

# Reading and Mathematics AYP Starting Points, Intermediate Goals, Annual Measurable Objectives

February 11, 2003

## *Starting Point (Baseline) Established*

### ■ Procedure

The procedure for establishing the statewide “starting point” or baseline value for determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is prescribed in the NCLB statute and final accountability regulations. Starting points are developed separately for reading and mathematics using school year 2001-02 state assessment data. The methodology is as follows:

Take the *higher* of the percentage of students at the proficient levels who are in:

- 1) the State’s lowest achieving subgroup of students, i.e., each of the various major racial/ethnic groups (5), the economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency; or
- 2) the school with a score that ranks at the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile in the State, calculated using enrollment, with all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.

This same information is conveyed immediately below in the form of a table.

<b>Baseline: Use the Higher Value as the Starting Point</b>	
% of students proficient in lowest achieving group:	% of students proficient in the school ranked at the 20 <sup>th</sup> percentile (of enrollment)
- Economically disadvantaged	- Rank all schools by % proficient
- Each major racial/ethnic group (5)	- Count up to reach 20% of total enrollment
- Students with disabilities	- % of students proficient at that school is the starting point
- Students with limited English proficiency	

Note: One baseline for reading and one for mathematics applies to all. That is, the reading and mathematics baselines or starting points, derived from statewide assessment data, as described above, apply uniformly “as is” to each school and to each required disaggregation subgroup within each school (and to the State as a whole). In other words, NCLB allows no customization or adjustment of starting points based on current school-specific or group-specific results.

■ **Results**

Statewide the percent of students proficient among the eight required disaggregation subgroups was:

<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>Percent (%) Proficient</b>	
	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>
Economically disadvantaged	27	10
Native American/Alaskan Native	35	14
Asian/Pacific Islander	38	18
African American	38	9
Hispanic	32	10
White	53	26
Students with disabilities	6	2
Limited English proficient	12	7

With 6% proficient in reading and 2% proficient in mathematics, the State’s lowest performing subgroup in both content areas was students with disabilities.

Using the second procedure (i.e., the school with a score that ranks at the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile in the State, calculated using enrollment, with all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level), the results were:

Reading - 30% proficient  
 Mathematics - 10% proficient

Since the second procedure yielded the higher values, these values are Hawaii’s starting points or baseline values.

<b>Hawaii’s AYP Starting Points or Baseline Values (% Proficient)</b>	
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>
<b>30%</b>	<b>10%</b>

## ***Intermediate Goals & Annual Measurable Objectives Established***

### **■ Procedure**

Once the starting points have been established for reading and mathematics, given that the prescribed 2013-14 end-goal is 100% proficiency, the determination of annual measurable objectives becomes largely a matter of simple arithmetic – *except for the latitude allowed in selecting the interval for “intermediate goals.”* The intermediate goals may, as prescribed by NCLB, be set for a maximum of no more than three-year intervals and must increase in equal increments over the 12-year period (school years 2001-02 through 2013-14).

The intermediate goals could be set every two-years or even annually. The latter option, in effect, would be equivalent to setting equal annual increments for the annual objectives from the baseline year (2001-02) to the end-goal year (2013-14). Selecting *annual* intermediate goals would, of course, be identical to the “annual measurable objectives” that would increase in a straight line, due to the requirement that the intermediate goals themselves increase in *equal* increments, from 2001-02 through 2013-14.

The “stair-step” options of two-year or three-year intermediate goals were reviewed. Analysis indicated that three-year intermediate goals afforded more opportunity to provide schools with assistance and supports and to focus on attaining a stable target prior to the next required increment in the intermediate goal as well as mitigate fluctuations in annual results due to differing student cohorts in relation to annual targets. Additionally, the release of the final regulations for Title I, Parts A, B, and D, on November 26, 2002, clarified that the first incremental increase in intermediate goals must take place no later than the 2004-05 school year. Consequently, the intermediate goals and accompanying annual measurable objectives were established using three-year intermediate goals with the first increase above baseline occurring in the 2004-05 school year.

■ **Results**

HCPS II State Assessment <b>Reading</b> Scores, Percent (%) of Students Proficient													
Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Starting Point (Baseline)	30												
Intermediate Goal	(30)			44			58			72		86	100
Annual Objective	(30)	30	30	44	44	44	58	58	58	72	72	86	100

HCPS II State Assessment <b>Mathematics</b> Scores, Percent (%) of Students Proficient													
Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Starting Point (Baseline)	10												
Intermediate Goal	(10)			28			46			64		82	100
Annual Objective	(10)	10	10	28	28	28	46	46	46	64	64	82	100