subgroups at each level. The 95 percent requirement will be applied to all AYP decisions. Missouri will use the additional flexibility that allows participation rate to be averaged over two or three years including the current year if the building or LEA does not meet the 95% requirement for the current year alone.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF *NOT* MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The 95 percent requirement will be considered in all AYP determinations. School buildings, districts, and subgroups with at least 95 percent participation will have met that part of the AYP requirement. Buildings, districts, and subgroups with participation rates of less than 95 percent will not make AYP unless the subgroup does not meet the minimum cell size. Then a participation rate of less than 95 percent will not result in failure to meet the AYP standard.

Appendix A
Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.*

2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.*

3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.*

4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.

5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.*

6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.*

7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.**

8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.***

***Not all of the disaggregated data is currently included. Revised rule will go to the State Board in April to include all the required elements for the 2003 Report Card.**

****AYP and school improvement information will be included in the 2003 Report Card.**

*****Partially included; will be completed for 2003 Report Card.**