



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



How

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Mike Flanagan 

DATE: October 31, 2005

**SUBJ: DISCUSSION OF ISSUES REGARDING
ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS FOR 2005-06**

The State Board of Education began a discussion of the minimum subgroup size for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) at the meeting on September 13, 2005. Many members of the Board expressed interest in further exploring this issue. In addition, other aspects of AYP were broached during the discussion. This item builds on the discussion, identifying issues and options in planning to determine AYP based on the new assessments at grades 3-8, beginning in fall, 2005.

AYP Determination by Grade Range

Michigan has been determining AYP separately by grade range at the elementary (grades 4 and 5, where the MEAP tests are given) and middle school (grades 7 and 8). In a school with overlapping grades (e.g. K-8 or 7-12 school) an AYP determination has been made separately (that is, a K-8 school would receive both an elementary AYP determination and a middle school AYP determination). In such cases, however, the AYP determination at the highest grade range in the school is used to determine the school's phase for consequences under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). In the case of the K-8 school, for instance, AYP for the school would be based on the middle school grades. In the case of a 7-12 school, AYP would be based on the high school. The assumption is that the school's curriculum is vertically aligned and that the highest grade range represents the culmination of the school's instructional program.

For 2005, Michigan will develop vertically articulated (that is, aligned from grade to grade) performance standards for MEAP and MI-Access. The assessments will report proficiency for each grade tested (3-8) at each school. The performance standards (cut scores) will result in assessments where the difficulty at a particular grade level will be very similar to the difficulty at adjacent grade levels. The State Board of Education will be asked to approve the performance standards in December, 2005. The scores

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

606 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

of all tested students must be used in the AYP determination because valid scores in English language arts and mathematics cannot be ignored. The issue to be decided is the organization of the data used to determine AYP for a school.

One option is to set a single separate AYP target for elementary (3-5) and a single AYP target for middle school (6-8). The targets would be consistent with current targets if the percentages of students passing the MEAP tests at each grade range are comparable to prior year data. It may be confusing for schools with configurations that overlap elementary and middle schools (K-8 schools). The "highest grade range" rule would still be needed for a school such as a K-8 school where the grade configuration overlaps grades 5-6.

A second option is to set separate statewide AYP targets for each grade level, and then combine the separate grade level targets to develop a target for the school as a whole, using a weighted average of the statewide targets for the grades tested at the school. In other words, based on student performance on the grade level tests, state targets would be established for each grade, 3 through 8. A school's elementary (for instance) target would be based on what grade levels were in the school. A K-5 school would have a different school AYP target than a K-6 school.

This option would account for differences in performance standards across grade levels. This would permit a single AYP determination for the school, through a comparison between a school's target and the state target. The only potential drawback is that schools would have different targets based on the school's grade configuration.

Staff recommends this second option because it will result in a single AYP determination for each school that is based on all of the students assessed in that school.

Minimum Group Size

Several states are using a minimum N or group size tied to the percentage of students in a subgroup as a percentage of all students tested at the school. This has the advantage of being fair for virtually any grade configuration. For example, Florida revised its minimum subgroup size to 15% of the tested students, with a minimum subgroup size of 100 students. Other options that the Board may wish to consider include:

Increasing the minimum N from 30 to 40 or 50 and applying this to each grade level separately.

Moving to a group size of 30 students per grade level tested and adding the group sizes up (30 x number of grades 3-8 tested in the building).

- Higher minimum N with a Percentage of Grade Range Enrollment;
- Higher minimum N with Percentage of Total Enrollment.
Keep 30 or 1% Percent of Total Enrollment

Large schools with proportionally larger subgroup populations have claimed that the current minimum group size of 30 has seemed punitive to them because a small subgroup of 30 students could determine whether a large school makes AYP. That concern is now expressed by many more schools because they will have a much larger testing cohort with the advent of 3-8 testing.

School districts understand the uniform use of a minimum group size of 30 when they are testing only one grade in the school. Schools, however, may be expecting the minimum size to expand to 30 per grade tested as a logical extension of the current rule. In other words, if 30 was the N when just 4th grade was tested, 90 should now be the N if grades 3, 4, and 5 will be tested and the scores combined to determine AYP. The N's of 30 should be combined too, it may be claimed.

Staff agree that it would not be appropriate to apply to combined grade levels the minimum N of 30 that up to now has been applied to just one grade. Staff is concerned, however, that using a minimum subgroup of 30 per grade level tested will result in too many subgroup student assessment results being excluded from AYP. The following table illustrates this:

School Enrollment	# of Students Tested (Cohort)	Current Minimum N	N with 30 per grade tested
360 (K-5)	180 (3 grades)	30	90
400 (K-3)	100 (1 grade)	30	30
500 (1-5)	300 (3 grades)	30	90
265 (3-5)	265 (3 grades)	30	90
1015 (6-8)	1015 (3 grades)	30	90
1500 (6-8)	1500 (3 grades)	30	90
2400 (9-12)	600 (1 grade)	30	

In the above table, it can be seen that an elementary school with 180 students in the three grades tested would have a minimum group size of 90, half of the total number of students tested. This would likely cause some, if not several, subgroups not to be counted in AYP. The table also shows that this formula would not help large high schools.

Staff has produced two models for minimum N that hold the most promise of fairness. One option would use a minimum N of 30...or...10% of the tested cohort, whichever is larger. This is still a very stringent requirement and provides no relief to smaller schools. The chart below presents a sample.

Option 1
Sample Impact of Minimum N of 30 or 10% of Tested Cohort

School Enrollment	# of Students Tested (Cohort)	Minimum N of 10%	Current Minimum N	AYP Based On
360 (K-5)	180	18	30	30
400 (K-3)	100	10	30	30
500 (1-5)	300	30	30	30
265 (3-5)	265	26	30	30
1015 (6-8)	1015	101	30	101
1500 (6-8)	1500	150	30	150
2400 (9-12)	600	60	30	60

Another option would use a minimum N of 30...plus...10% of the tested cohort. This model provides an expansion of the subgroup size in proportion to the student cohort tested. Staff feels that this model is fair to all schools, does not ignore student assessment results and respects the current level of representation of sub-populations within the whole student population. In both this model and the one above the subgroup size will be capped at 150. The chart below presents a sample of the impact.

Option 2
Sample Impact of Minimum N of 30 plus 10% of Tested Cohort

School Enrollment	# of Students Tested (Cohort)	10% of Tested Cohort	30 + 10%	AYP Based On
360 (K-5)	180	18	48	48
400 (K-3)	100	10	40	30*
500 (1-5)	300	30	60	60
265 (3-5)	265	26	56	56
1015 (6-8)	1015	101	131	131
1500 (6-8)	1500	150	180	150**
2400 (9-12)	600	60	90	90

* In a school that includes any grades K-5 and assesses only one grade, the minimum N remains at 30.

** Subgroup capped at 150.

The following chart depicts the impact Option 2 would have on the number of schools that would include African American and Students With Disabilities subgroups in calculating their AYP.

Number of Schools With Subgroups Above N

Subgroup	Current N of 30	Option 1 With N of 30 or 10%	Option 2 With N of 30 plus 10%
African American	907	906	746
Students With Disabilities	586	1,421	344

Staff recommends that the State Board approve an application to the U. S. Department of Education requesting an amendment to Michigan’s subgroup minimum size to use a formula of 30 plus 10% of the total number of students tested in the cohort, to be employed in calculating AYP for the 2006 report cards.

Graduation Rates

NCLB requires that AYP determinations for high schools include a measurement of the graduation rate. The Center for Educational Performance and Information has convened an interdepartmental workgroup to develop rules for calculating graduation rates, using a cohort methodology. Additionally, Michigan is committed to using the methodology adopted by the National Governors Association. However, the data collected through the Single Record Student Database (SRSD) will not yet allow a cohort to be followed through high school until 2007-08. Therefore, an interim methodology will be used in the 2006 Report Card.

The graduation rate target for AYP is scheduled to increase from 80% to 85% in 2005-06. The graduation rate targets were set based on the current formula for calculating graduation rate. The currently set targets may not be realistic when a new methodology is used to calculate graduation rates.

Staff recommends that the State Board postpone any increase in the graduation rate target until the method of calculating the graduation rate is changed to the cohort methodology. This will require us to seek approval for this as an amendment to our NCLB Accountability Workbook.

Summary

The State Board of Education should begin its discussion of AYP for 2006 based on the information contained in this memorandum. Following the Board’s discussion, staff will develop research and policy documents that may be necessary for future action by the Board. Schools have been calling the

Department seeking answers to these questions. Action will be needed by the State Board of Education so that the revised policies can be forwarded to the U.S. Department of Education for approval. Decisions on these issues are needed by the December, 2005 meeting of the State Board of Education.