



# ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## **ARKANSAS DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROPOSAL** to the United States Department of Education

**September 17, 2008**

**Dr. T. Kenneth James, Commissioner**  
**[Arkansased.org](http://Arkansased.org)**

# Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal

## *Table of Contents*

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	3
<b>SECTION I: Accountability</b>	
Core Principle 1 .....	8
Core Principle 2 .....	8
Core Principle 3 .....	9
<b>SECTION II: Differentiation Model</b>	
Core Principle 4 .....	10
Core Principle 5 .....	22
Core Principle 6 .....	24
<b>SECTION III: Interventions</b>	
Core Principle 7 .....	24
Core Principle 8 .....	33
Core Principle 9 .....	36
<b>SECTION IV: Restructuring (or Alternative Label)</b>	
Core Principle 10 .....	37
<b>SECTION V: Differentiation Data Analysis</b> .....	39
<b>SECTION VI: Annual Evaluation Plan</b> .....	39



# ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## ARKANSAS DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROPOSAL *EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

Arkansas has demonstrated a strong commitment to student achievement. The Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal allows the state to better differentiate interventions and resources to schools most in need. After six years of implementing No Child Left Behind (NCLB), 30 percent of Arkansas' schools are in some stage of school improvement. Because these 325 schools are very different from each other – some are achieving with their students across the board except in one subpopulation on one test while others are failing with students across the whole population on both tests – Arkansas is pleased to submit the Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal for initial implementation in the 2009-2010 school year.

The proposed model will distinguish among schools by applying different labels, interventions and consequences to schools appropriate to their actual school improvement status based on the 2009 Arkansas Benchmark Scores. These categories of improvement are: Achieving, Targeted Improvement, Targeted Intensive Improvement, Whole School Improvement, Whole School Intensive Improvement and State Directed. Arkansas' present system is based on numbers of years of school improvement with no differentiation.

The Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal enhances and differentiates efforts mandated by state law regarding accountability and school improvement. The more significant pieces include Acts 1467 of 2003 and 35 of the Second Extraordinary Session of 2003, which establish an educational system of accountability that includes standards, assessments, student performance, and professional development.

Act 1467 of 2003 (codified as A.C.A. § 6-15-201 *et seq.*), commonly referred to as “The Omnibus Quality Education Act” or, more simply, “Omnibus,” authorizes the State Board of Education and/or the Commissioner of Education to intervene when a school fails to meet all state accreditation standards or when it meets the criteria for placement in fiscal distress, academic distress, or facilities distress. These interventions range from state-provided technical assistance to state takeover of the district with removal of the superintendent and/or school board. Within the last four years, the state has assumed control of six districts for fiscal distress issues. (Please see <ftp://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/acts/2003s2/public/Act35.pdf>.)

Act 35 of the Second Extraordinary Session of 2003 (see especially A.C.A. § 6-15-401 *et seq.*), creates and mandates the state's academic standards and accountability system by requiring content standards, outlining required assessments, dictating the state's accountability system which includes a “status” and a “gains” model, and outlining required professional development for teachers and administrators. (Please see <ftp://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/acts/2003/public/Act1467.pdf>.)

The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Rule Governing the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) ([http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade\\_247\\_actaap06\\_current.pdf](http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade_247_actaap06_current.pdf)) is the state's enforcement mechanism that encompasses the mandates of Omnibus and Act 35. The components of the rule are monitored by the ADE Standards and Assurance Unit.

While enhancing the effects of the aforementioned state laws and rule, the Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal is also grounded in the *Arkansas Standards and Indicators of School Improvement* (ACTAAP Section 9.12). These standards, adapted from Kentucky, were approved by the Arkansas State Board

of Education in 2006 and allow the assessment of systemic performance of a school by taking an evidence-based approach of three inclusive areas. These are:

<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>Learning Environment</b>	<b>Efficiency</b>
Curriculum	School Culture	Leadership
Classroom Evaluation/Assessment	Student/Family/Community Structure	Organizational Structure
Instruction	Professional Growth	Comprehensive/Effective Planning

The state currently utilizes a scholastic audit in schools identified in School Improvement Year 3 or beyond to determine the implementation integrity of the *Arkansas Standards and Indicators of School Improvement* [http://arkansased.org/scholastic\\_audit/pdf/sisi\\_041408.pdf](http://arkansased.org/scholastic_audit/pdf/sisi_041408.pdf). The scholastic audit is a comprehensive review of a school’s academic performance, learning environment and efficiency. The audit provides meaningful insight as educators make decisions about how best to lead their schools. Kentucky has found the audit to successfully identify the school-related traits that separate high-performing schools from low-performing schools, regardless of student demographic composition <http://www.prichardcommittee.org/Fort%20Study/FordReportJE.pdf>. Although Arkansas is now in the process of analyzing data from the Arkansas Scholastic Audit, preliminary findings replicate those of Kentucky.

The Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal aligns ALL interventions in the proposed school improvement matrix to the *Arkansas Standards and Indicators of School Improvement*. By tying the diagnostic phase of the audit to the interventions necessary to reach these standards, the proposal creates a seamless, comprehensive system to drive meaningful academic improvement for all students in low-performing schools.

The ADE will increase the use of the state’s technology system to maximize its capacity to provide technical assistance to schools in school improvement. The Web-based ACSIP format allows the ADE to promptly provide technical assistance and monitor implementation of comprehensive plans, including state and federal expenditures.

In support of this application, Arkansas notes that it meets the United States Department of Education eligibility criteria for the Differentiated Accountability Pilot:

- Arkansas’ standards and assessment system received approval in 2006.
- Arkansas has no significant NCLB monitoring findings.
- Arkansas’ Highly Qualified Teachers plan was approved in 2006.
- Arkansas provides timely and transparent information to parents who are alerted to a school’s adequate yearly progress (AYP) status by letter from the school. In addition, ADE posts complete school-by-school AYP information on the ADE Web site and notifies state media outlets throughout the state of the release of the AYP list.
- The proposal continues to apply the principles of Arkansas’ federally-approved NCLB Accountability Workbook to all Arkansas schools regardless of Title I designation. The proposal will allow the ADE to better align resources in order to provide assistance to schools and districts in most need without lessening accountability.

While explained in more detail in the proposal, the proposed plan adheres to the Core Principles of Differentiated Accountability.

### CORE PRINCIPLE 1: ACCOUNTABILITY

Implementation of Arkansas' Differentiated Accountability Proposal will allow the ADE to apply alternate labels and to better align and strengthen interventions to schools' needs, but in no way will this Differentiated Accountability Proposal change the current process for determining AYP.

### CORE PRINCIPLE 2: TRANSPARENT INFORMATION ABOUT AYP CALCULATIONS

The ADE partners with the National Office for Research on Measurement and Evaluations Systems (NORMES) at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville for storing achievement data, providing technical support for calculating AYP, and delivering professional development on a variety of topics related to student assessment and achievement. NORMES maintains documentation describing the methodology used in calculating AYP, which is available on its public and private sites. All districts and schools have password-only access to their own information on the private site. Access to reports and definitions are public at <http://normes.uark.edu>. In addition, the ADE posts -- **ArkansasEd.org** -- the Arkansas Accountability Workbook, as well as current and recent annual School Improvement lists.

### CORE PRINCIPLE 3: TITLE I SCHOOLS CONTINUE TO BE IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT AS REQUIRED BY NCLB

The state insures that all Title I and non-Title I schools will continue to be identified for improvement based on the process described in the Arkansas Accountability Workbook. As part of the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment, and Accountability Program (ACTAAP), Arkansas will include all public schools and school districts in the accountability system.

### CORE PRINCIPLE 4: METHOD OF DIFFERENTIATION

Based on recommendations from public school personnel and public and business partners, ADE has selected six categories for labeling that clearly signify a hierarchy of accomplishment to intensive need:

Label	Selection Criteria
Achieving Schools	Meets Standards
Targeted Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for <u>25 percent or fewer groups</u> and <u>do not</u> miss the AMO for combined population resulting in school improvement years one through three (1-3) will be labeled as in "Targeted Improvement" <b>TI-1, TI-2 and TI-3 Corrective Action</b>
Whole School Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for combined population and/or <u>more than 25 percent of groups</u> resulting in school improvement years one through three (1-3) will be labeled as in "Whole School Improvement" <b>WSI-1, WSI-2 and WSI-3 Corrective Action</b>
Targeted Intensive Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for <u>25 percent or fewer groups</u> and <u>do not</u> miss the AMO for combined population resulting in school improvement for four (4) or more years will be labeled as in "Targeted Intensive Improvement" <b>TII-4, TII-5: Restructuring</b>
Whole School Intensive Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for combined population and/or <u>more than 25 percent groups</u> resulting in school improvement years four (4) or more years will be labeled as in "Whole School Intensive Improvement" <b>WSII-4, WSII-5: Restructuring</b>
State Directed	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy after TI-5 or WSII-5 will be labeled as in "State Directed" status

These designations are based on statistical modeling which delineates between targeted needs and systemic needs of improvement in a school. The statistical analysis behind the model is explained fully in the proposal.

#### **CORE PRINCIPLE 5: TRANSITION**

The state does not anticipate issues in transitioning to the differentiated accountability system because the proposed classification works alongside the current system of school improvement year status. Schools' current classifications will be the starting point for the reclassification of new labels and structured interventions.

#### **CORE PRINCIPLE 6: TRANSPARENCY**

The new labels identified in this proposal clearly and accurately reflect the ratings of each school in relation to the implementation level of the *Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement*. The category for each school will be noted on the ADE Web site with links to intervention information specific to the categories.

#### **CORE PRINCIPLE 7: INTERVENTION TIMELINE**

Schools will be required to develop a comprehensive school improvement plan that includes, but is not limited to the assigned interventions by status and that will be implemented the following school year. The Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP) will include a timeline that reflects the urgency for turn-around. Schools will advance in intensity of interventions based on percentage of subpopulations meeting AMO and the number of years in school improvement.

#### **CORE PRINCIPLE 8: TYPES OF INTERVENTIONS**

Arkansas' Differentiated Accountability Proposal presents a system of varying interventions, determined by data analysis and built on current policies and practices necessary to turn school improvement around. The proposed changes, fully outlined in the proposal, will strengthen current practices and more precisely target available resources to those non-proficient students who are in most need.

#### **CORE PRINCIPLE 9: PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICE**

Arkansas was one of 11 states selected to participate in the Supplemental Education Services Pilot for 2008-2009. In that proposal, Arkansas exercised the option of allowing any district in the state to participate in the pilot program. Currently, three of the larger districts in the state have declared the intent to participate in the program, which provides for SES in School Improvement Year 1 and beyond. School Choice begins in School Improvement Year 2.

#### **CORE PRINCIPLE 10: RESTRUCTURING (OR ALTERNATE LABEL)**

After Year 5 in either Targeted Intensive Improvement or Whole School Intensive Improvement, if a school has implemented its interventions and still has not been able to meet AYP, the school shall go into State Directed status. This status involves a possible state-appointed School Improvement Director who will report to the Commissioner of Education (or designee) to oversee the administration of the infrastructure, learning environment and instruction.

The Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal will allow the state to more accurately label schools that are in various stages of school improvement, more adequately assess the needs of schools to increase student achievement, and to implement the interventions most appropriate to those needs. The public will have a clearer understanding of the challenges facing their schools as well as a transparent view of the interventions that have been prescribed to their school. This should promote better understanding of where patrons' schools are succeeding as well as the need to focus efforts to ensure the proficient achievement of all students. These efforts will build on Arkansas' previous accomplishments in raising the performance levels of historically low-

performing subgroups as exemplified in National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) mathematics, literacy and writing exams (as noted by Education Trust in April 2008).

## SECTION I: ACCOUNTABILITY

### CORE PRINCIPLE 1: ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP) DETERMINATIONS CONSISTENT WITH STATE'S CONSOLIDATED ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

**1.1 Has the state demonstrated that the state's accountability system continues to hold schools and school districts accountable and ensures that all students are proficient by 2013-14?**

**1.2 Has the state demonstrated that it makes annual AYP determinations for all public schools and school districts as required by NCLB and as described in the state's accountability plan?**

The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) operates an assessment and accountability system that continues to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for all of its public schools and school districts as required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and as described in its approved Arkansas Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook:

[http://arkansased.org/nclb/pdf/accountability\\_wkbk\\_021208b.pdf](http://arkansased.org/nclb/pdf/accountability_wkbk_021208b.pdf). The ADE will continue to implement a rigorous accountability system and hold high standards for performance as shown in Core Principle 4. Arkansas will also continue to hold schools and school districts accountable to ensure that all students are proficient in reading and math by 2013-14.

In no way will this Differentiated Accountability Proposal change the current process for determining AYP. Implementation of the Differentiated Accountability Proposal will allow the ADE to apply different labels to appropriately describe the degree of improvement required by a school and to better align and strengthen interventions to a particular school's need.

### CORE PRINCIPLE 2: TRANSPARENT INFORMATION ABOUT AYP CALCULATIONS.

**2.1 Has the state explained how it ensures that the components of its AYP calculations include all students?**

The ADE partners with the National Office for Research on Measurement and Evaluation Systems (NORMES) at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville for storing student achievement data, providing technical support for calculating AYP and delivering professional development on a variety of topics related to student assessment and achievement.

NORMES maintains documentation describing the methodology used in calculating AYP. The technical report (*Appendix A*) includes the models used for calculating all components of AYP, including but not limited to, student mobility, minimum N size, factors associated with first year limited English proficient students and the one percent cap.

Also, the ADE has amended the Arkansas Accountability Workbook to build a stronger system for reporting school improvement. ADE does not plan to amend this well defined methodology for determining school improvement with this proposal.



## **2.2 How has the state provided the public with transparent and easily accessible information about how the state calculates AYP?**

The NORMES Web site houses a public and a private site. All district and school private sites are password protected to secure student confidentiality permitting access to individual student data only to those personnel designated by the district superintendent or principal. Educators have access to a variety of analytical reports at the student, school and district levels. The district and school sites house all school and district improvement reports that include status, safe harbor calculations, growth model calculations, secondary indicators and the percent tested information. In addition, student level data are provided to schools and districts to allow for replication of the calculations and identification of the students who comprise the calculations. This offers an unparalleled level of transparency for school and district leaders.

The public site provides parents and communities with district and school performance achievement data by way of the Arkansas School Performance Reports. Other helpful information on the Web site includes the Geographic Academic Policy Series, illustrating results of analysis of achievement and factors that may be related to achievement. The Web site also includes the Analyzing Learning Equity Research Trends site, which provides interactive analysis of academic achievement gaps in Arkansas. The public and private sites are accessed from the NORMES home page at <http://normes.uark.edu>.

Each year ADE identifies the annual school improvement list and is released to the media, as well as posted on the ADE Web site [http://arkansased.org/nclb/excel/ayp\\_si\\_2007\\_101907\\_rev121007.xls](http://arkansased.org/nclb/excel/ayp_si_2007_101907_rev121007.xls). With the release of the improvement list, the ADE invites media representatives to engage in discussions related to NCLB and the state accountability system.

Although the Arkansas Accountability Workbook contains the explanation for the decisions that are made when determining AYP, the ADE, NORMES and Arkansas' Education Service Cooperatives provide additional services that furnish educators and the public with a clear understanding of the state system for making school improvement decisions. Through the state's teleconferencing system, all educators have access to presentations offering explanation of the AYP process and reports. The ADE presents at all state education conferences, as well as various community meetings. In addition, NORMES produces and posts on the Internet a wide selection of reports for a variety of users, including an on-line tutorial for AYP reporting.

### **CORE PRINCIPLE 3: TITLE I SCHOOLS CONTINUE TO BE IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT AS REQUIRED BY NCLB.**

## **3.1 Does the state identify schools and school districts for improvement and publicly report such determinations?**

The state ensures that all Title I and non-Title I schools will continue to be identified for improvement based on the process described in the Arkansas Accountability Workbook. As noted in the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment, and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) Rule [http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade\\_247\\_actaap06\\_current.pdf](http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade_247_actaap06_current.pdf) and state law, Arkansas must include all public schools and school districts in the accountability system. Title I and non-Title I schools receive a school improvement determination prior to the start of school each year. All schools placed in school improvement status have the right to appeal that status to the Arkansas State Board of Education. Title I and non-Title I schools are required to notify parents if the school is placed in improvement and offer options such as Supplemental Educational Services (SES) and/or Public School Choice (PSC). Also, all districts are required to provide an Annual Report to the Public each year explaining the schools AYP status by LEA (A.C.A. § 6-15-2006).

## SECTION II: DIFFERENTIATION MODEL

### CORE PRINCIPLE 4: METHOD OF DIFFERENTIATION

#### 4.1 Has the state established technically and educationally sound criteria to distinguish between the phases (e.g., from “improvement” to “restructuring”) of differentiation?

Based on recommendations from public school personnel and public and business partners, the ADE selected six categories for labeling improvement levels that clearly signify a hierarchy of accomplishment to intensive needs.

**Table 1. Arkansas Proposal**

Label	Selection Criteria
Achieving Schools	Meets Standards
Targeted Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for <u>25 percent or fewer groups</u> and <u>do not</u> miss the AMO for combined population resulting in school improvement years one through three (1-3) will be labeled as in “Targeted Improvement” <b>TI-1, TI-2 and TI-3 Corrective Action</b>
Whole School Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for combined population and/or <u>more than 25 percent of groups</u> resulting in school improvement years one through three (1-3) will be labeled as in “Whole School Improvement” <b>WSI-1, WSI-2 and WSI-3 Corrective Action</b>
Targeted Intensive Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for <u>25 percent or fewer groups</u> and <u>do not</u> miss the AMO for combined population resulting in school improvement for four (4) or more years will be labeled as in “Targeted Intensive Improvement” <b>TII-4, TII-5: Restructuring</b>
Whole School Intensive Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for combined population and/or <u>more than 25 percent groups</u> resulting in school improvement years four (4) or more years will be labeled as in “Whole School Intensive Improvement” <b>WSII-4, WSII-5: Restructuring</b>
State Directed	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy after TI-5 or WSII-5 will be labeled as in “State Directed” status

#### 4.2 Has the state established technically and educationally sound criteria to differentiate between categories (e.g., between “targeted” and “comprehensive”) within a phase of improvement?

##### *Preliminary Data Modeling of Arkansas Accountability Data*

The analysis of accountability data in Arkansas from 2005 – 2007, reveals some important patterns and trends. In contrast to much of the more national rhetoric of schools missing performance goals for NCLB due to one or two subgroups, the Arkansas data models suggest that missing for one or two subgroups is a more isolated situation (see Table 2). A much more common occurrence is that schools miss NCLB targets due to several subgroups in both reading and math. In 2007, 78 percent of schools that did not meet AYP missed the AMO for two or more groups of students. For schools missing the AMO in 2007, 52 percent missed the target for their economically disadvantaged population. More importantly, the configuration of the school district, size of the

schools and total number of subgroups measured within a school system have a definite impact on the likelihood that a school system meets all the requirements associated with NCLB.

**Table 2. Number of Subgroups Missing AMO in Each of Three Years for Schools That Did Not Make AYP in 2007**

Number of Groups (Combined Population or Subgroups) Missed in Math and Literacy from Groups Eligible	Number of Schools in 2007	Number of Schools in 2006	Number of Schools in 2005
0 (schools in Alert or SI for secondary indicators)	35	22	15
1	83	99	120
2	113	118	72
3	68	62	58
4	50	43	82
5	36	18	29
6	51	56	69
7	13	11	14
8	19	19	8
9	3	1	1
10	3	1	1
12	1	0	0
13	0	0	0
14	0	0	0

**Total Enrollment in School**

The more students enrolled in a school system, predicated on the location and the diversity of the student population, the greater number of NCLB subgroups a school will have that meet the Arkansas minimum N provisions to be included in NCLB computations. Thus the size of the school must be considered in the model by considering the number of subgroups for which a school is accountable.

The inclusion of students from more subgroups in NCLB models does not, by itself, present a punitive or negative impact on school systems. For example, [Table 3](#) provides information on *matched* schools that have both made and not made NCLB requirements. This table illustrates that the number of subgroups for which a school is accountable is not the primary challenge in meeting AYP. Rather the more likely challenge presented by schools not meeting NCLB requirements result from systemic, instructional, programmatic or administrative issues.

**Table 3. Comparison of Three Middle Schools' Status with Six or More Subgroups for Accountability in Literacy**

Group	Literacy Status School #1	Literacy Status School #2	Literacy Status School #3
Overall School Status	School Improvement Year 2	Met Standards for AYP	School Improvement Year 1
Combined Population	Met AYP	Met AYP	Met AYP
African Americans	NA	NA	Met AYP
Hispanic	Did Not Meet AYP	Met AYP	Met AYP
Caucasian	Met AYP	Met AYP	Met AYP
Economically Disadvantaged	Did Not Meet AYP	Met AYP	Met AYP
Limited English Proficient	Did Not Meet AYP	Met AYP	Met AYP
Students with Disabilities	Did Not Meet AYP	Met AYP	Did Not Meet AYP

As a result of this empirical evidence it is important that the differentiated accountability model work to provide the comprehensive and intensive interventions necessary for those most needing to improve student performance, while providing greater flexibility for targeted interventions to schools that do not make AYP, but have a much greater demonstrated record of success with the majority of groups.

***Understanding the “Feeder System” Elementary to High Schools***

Schools exist within district systems and are situated in a manner for elementary schools to feed into middle and secondary schools. This process results in a greater numbers of students in a single school system at the higher grade levels. In order to target performance issues at an earlier, preventative level, this feeder system must also be considered in the Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal. For example, an Arkansas high school did not meet AYP for the first time in the 2008 academic year. This high school is the only high school in a district with over 8,000 students. The class size ratio of the high school to elementary schools is six to one. The minimum N in Arkansas is 40. If each of the nine elementary schools has only five Hispanic students, the school is not held accountable to the subgroup in reading and math at the elementary level. Depending upon attendance zones, this subgroup may not be held accountable at the middle school level. However, the high school will ultimately get all five students from each of the elementary schools resulting in 45 Hispanic students. At that point, the high school will be held accountable for this subgroup. If the high school is receiving these students from the “feeder system” and the students are not meeting performance in high school, such a result may be representative of a greater systemic problem in the elementary and middle schools. This must also be addressed in the differentiated accountability model.

If a secondary school (middle, junior or high school) is in restructuring due to subgroups not measured in the elementary or middle schools as a result of minimum N issues, the elementary and middle schools will not be allowed flexible, targeted interventions in *Targeted Improvement* or *Targeted Intensive Improvement* if the percent of students proficient in these same subgroups does not meet the AMO.

***Proposed Measurement Model for Differentiated Consequences***

The identification of schools in Arkansas warranting *differential accountability* involves several components:

### ***Number of Subgroups Missed***

The use of only the number of subgroups where a school missed NCLB is too simplistic because it does not take into account the number of subgroups where a school was measured. For example, School A is measured on ten subgroups while School B is measured on only two subgroups. However, both School A and School B missed meeting NCLB requirements due to one subgroup. If School A is meeting NCLB requirements in nine of ten subgroups it is performing much better than School B who missed NCLB in one of two subgroups. Further School B would have missed NCLB due to the COMBINED category in either reading or math which indicates a greater systemic problem. Therefore, in the Differentiated Accountability Proposal, the number of subgroups missed must be measured with respect to the total number of subgroups measured. This method must also take into account the N size of the subgroups that are missing the goal. To this end, several models were run using three years of AYP data to determine an appropriate method of differentiation. Arkansas proposes using the NCLB Performance Ratio (NCLB PR) which indicates the ratio of subgroups missed to the number of subgroups eligible. This ratio was developed and tested using the data models for Arkansas for three years of AYP.

The models were run using 2005-2007 AYP data in order to determine an appropriate index value for differentiating accountability. The goal of using the index is to establish a continuum of severity for student performance problems to differentiate the most problematic schools in need of improvement from the schools that are less problematic. Focusing the most intensive interventions on the most problematic schools would maximize the state's technical assistance resources. It is logical to conclude that schools who meet the AYP for a majority of the subgroups for which the schools are accountable are less problematic than schools for which less than the majority make adequate progress. For this reason a NCLB PR of 3:4, or 75 percent of subgroups meeting AYP, was selected and tested for this model. NCLB PR values of 60 percent, 65 percent and 75 percent were also tested. Results indicated that 75 percent provided the clearest demarcation between schools needing targeted versus whole school interventions.

The premise is that schools with a NCLB PR of 75 percent or higher are providing a comprehensively sound program for the majority of students, but are challenged by the special needs of one or two groups within their population. Providing flexibility for these schools to target the specific subgroup needs allows the ADE to focus comprehensive and intensive interventions on those schools where the issues are more systemic or more enduring. The capacity of the ADE to provide technical assistance will be enhanced by differentiating the financial and personnel resources to support the varied needs of these schools.

For the 2007 AYP determination cycle, 475 schools did not make AYP in either mathematics or literacy. A subset of 329 schools missed AYP for two or more years. These schools were designated as Schools in Need of Improvement. Arkansas 2007 AYP status distribution is provided in [Table 4](#).

**Table 4. 2007 AYP Status Distribution for Arkansas**

Overall AYP Status	Number (Percent) Schools
<i>Met Standards (MS)</i>	560 (53.9%)
<i>Not Applicable</i>	3 (0.3%)
<i>Alert (Missed one year)</i>	146 (14.1%)
<i>School Improvement MS (SI MS) *</i>	79 (7.7%)
<i>School Improvement Year 1 (SI 1)</i>	81 (7.8%)
<i>School Improvement Year 2 (SI 2)</i>	50 (4.8%)
<i>School Improvement Year 3 (SI 3)</i>	44 (4.2%)
<i>School Improvement Year 4 (SI 4)</i>	54 (5.2%)
<i>School Improvement Year 5 (SI 5)</i>	18 (1.7%)
<i>School Improvement Year 6 (SI 6)</i>	2 (0.2%)
<i>School Improvement Year 7 (SI 7)</i>	1 (0.1%)
<i>Total</i>	1038

\* Schools in Need of Improvement that met AYP for one year, but are not removed until met AYP two consecutive years.

An analysis of the number of subgroups that missed the AMO for these schools indicates 40 percent had an NCLB PR of 75 percent or higher, meeting AYP for at least three-fourths of the subgroups for which they were accountable leaving 60 percent of schools meeting AYP for less than a majority of the groups. Table 5 indicates the percentage of schools that did not meet AYP with a minimum NCLB PR of 75 percent for 2005-2007.

**Table 5. Percentage Not Meeting AMO for 75 percent or More Subgroups for Schools That Did Not Meet AYP 2005 – 2007**

	Percentage Not Meeting AMO for 75% or More Subgroups
2007	59.6
2006	43.0
2005*	60.9

\*Grades 3, 5 and 7 were added to AYP in 2006 resulting in more schools meeting the minimum N for more subgroups.

For the 475 schools that did not meet AYP in 2007, [Table 6](#) illustrates the breakdown of school status based on the NCLB PR of 75 percent.

**Table 6. Longitudinal Patterns for Subgroup Performance of the 2007 Schools Missing AYP Using NCLB Performance Ratio**

Status	Schools Meeting AMO for 75% of Groups 2007	Schools Meeting AMO for 75% of Groups 2006	Schools Meeting AMO for 75% of Groups 2005	Schools Meeting AMO for Fewer Than 75% of Groups 2007	Schools Meeting AMO for Fewer Than 75% of Groups 2006	Schools Meeting AMO for Fewer Than 75% of Groups 2005
Meets Standards	NA	113	100	NA	3	31
Alert	73	63	49	73	23	74
SI MS	79	21	9	0	20	12
SI Year 1	40	46	7	41	37	31
SI Year 2	13	5	12	37	30	95
SI Year 3	9	19	0	35	62	28
SI Year 4	8	0	0	46	22	4
SI Year 5	1	0	0	17	3	1
SI Year 6	0	0	0	2	1	0
SI Year 7	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	192	267**	177	283	201**	276

\*\*More schools had subgroups eligible for accountability (minimum N of 40) in 2006 and 2007 compared to 2005 due to the addition of grades 3, 5, and 7 to the AYP calculations.

Three years of AYP status data were used to model this differentiation of performance providing evidence for proposed differentiated accountability for Arkansas schools. Note that the use of a 75 percent NCLB PR differentiates schools whose performance is improving for the majority of groups relative to schools continuing to have systemic poor performance with fewer than 75 percent of groups meeting the AMO. The majority of schools in the Restructuring phase (SI years 4 and beyond) fall within the more systemic problem schools, or *Whole School Intensive Improvement*. These schools would be required to participate in intensive, systemic interventions.

However, nine schools classified in the Restructuring Phase in 2007 appear to be less problematic, *Targeted Intensive Improvement* schools, and are therefore potentially eligible for differentiated consequences within that phase. These schools would be further evaluated using the additional proposed differentiation criteria of: 1) combined population status; and 2) school size and feeder systems issues. For example, of the restructuring schools meeting the 2007 AMO for 75 percent of the groups, only four schools did not meet the AMO for combined population. The schools meeting the AMO for combined population would be eligible for more flexible, targeted interventions as noted in *Targeted Intensive Improvement*. The four schools whose combined population group did not meet the AMO for 2007 would not be eligible for the flexibility in the proposed model because missing AYP for the combined population is an indication that the performance issues are systemic, regardless of the subgroups that may exist at the school. These schools would maintain their classification as *Whole School Intensive Improvement* schools.

Regarding capacity, investigation of NCLB PR trends over time indicates that 42 percent of schools in SI 1, SI 2 or SI 3 had a NCLB PR of 75 percent or higher in 2007 compared to only 3.3 percent of the Restructuring Schools. These are *Targeted Improvement* and *Targeted Intensive Improvement* schools. [Table 7](#) illustrates the pattern for schools over time. Schools with fewer than 75 percent of groups with adequate progress that are currently in the Restructuring Phase of sanctions will need the most intensive, systemic interventions and require a greater proportion of technical assistance resources.

**Table 7 NCLB PR Trends for Schools Missing AYP for 2007**

Schools Missing AYP 2007	NCLB Performance Ratio	Schools in SI:1-3	Schools in Restructuring (SI: 4 and beyond)
Higher Performing	2007 NCLB PR >75%	42.0%	3.3%
	2006 NCLB PR >75%	34.6%	0
	2005 NCLB PR >75%	14.1%	0
Lower Performing	2007 NCLB PR < 75%	34.4%	20.0%
	2006 NCLB PR < 75%	54.0%	11.4%
	2005 NCLB PR < 75%	83.0%	2.5%

Additional evidence for the use of the NCLB PR in initial differentiation of consequences for schools proportionate to severity of performance issues is provided in [Tables 6 and 7](#). Additional evidence to support the 75 percent of subgroups criteria is provided in [Table 8](#). Note that for schools that did not meet AYP for 2007, 34.3 percent and 19.4 percent did not meet the AMO for the combined population in literacy and mathematics, respectively. These schools would not be eligible for the flexible, targeted interventions designation (*Targeted Improvement and Targeted Intensive Improvement*).

Further, of the schools missing AMO for the combined population, 97.5 percent (literacy) and 100 percent (math) were below the NCLB PR of 75 percent.



This reinforces the notion that the NCLB PR set at 75 percent would capture the schools with the greatest needs for technical assistance and intervention, regardless of how many years the schools missed AYP. The performance of all other groups, except the Students with Disabilities (SWD) group, exhibits the same pattern. It is important to note that schools with a minimum N large enough to be accountable for SWD comprise only 33 percent and 38 percent of the 475 schools that did not meet AYP in 2007. Similarly, schools with a sufficient Limited English Proficient (LEP) subgroup comprised only 89 percent of these schools. Schools that would qualify for the flexible, targeted interventions would be able to focus on their poorest performing subgroups, which may impact the performance of these groups more rapidly than a more comprehensive intervention.

**Table 8. Percentage of Alert and School Improvement Schools Missing AMO in 2007 for Groups Meeting Minimum N**

	Literacy			Mathematics		
	Percent of All Schools Missing AMO	Schools Missing AMO for Group Percent with NCLB PR $\geq$ 75%	Schools Missing AMO for Group Percent with NCLB PR $<$ 75%	Percent of All Schools Missing AMO	Schools Missing AMO for Group Percent NCLB PR $\geq$ 75%	Schools Missing AMO for Group Percent NCLB PR $<$ 75%
Combined Population	34.3	2.5	97.5	19.4	0	100.0
African American	61.3	12.5	87.5	43.7	5.1	94.9
Hispanic	58.8	15.0	85.0	19.2	0	100.0
Caucasian	6.6	4.2	95.8	2.6	0	100.0
Economically Disadvantaged	56.3	16.9	83.1	29.6	6.6	93.4
Limited English Proficient	84.0*	16.7	83.3	51.0*	0	100.0
Students with Disabilities	93.6**	56.6	43.5	67.0**	41.8	58.2

\* 89 percent of schools were not accountable for LEP subgroup in literacy and math due to not meeting minimum N.

\*\* 67 percent and 62 percent of schools were not accountable for SWD subgroup in literacy and math, respectively, due to minimum N.

***Performance on Combined Population for Math and Reading***

If a school fails to meet the AMO (with or without growth) or Safe Harbor in the COMBINED group for either math or reading, such a result is considered to more problematic than a school failing to meet AYP on a subgroup because the result is indicative of a larger systemic problem. The COMBINED group provides information on the overall performance without regard to race, poverty or special educational needs. If a school system does not meet NCLB for math and literacy for the COMBINED group, it will NOT be eligible for flexible, targeted interventions in *Targeted Improvement* or *Targeted Intensive Improvement* as this is a “whole school” concern.

***Test for Concerns Regarding Large Subgroups Missing but Excluded from Whole School Intervention***

The review panel for Differentiated Accountability expressed concerns about the metric proposed by the ADE for identifying schools eligible for differentiated consequences. The ADE proposed using an index

where if a school met AYP requirements for 75 percent of the measured subgroups they would be eligible for differentiated consequences. This metric was proposed for several reasons:

- 1) Examination of schools only missing on the number of subgroups (setting one or two subgroups as the differentiation criteria) created an inherent inequity in the models. If a school was only measured on two subgroups and missed on one, this is very different than a school that was measured on 14 subgroups and missed on only one.
- 2) The number of subgroups measured is based on the size of the school which inherently increases diversity and the number of subgroups. If you examined only the combined subgroup or total number of student's proficient some of the more traditionally underperforming groups may be missed in differentiated accountability.
- 3) Thus, a metric that considered total number of eligible subgroups based on minimum N and allowed for smaller subgroups to be influential in the determination of Differentiated Consequences was essential.

Further, the mathematical assertions of the review panel are untenable given the nature of NCLB computations and inclusion of students in multiple subgroups. The panel was concerned that a school could consistently fail to meet AYP due to one or two of their largest subgroups and be eligible for differentiated consequences. Further, this would occur in school systems with diverse populations. The following example illustrates the impact of inclusion in multiple subgroups.

School A has:

- 200 Black Students with 150 proficient in reading and math
- 200 White Students with 100 proficient in reading and math
- 200 Hispanic Students with 150 proficient in reading and math
- 600 Total Students with 400 proficient in reading and math

If the AMO is 60 percent, School A misses for White Students in reading and math, but makes NCLB in Combined and for Black and Hispanic Students. Thus, School A makes AYP in 75 percent of categories. However, you have not included categories for FRLP, LEP, or SPED. If 50 percent of students in each category *participate in FRLP* and their pass rate is 50 percent you have:

- 100 Black Students with 50 proficient in reading and math
- 100 White Students with 50 proficient in reading and math
- 100 Hispanic Students with 50 proficient in reading and math
- 300 Total Students with 150 proficient in reading and math

School A misses in both reading and math for FRLP students. Thus, they are making AYP in six of ten measured subgroups.

To test the accuracy of the proposed differentiated accountability model with regards the peers concern, data from 2005 – 2007 were analyzed to demonstrate that schools with NCLB PR of 75 percent or higher did not miss the AMO due to subgroups that represented a large proportion of the enrollment.

Question: How many schools are eligible for Differentiated Consequences when they meet AYP for 75 percent of subgroups, but the largest subgroup(s) do NOT meet the AMO?

- Step 1: Identify all schools that met the 75 percent criteria.
- Step 2: A total-N tested value was calculated for all subgroups where they met minimum-N requirements.
- Step 3: The total number of students in eligible subgroups that MET AMO was computed (Called X).
- Step 4: The total number of students in eligible subgroups that DID NOT MEET AMO or did not meet the minimum n was computed (Called Y).

- Step 5: Divide Y by X. If this ratio exceeds 1.0, then more students are in subgroups that missed AYP than in those groups making AYP.

Empirical Evidence: Data from 2005 – 2007 were analyzed and NO schools who met the 75 percent threshold had subgroups with a simple majority of students.

- In 2005, of the 177 schools that missed AYP but met the AMO for 75 percent or more of their subgroups, no schools had an AYP weight greater than or equal to one.
- In 2006, of the 267 schools that missed AYP but met the AMO for 75 percent or more of their subgroups, no schools had an AYP weight greater than or equal to one.
- In 2007, of the 192 schools that missed AYP, but met the AMO for 75 percent of or more of their subgroups, no schools had an AYP weight greater than or equal to one.

In 2007, 70 percent (105) of the AYP weights ranged from 0 to 0.1 or the ratio of enrollment in subgroups that DID NOT MEET AMO to enrollment that MET AMO was 1:10. In other words, for 70 percent of the schools, the students in the subgroups that DID NOT MEET AMO represent only ten percent of the students in the subgroups who MET the AMO. This demonstrates the 75 percent model is correctly identifying schools that warrant a differentiated label and interventions.

Thirty percent (44) of the schools' AYP weights ranged from 0.11 to 0.44. No schools had more than 50 percent of the enrollment in subgroups miss the AMO compared to the enrollment that met the AMO when the school met on 75 percent or more of groups. All of the schools in the targeted category had less than a 5:10 ratio of subgroup enrollment that DID NOT MEET the AMO compared to subgroup enrollment that MET AMO.

In 2006, 79 percent of these schools had an AYP weight of 0.10 or less. All of the schools in the targeted category had less than a 5:10 ratio of subgroup enrollment that DID NOT MEET the AMO compared to subgroup enrollment that MET AMO.

In 2005, 48 percent of the schools had an AYP weight of 0.10 or less. Ninety-nine percent of the schools in the targeted category had less than a 4:10 ratio of subgroup enrollment that DID NOT MEET the AMO compared to subgroup enrollment that MET AMO. One school had an AYP weight of 0.62.

This analysis demonstrates the majority of students are in subgroups that are meeting AYP for schools that meet the AMO for 75 percent or more of eligible subgroups.

**4.3 Has the state provided a description and detailed examples of how schools could move between different categories and phases of improvement?**

The Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal moves schools through the improvement process in a manner similar to the current process being implemented in the state. If a school fails to meet the identified AYP target, the school will continue to receive increased interventions and sanctions. Schools can also move between *Targeted* and *Whole School* categories depending on the percentage of subgroups meeting the AYP target. A school will be removed from the state's improvement list when it meets the AYP target for two consecutive years.

**4.4 Has the state proposed a technically and educationally sound process for using valid and reliable additional academic indicators (e.g., science assessments, academic improvement over time) to differentiate among identified schools or school districts? Are these additional academic indicators applicable to all students within a grade span?**

Arkansas will not incorporate the additional academic indicators to differentiate among identified schools or school districts into its Differentiated Accountability Proposal. Arkansas will continue to use

the additional academic indicators (attendance, graduation rate and the pilot growth model) as noted in the current Accountability Workbook.

**Address concerns for perceived or potential bias in Arkansas' method for differentiating between schools.**

The peer review committee has expressed concern regarding the method proposed to "differentiate" schools and the placement in whole-school versus targeted interventions. More specifically, the committee suggests that an inherent bias may exist due to the assignment of more schools to whole school intervention programs that have fewer than eight subgroups than those schools that have eight or more subgroups. The ADE does not attribute this discrepancy to "bias" but to an understanding of the school systems and purpose of whole-school versus targeted interventions.

First, schools are typically measured on an even number of subgroups (e.g., 2, 4, 6, etc.), with limited cases where a school is measured on an odd number (e.g., 1, 3, 5, etc.). If a subgroup has the minimum N to be accountable in reading it will typically have the required minimum N to be measured in math. Second, all students are measured in at least two subgroups, the combined and their specific race category. If a school is measured on only four subgroups it is predominantly one race, and if it fails to meet 75% of the AYP subgroups it demonstrates a need for "whole-school" intervention. For example, a school has 200 students assessed as part NCLB, 160 of whom are Caucasian, a Performance Goal (PG) of 60% and a Minimum N of 40. The school does not meet the minimum N for Black, Hispanic, LEP, SPED, or FRLP. If the school fails to meet the PG for Combined, this means at least 40% of the student body is not proficient (or 80 students), including the application of confidence intervals, safe harbor, and growth it indicates actually almost 50% of students are NOT proficient in reading or math. This does not warrant targeted intervention but is more appropriate for whole school intervention. Third, if this is a large school with 1,000 students and 80% Caucasian, the same issue exists. If the school is only measured on four subgroups, but the school misses on two (i.e., 50% AYP) it is still in need of whole-school intervention due to the large number of students who would not be proficient. If it misses on one subgroup, at 75% it is eligible for targeted interventions.

In contrast, what if this larger school is measured for AYP on six subgroups, has 1,000 measured students, and the third subgroup is FRLP. For example, what if 200 students are in FRLP and 100 fail to meet AYP in both reading and math? Additionally, suppose all 800 students in the Caucasian category are proficient. This means only 100 students of 1,000 are proficient and a case can be made for targeted intervention for this school. In reality, this school doesn't exist. In theory it may exist, but in actuality it simply doesn't exist. Additionally, inclusion of the Combined groups in the models

**Key Arkansas Facts for 2008 AYP:**

- Total Schools: 1083
- Max Enrollment: 3,135
- Median Enrollment: 378
- Minimum Enrollment: 28
- Trimmed Median (bottom 5% and top 5% set aside): 368
- Trimmed Skewness: 0.5
- Trimmed Kurtosis: -.31 (The trimmed analysis makes the data approximately normal)
- Total number of schools with 7 or fewer subgroups: 660 (60.9%)
- Total number of schools with 8 or more subgroups: 423 (39.1%)

**Key Committee Facts for 2008 AYP for Schools Measured on 7 or Fewer Subgroup Categories (N = 660):**

- Schools that Made AYP in 2008: 476

- Schools that missed AYP on 1 or 2 subgroups: 78
  - Of these schools, those who missed AYP on one category who would be identified for whole-school improvement: 0
  - Of these schools, those who missed AYP on two categories, but met on over 50% of AYP subgroup categories, identified for whole-school improvement: 20
  - Of these 20 schools, the number who were measured on seven subgroup categories: 9 (11 on 6 subgroup categories for 20 total)
  - Of these 20 schools, ten are in School Improvement from previous years performance (7 Schools in year 3 or worse)
  - Of these 20 schools, ten are in Alert and would NOT be required to participate in whole-school improvement or targeted services.

Thus, of 1083 schools, only three would represent the scenario identified as a concern by the Committee. Of these three schools their respective enrollments are 159, 200, and 492. Incidentally, all three missed due to their free/reduced lunch population.

- School 1 with a Total Enrollment of 492: For the COMBINED subgroup only 57.9% and 52.9% of 159 students tested were proficient in Math and Literacy, respectively. For the FRLP subgroup only 45.1% and 33.3% of 91 students tested were proficient in Math and Literacy, respectively.
- School 2 with a Total Enrollment of 159: For the COMBINED subgroup only 58% and 43.5% of 88 students tested were proficient in Math and Literacy, respectively. For the FRLP subgroup only 50.9% and 29.5% of 57 students tested were proficient in Math and Literacy, respectively.
- School 3 with a Total Enrollment of 200: For the COMBINED subgroup only 46.8% and 35% of 80 students tested were proficient in Math and Literacy, respectively. For the African-American subgroup only 44.9% and 34.3% of 70 students tested were proficient in Math and Literacy, respectively.

All three schools did NOT make AYP via percent proficient for at least four subgroup categories. Schools 1 and 2 ultimately missed AYP on two subgroup categories because they made Safe Harbor on the other two categories. School 3 ultimately only missed AYP on two subgroup categories because they made AYP via growth, however, even with growth, they only had seven students who met growth, but this added to percent proficient met growth.

ADE believes that this analysis provides the state relief from the committees concerns. More specifically, AYP is a series of steps designed to provide the greatest benefit of the doubt to each school system via percent proficient, confidence intervals, safe harbor, and growth. Ultimately, when a school does NOT make this 75% goal it represents a much greater systemic problem.

One of the consultants on this project worked at the ADE for several years and the target of 75% was developed on multiple iterations at the national level examining 50%, 60%, 70%, 75%, and 80%. The target for national levels was selected at 75% due to the examination of the impact of Safe Harbor, confidence intervals, and the use of Status-Plus scoring systems via growth models. Ultimately, the goal of Differentiated Accountability models was to identify those schools in greatest need of interventions, and relief. ADE believes that this model meets that goal.

## CORE PRINCIPLE 5: TRANSITION

### 5.1 How does the differentiated accountability model consider the current status of a school (e.g., how will a school transition from corrective action in 2007-08 to a new phase under the differentiated accountability model in 2008-09 without starting over in the intervention timeline)?

As previously noted, the process of determining AYP as approved in the Arkansas Accountability Workbook will continue. Based upon current school improvement planning requirements and process, the state does not anticipate issues in transitioning to the differentiated accountability system. Since the proposed differentiated accountability classification works alongside the current system of school improvement year status, a school's current classification will be the starting point for the re-classification of new labels and structured interventions as indicated in [Table 9](#).

A school that meets standards for AYP will be designated an *Achieving School*. A school that has not made AYP for one year will continue to be designated as an *Alert School*. The remaining schools will receive the differentiated accountability status based on the prior year's status and the schools' NCLB PR (percent of groups meeting AMO). For example, if a school is currently in School Improvement Year 2 and fails to make AYP this school year, the school will be placed in *Targeted Improvement Year 3* or *Whole School Improvement Year 3: Corrective Action* (depending on the percentage of subpopulations meeting AMO). See Core Principle 4 for the number of schools falling into each category under the Differentiated Accountability Proposal.

Movement can occur sequentially by year if a school remains in the targeted or systemic category (orange arrows if progressing in *Targeted Improvement* categories and red if progressing in *Whole School Improvement* categories). Movement can also occur for schools moving between *Targeted* and *Whole School* depending on the percentage of subgroups missed. If a *Targeted* school in TI-2 continues to miss AYP and misses for more than 25 percent of groups, the school would progress on the continuum a year and move to the *Whole School Improvement* designation WSI-3: Corrective Action. This is represented by the red arrows from *Targeted Improvement* to the next year's *Whole School Improvement*. In contrast, if a *Whole School Improvement* school (WI-2) misses AYP again, but only misses for 25 percent or less of its subgroups, the school would move to *Targeted Improvement* (TI-3: Corrective Action).

Any school that has met its AYP targets for two years will be relieved from mandated improvement interventions and sanctions. The designations *Targeted Improvement: Achieving Year X* or *Whole School Improvement: Achieving Year X* would indicate the school has achieved the standard for one year and must meet for a second consecutive year in the same subject to be removed from the Improvement list. The same would hold true for the *Targeted Intensive* and *Whole School Intensive* schools. These are represented as a lateral move on the transition chart. If a school meets AYP for 2 years consecutively in the same subject then the school receives a designation of *Achieving School* and is removed from the improvement list.

**Table 9. Transition of Status Designation from Current AYP Accountability to Differentiated Accountability**

<b>Years Missing AMO</b>	<b>Current AYP Accountability</b>	<b>Differentiated AYP Accountability</b>	<b>Differentiated AYP Accountability</b>	<b>Exiting Improvement</b>
	<b>Status Designation</b>	<b>Targeted Status Designation</b>	<b>Whole School Status Designation</b>	
0	Meets Standards	Achieving School	Achieving School	
		<b>Schools Meeting AMO for 75% or More of Groups</b>	<b>Schools Meeting AMO for Less Than 75% of Groups and/or Combined Population</b>	<b>School Meets Standards for All Groups in Subsequent Year</b>
1	Alert	Alert	Alert	Achieving School
2	School Improvement: Year 1 (SI:1)	Targeted Improvement: Year 1 (TI-1)	Whole School Improvement: Year 1 (WSI-1)	Targeted Improvement: Achieving Year 1 or Whole School Improvement: Achieving Year 1 (TI-A-1) or (WSI-A-1)
3	School Improvement: Year 2 (SI:2)	Targeted Improvement: Year 2 (TI-2)	Whole School Improvement: Year 2 (WSI-2)	Targeted Improvement: Achieving Yr 2 or Whole School Improvement: Achieving Yr 2 (TI-A-2) or (WSI-A-2)
4	School Improvement: Year 3 Corrective Action (SI:3)	Targeted Improvement: Year 3 (TI-3: Corrective Action)	Whole School Improvement: Year 3 (WSI-3: Corrective Action)	Targeted Improvement: Achieving Yr 3 or Whole School Improvement: Achieving Yr 3 (TI-A-3: Corrective Action) or (WSI-A-3: Corrective Action)
5 or more	School Improvement: Year 4 (SI:4)	Targeted Intensive Improvement: Year 4 (TII-4, TII-5: Restructuring)	Whole School Intensive Improvement: Year 4 (WSII-4, WSII-5: Restructuring)	Targeted Intensive Improvement: Achieving Yr 4 or Whole School Intensive Improvement: Achieving Yr 4 (TII-A-4, etc.) or (WSII-A-4, etc.)

**5.2 How will the state ensure students participating in public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) during the 2007-08 school year continue to have those options available to them during the transition, even if they would not be eligible under the state's proposed differentiated accountability model?**

Previously identified schools in improvement will be required to continue providing SES and PSC to all students currently receiving those services in 2008-09. Please see Core Principle 9 for more information concerning the state's SES and PSC plans.

**CORE PRINCIPLE 6: TRANSPARENCY OF DIFFERENTIATION AND INTERVENTIONS**

**6.1 How has the state ensured that the process for differentiation is data-driven and accessible to the public?**

The new labels identified in this proposal clearly and accurately reflect the ratings of each school in relation to the implementation level of the *Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement* (see Core Principle 7 for overview). The category for each school will be noted on the ADE Web site with links to intervention information specific to the categories. In addition, school improvement information is listed on the Annual School Performance Reports mailed to each parent and must be included in each school district's annual report to the public.

**SECTION III: INTERVENTIONS**

**CORE PRINCIPLE 7: INTERVENTION TIMELINE**

**7.1 Has the state established a comprehensive system of interventions and clearly described how the interventions relate to the academic achievement of the schools?**

Arkansas' Differentiated Accountability Proposal presents a system of interventions, informed by data analysis and educationally sound research. The system of interventions focuses on alignment to the *Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement*, which is designed to promote meaningful reform in schools. Schools will be required to develop a comprehensive school improvement plan which includes, but is not limited to, the assigned interventions by status which will be implemented the following school year. The Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP) will include a timeline that reflects the urgency for turn-around.

Schools will advance in intensity of interventions based on percentage of subpopulations meeting AMO and the number of years in school improvement. Arkansas is dedicated to the success of all students and will reallocate school improvement funds and resources, including time and personnel, to provide targeted interventions to schools most in need. Arkansas will use data analysis to ensure all students are appropriately served.

All schools in school improvement will review the school ACSIP annually. In the *Targeted* and *Whole School Improvement* status levels of interventions, schools are given state guidance in the decision making process. If schools progress to more intensive phases, the state transitions from a more collaborative approach to a more directive one. The state will work cooperatively with the 15 Education Service Cooperatives, 12 Math and Science Centers, 10 Education Renewal Zones (ERZ), 5 Migrant Education Cooperatives, the Arkansas Workforce Education, the Arkansas Leadership Academy and other in-state and out-of-state agencies and organizations to provide differentiated support to schools in all stages of school improvement.



In addition, a State Specialty Team will be created to assist in enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the school improvement system for those schools in School Improvement Year 3 and beyond. The State Specialty Team may consist of regional math and literacy specialists, special education supervisors, data-analysis specialists, intervention specialists, parent involvement coordinators, leadership coordinators, ELL coordinators, gifted and talented coordinators, finance specialists, ALE advisors, early childhood specialists and/or others as deemed necessary based on the differentiated needs of the school. The State Specialty Team members will be selected based on expertise with regional experts being utilized as much as possible. The State Specialty Team, working with the district administrator and school staff will use data analysis to identify students within subgroups and students representing small numbers within subgroups to plan targeted interventions for all underachieving students as represented in Academic Improvement Plans (AIP) for math and/or literacy and Intensive Reading Interventions (IRI).

<b>Targeted Improvement (TI)</b>	
<b>Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement</b>	<b>Schools</b> identified in <i>Targeted Improvement</i> shall implement and provide documentation of required interventions.
Academic Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that each student experiences a rigorous curriculum aligned to the Arkansas Curriculum Framework</li> <li>• Analyze test data and secondary indicators to determine school improvement plan</li> <li>• Identify content, subpopulations and secondary indicators to be continually monitored for growth; using a math and literacy “Assessment Wall” to track grade level, classroom and student growth</li> <li>• Implement targeted research-based practices that address the specific needs of the subpopulation identified for math and literacy</li> </ul>
Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide targeted student services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide state-approved SES <u>or</u> offer PSC for all students at the school in TI Year 1</li> <li>- Provide state-approved SES <u>and</u> offer PSC to all students at the school in TI Year 2 and TI Year 3</li> <li>- Require schools to post math and/or literacy AIP or IRI on-line</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide quality professional development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participate in professional development on how to analyze and effectively use data</li> <li>- Implement a quality instructional coaching model with trained educators in TI Year 3 for math and/or literacy</li> <li>- Require teachers to make individual professional development plans based on student data and classroom observations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require documentation of daily “classroom walk through” observations by the building administrator to monitor classroom instruction</li> <li>• Report school improvement plan progress to the superintendent quarterly, who in turn will report the progress to the school board</li> <li>• Notify parents that the school is identified as TI Year 1, 2, or 3</li> <li>• Review policies, procedures and practices that may present barriers to all students’ achievement</li> </ul>
<b>Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement</b>	<b>ADE</b> shall provide on-site technical assistance from ADE ACSIP Supervisors or other designated staff. In addition, State Specialty Teams will assist in enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the school improvement system for those schools in TI Year 3.
Academic Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information and direction on best practices as noted in Scientific Based</li> </ul>

	Reading Research (SBRR) and clearinghouses
Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide opportunities for leadership training to school leadership teams</li> <li>• Provide faculty members with professional development on how to analyze and effectively use data to build school capacity and improve student performance</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide assistance in development and implementation of a school leadership team that focuses on the targeted subpopulation(s) missing the AMO. The leadership team would be responsible for reviewing progress monitoring data, making adjustments in student interventions monthly and overseeing the implementation of the school improvement plan.</li> <li>• Assist in the development of a school improvement plan that follows the school improvement process and clearly outlines the necessary interventions and actions to move all students to proficiency by 2013-2014</li> </ul>

In addition to the required interventions and the ADE technical assistance, schools in TI Year 3 must select at least **one additional intervention** based on multi-year progress and data based identified needs:

- Schedule and participate in a scholastic audit
- Provide preschool opportunities within the district and/or campus
- Hire a parent & community specialist to assist in community and parental support
- Extend learning time for students on topics and skills that lack sufficient progress in math and/or literacy
- Reallocate funds for additional professional development in math and/or literacy

<b>Whole School Improvement (WSI)</b>	
<b>Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement</b>	<b>Schools identified in <i>Whole School Improvement</i> shall implement and provide documentation of required interventions.</b>
Academic Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that each student experiences a rigorous curriculum aligned to the Arkansas Curriculum Framework</li> <li>• Analyze test data and secondary indicators to determine school improvement plan</li> <li>• Identify content, subpopulations and secondary indicators to be continually monitored for growth; using a math and literacy “Assessment Wall” to track grade level, classroom and student growth</li> <li>• Implement targeted research-based practices that address the specific needs of all students identified as below proficient</li> <li>• Assess student learning frequently with standards-based assessments</li> <li>• Provide additional time on task by implementing quality after school, before school, and/or summer school for the purpose of alternative instruction, small group intervention, one-to-one intervention or acceleration for schools in WSI Year 3</li> </ul>
Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide targeted student services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide state-approved SES <u>or</u> offer PSC for all students at the school in WSI Year 1</li> <li>- Provide state-approved SES <u>and</u> offer PSC to all students at the school in WSI Year 2 and WSI Year 3</li> <li>- Require schools to post math and/or literacy AIP or IRI on-line</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide quality professional development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participate in professional development on how to analyze and effectively use data</li> <li>- Implement a quality instructional coaching model with trained educators in WSI Year 3 for math and/or literacy</li> <li>- Require teachers to make individual professional development plans based on student data and classroom observations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require documentation of daily “classroom walk through” observations by the</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>building administrator to monitor classroom instruction</li> <li>• Conduct an audit of time resource allocation for the principal and increase the amount of time for instructional leadership</li> <li>• Report school improvement plan progress to the superintendent quarterly, who in turn will report the progress to the school board</li> <li>• Notify parents that the school is identified as WSI Year 1, 2, or 3</li> <li>• Review policies, procedures and practices that may present barriers to all students' achievement</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement</b>	<b>ADE shall provide on-site technical assistance from ADE ACSIP Supervisors. In addition, State Specialty Teams will assist in enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the school improvement system for those schools in WSI Year 3.</b>
Academic Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information and direction on best practices as noted in Scientific Based Reading Research (SBRR) and clearinghouses</li> </ul>
Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide professional development on how to analyze and effectively use data to build school capacity and improve student performance.</li> <li>• Provide opportunities for leadership training to leadership teams</li> <li>• Provide professional development for all faculty members on higher expectations for all students in Year 3</li> <li>• Provide leadership training and facilitate the leadership team process for all faculty members</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide assistance in development and implementation of a school leadership team that focuses on the targeted subpopulation(s) missing the AMO. The leadership team would be responsible for reviewing progress monitoring data and making adjustments in student interventions monthly and overseeing the implementation of the school improvement plan.</li> <li>• Develop a school improvement plan that follows the school improvement process and clearly outlines the necessary interventions and actions to move all students to proficiency by 2013-2014</li> </ul>

In addition to the required interventions and the ADE technical assistance, schools in WSI Year 3 must select at least **one additional intervention** based on multi-year progress and data-based, identified needs:

- Schedule and participate in a scholastic audit
- Provide preschool opportunities within the district and/or campus
- Hire a parent & community specialist to assist in community and parental support
- Accelerate community collaborations by bringing parents, students, educators, non-profit entities, foundations, and business interest together to focus on systemic improvements
- Extend learning time for students on topics and skills that lack sufficient progress in math and/or literacy
- Reallocate funds for additional professional development in math and/or literacy
- Subcontract with recognized educators, such as National Board Certified Teachers, Milken Winners and/or Arkansas State Teacher of the Year Finalists to assist in data analysis, observations, and mentoring

<b>Targeted Intensive Improvement (TII)</b>	
<b>Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement</b>	<b>Schools identified in <i>Targeted Intensive Improvement</i> shall implement and provide documentation of required interventions. Schools identified in <i>Targeted Intensive Improvement</i> <u>will implement actions included under <i>Targeted Improvement</i> as deemed necessary by the assigned State Specialty Team.</u></b>
Academic Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess progress and continue implementation of best instructional strategies listed in <i>Targeted Improvement</i></li> </ul>
Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide state-approved SES and offer PSC to all students at the school</li> </ul>

Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notify parents that the school is identified as TII Year 4 or 5</li> <li>• Schedule and participate in a scholastic audit</li> </ul>
<b>Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement</b>	<b>ADE shall provide on-site technical assistance from ADE ACSIP Supervisors of other designated staff. In addition, State Specialty Teams will assist in enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the school improvement system.</b>
Academic Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement a Response-to Intervention Plan (Arkansas' Closing the Gap Model) that address curriculum, instruction, assessments and appropriate student interventions</li> <li>• Implement an ongoing, systematic and coherent assessment system</li> <li>• Implement with high-fidelity, proven academic programs that will enable all students to meet academic objectives</li> </ul>
Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide professional development for all faculty members focusing on high expectations for all students</li> <li>• Provide leadership training and facilitate the leadership team process for all faculty members</li> <li>• Provide training based on the scholastic audit results for all faculty members</li> <li>• Assist with the design of a comprehensive instructional coaching plan that addresses classroom needs in deficit areas of math and/or literacy</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide assistance in analyzing the "classroom walk through" data</li> <li>• Assist with the reallocation of available funding, to include state and federal funds, to implement the school improvement plan</li> <li>• Assist in the development of a three-year school improvement plan that follows the school improvement process and clearly outlines the necessary interventions and actions to move all students to proficiency by 2013-2014</li> </ul>

In addition to the required interventions for *Targeted Intensive Intervention* and the ADE technical assistance, the LEA shall select at least **one restructuring action** from the following list for their school in a manner consistent with Arkansas law. Planning for the restructuring shall take place in TII Year 4 and implementation shall take place in TII Year 5.

- Extend the school year or school day for the school
- Restructure the internal organization of the school
- Create a school within a school to address the needs of the targeted subpopulation (must be approved by the ADE)
- Reopen the school as a public charter school or multiple charters
- Replace all or most of the school staff, including the building administrator
- Enter into a contract to have an outside entity operate the school (must be approved by the ADE)
- Any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement (approved by the ADE)

<b>Whole School Intensive Improvement (WSII)</b>	
<b>Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement</b>	<b>Schools identified in <i>Whole School Intensive Improvement</i> shall implement and provide documentation of required interventions. Schools identified in <i>Whole School Intensive Improvement</i> will implement actions included under <i>Whole School Improvement</i>, as deemed necessary by the assigned State Specialty Team.</b>
Academic Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess progress and continue implementation of best instructional strategies listed in <i>Whole School Improvement</i></li> </ul>
Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide state-approved SES and offer PSC to all students at the school</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notify parents that the school is identified as WSII Year 4 or 5.</li> <li>• Schedule and participate in a scholastic audit</li> </ul>

<b>Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement</b>	<b>ADE shall provide on-site technical assistance from ADE ACSIP Supervisors or other designated staff. In addition, State Specialty Teams will assist in enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the school improvement system.</b>
Academic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement a Response-to Intervention Plan (Arkansas' Closing the Gap Model)</li> </ul>

Performance	<p>that addresses curriculum, instruction, assessments and appropriate student interventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement an ongoing, systematic and coherent assessment system</li> <li>• Analyze a complete data set that examines both early childhood services and higher education entry and retention</li> <li>• Implement with high-fidelity, proven academic programs that will enable all students to meet academic objectives</li> </ul>
Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide professional development for all faculty members focusing on high expectations for all students</li> <li>• Provide leadership training and facilitate the leadership team process for all faculty members</li> <li>• Provide training based on the scholastic audit results for all faculty members</li> <li>• Assist with the design of a comprehensive instructional coaching plan that addresses classroom needs in deficit areas of math and/or literacy</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement a state-approved school turn-around model/plan.</li> <li>• Assist with the analysis of the “classroom walk through” data and design of effective intervention strategies</li> <li>• Assist with establishing a progress monitoring plan developed to track quarterly achievement with a monthly meeting of the schools’ leadership team to plan and review progress in meeting goals</li> <li>• Assistance with analyzing the needs of the school and reallocating funds and resources (time, personnel, materials, etc) to meet improvement plans and a comprehensive turn around model of school reform</li> <li>• Assist in developing a three-year school improvement plan that follows the school improvement process and clearly outlines the necessary interventions and actions to move all students to proficiency by 2013-2014</li> </ul>

The LEA shall replace the principal of the school in improvement if that principal has been at the school during the entire time of increasing school improvement status or hire a school improvement specialist (as approved by ADE) who shall oversee the work of the principal on a full or part-time basis at the schools expense. The ADE may, at anytime during this phase, determine how federal and state school improvement funds will be designated. The ADE may defer programmatic funds or reduce administrative funds, if necessary.

In addition to the required interventions for *Whole School Intensive Intervention* and the ADE technical assistance, the LEA shall select at least **one restructuring action** from the following list for their school in a manner consistent with Arkansas law. Planning for their restructuring shall take place in WSII Year 4 and implementation shall take place in WSII Year 5.

- Extend the school year or school day for the school
- Restructure the internal organization of the school
- Reopen the school as a public charter school or multiple charters
- Replace all or most of the school staff, including the building administrator
- Enter into a contract to have an outside entity operate the school (must be approved by the ADE)
- Arrange for the ADE to take over operation of the school
- Any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement (approved by the ADE)

ADE does not believe that planning for restructuring a year earlier (in Year 3) is educational sound and will not necessarily lead to better student and school-wide success. Current NCLB law recognizes that the fourth year of school improvement is when it is appropriate for restructuring planning to take place and Arkansas believes that this is educationally sound. Research shows that to change the systemic problems (culture) occurring within a school system takes a minimum of three years. Also, to move the sanctions for school improvement up a year is a significant change to our plan and puts a huge burden on the state to effectively promote the desire to help schools with interventions (which was our hope with the approval of our differentiated accountability plan). The educational stakeholders, and the “politics” of the state, will only focus on this change and not the other great plans that this pilot will put into place, which is counterproductive. Even though we believe that planning for restructuring should remain in Year 4, aggressive measures to review and work with schools will occur in the third year as shown by our plan. Changing this timeline would undermine the public confidence and support for how this new system could work.

<i>State Directed (SD)</i>	
After TII Year 5 or WSII Year 5, if a school has implemented the intensive improvement interventions and still has not been able to meet AYP, the school shall enter <i>State Directed</i> status.	
<b>STATE DIRECTED</b>	<p>The ADE shall, in a manner consistent with Arkansas law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct a school team to participate in a leadership institute during the summer</li> <li>• Determine how federal and state school improvement funds will be used. The ADE may defer programmatic funds or reduce administrative funds, if necessary</li> <li>• Replace school staff relevant to the failure of students meeting their AMO’s, if necessary</li> <li>• Reallocate resources and provide professional development to fulfill the school’s mandated plan using school district funds, if necessary</li> <li>• Determine the future of the schools status (charter, consolidation, closure, etc)</li> <li>• At the discretion of the Commissioner of Education, the state may assign a School Improvement (SI) Director who shall report to the Commissioner of Education (or designee) to oversee the administration of the school(s) learning environment. The SI Director shall be paid out of school district funds and will share progress reports to the district Superintendent and School Board. The SI Director shall direct the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Implementation of any actions under <i>Targeted</i> and/or <i>Whole School Intensive Improvement</i> as deemed necessary</li> <li>○ Development of partnerships (internally and externally) to assist the school with any <i>State Directed</i> actions</li> <li>○ Implementation of a teaching design that encompasses most effective practices defined in research</li> <li>○ Development of comprehensive data sets with training on root cause analysis within areas such as demographics, student achievement, perception, and school processes across feeder patterns</li> <li>○ Implementation of professional development for personnel, as needed</li> <li>○ Implementation of an ADE-approved personnel evaluation system</li> <li>○ Presentation of a quarterly progress report to the Commissioner of Education (or designee)</li> <li>○ Development of a short-term (45-60 day) action plan to achieve school improvement results</li> <li>○ Implementation of a scholastic audit as needed to monitor progress</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The school shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notify parents of <i>State Directed</i> status</li> </ul> <p>The district shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work cooperatively with the School Improvement Director</li> </ul>

**7.2 Has the state explained how it’s proposed differentiated accountability system of interventions aligns with and builds on current state interventions?**

The proposed differentiated accountability system will align with, build on, and strengthen Arkansas’ current system of intervention support and accountability. *Appendix B* shows the comparison of what is currently required of schools in improvement (*italics*) and what new interventions are available or required.

**7.3 How does the state’s model ensure that Title I schools and school districts identified for improvement that continue to miss AYP progress though an intervention timeline with interventions increasing in intensity over time?**

The state’s accountability plan does not distinguish between Title I and non-Title I schools. Therefore, Arkansas ensures that all Title I schools, as with all other schools identified for improvement, will receive the same level of interventions that increase in intensity over time.

**7.4 How will the state and its school districts ensure that students in schools needing the most comprehensive interventions have access to teachers and principals with a demonstrated history of improving student achievement? How will the state and its school districts target resources to improve teacher and principal effectiveness?**

To ensure an equitable distribution of teachers with a demonstrated record of improving student academic achievement, the Arkansas State Legislature enacted the following initiatives:

- **Housing Assistance**

*Act 39 of the Second Extraordinary Session of 2003* (A. C. A. § 6-26-101 et seq.) created the Arkansas Teacher Housing Development Foundation (ATHDF) to provide affordable housing and housing incentives to attract high-performing teachers to high-priority school districts. The ATHDF efforts focus on opportunities across the entire state. In addition, the Foundation will offer additional housing assistance and special incentives to qualified teachers serve or are willing to serve in high priority school districts.

A “*high-priority*” school district is defined as one that has difficulty recruiting and retaining high performing teachers for grades K-12; has a critical shortage of teachers qualified to teach for any grades K-12; and has 50 percent or more of the students in the district performing below proficiency on any or all benchmark examinations.

- **Master Principal Program**

*Act 44 of the Second Extraordinary Session of 2003* (A. C. A. § 6-26-101 et seq.) created the Master Principal program. The program is a voluntary three-phase program (approximately three years) that will provide bonuses to practicing principals achieving Master Principal status.

The program is administered by the Arkansas Leadership Academy, which is funded by ADE. The Arkansas Leadership Academy and ADE jointly determine the selection of candidates, as well as, review and provide guidance in the areas of individual performance and develop rigorous assessments. Participant must be full-time practicing principals with one year of experience, and hold a state principal license/standard building level administrator license.

The required competencies of the program include the following performance areas:

- Creating and Living the Mission, Vision and Beliefs

- Leading and Managing Change
- Developing Deep Knowledge of Teaching and Learning
- Building and Maintaining Collaborative Relationships
- Building and Sustaining Accountability Systems

The ADE has promulgated rules to effectively and efficiently implement the program: [http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade207\\_professional\\_development.pdf](http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade207_professional_development.pdf). The *Master Principal* Program rules allow the distribution of bonuses to principals that have successfully completed the program requirements:

- \$9,000 annually for five years to *Master Principals* serving as full-time principals in any Arkansas public school.
  - \$25,000 annually for five years to *Master Principals* who are selected and agree to serve in a “high need” school as defined by the ADE. There is a longevity holdback of \$5,000 per year to be paid in lump sums at the end of the third and fifth years.
- **Incentives for Teacher Recruitment and Retention in High-Priority Districts**  
Act 1044 of the Second Extraordinary Session of 2007 (A.C.A § 6-17-811 et seq.) created monetary incentives to recruit and retain high-performing teachers to high-priority districts. A high priority district is defined as having:
    - Eighty percent or more of the public school students eligible for the free or reduced lunch program under the National School Lunch Act (NSLA).
    - A third quarter average daily membership (ADM) in the previous year of 1,000 or fewer students.
    - As of the 2007-2008 school year, in order to receive the monetary incentives, an individual must be licensed by the State Board of Education, complete the entire current school year teaching in a high-priority district and complete his or her contracted teaching obligations.
  - **Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program (REAP)**  
Act 1029 of 2007 allows school districts to implement a restructured pay plan for their teachers as part of a state pilot program. To be approved, applicants for the pilot must show how the school will pay teachers based both on knowledge and skills and on performance, with each overall factor accounting for between 40 percent and 60 percent of the individual’s salary. School districts are allowed to design a model within those parameters, reflecting such factors as education level and years of experience, and performance reflecting such criteria as students’ gains on performance assessments and evaluations by peers and supervisors. Also, 70 percent of the teachers must signal support of the school’s or district’s REAP plan and 50 percent of teachers must elect to participate.

Based on the individual school’s disaggregated data, all staff will be trained in a state approved data-driven decision-making process, as well as become competent in using scientifically based research programs and practices to improve instruction. Intensive and on-going professional development will be provided based on the targeted areas of need. All targeted instructional strategies and professional development will be noted in the school’s ACSIP.

In addition to academics, the school improvement plan will also support the whole child, by addressing the health and wellness of all students. A health plan, addressing the state mandated School Health Index, student Body Mass Index (BMI), Vision Screening, Hearing Screening, and Scoliosis Screening will be addressed in the school ACSIP. Neither effective instructional strategies nor a comprehensive system can be achieved without healthy staff, healthy students, and a healthy school environment.



## CORE PRINCIPLE 8: TYPES OF INTERVENTIONS

### 8.1 Has the state proposed interventions that are educationally sound and designed to promote meaningful reform in schools?

Arkansas' Differentiated Accountability Proposal presents a system of interventions, informed by data analysis to produce the results necessary to improve school performance. The proposed changes will strengthen current practices and more precisely target available resources to those students who are in most need. Current policies outlined in the ACTAAP require schools to complete an individual Academic Improvement Plan (AIP) for math and/or literacy or Intensive Reading Intervention (IRI) for each student that is not proficient. The AIP/IRI is structured to guide schools to use data to drive intervention decisions. A planning team consisting of the teacher, principal, parent and other support personnel determine each student's areas of deficiency using the state assessment results and additional student data. The team then plans remediation or interventions for the student, delineates the strategies that will be used to carry out the intervention or remediation, and monitors the student's progress toward proficiency. The state requires this information to be documented and signed by the teacher, parent and principal. This information is reviewed by ADE Standards and Assurance staff during annual compliance monitoring. This current policy ensures schools are using a data-driven process to focus intervention efforts at the student level to the students with the demonstrated needs.

While the state does not endorse specific standards-based assessments, schools will be expected to identify assessments appropriate to the school improvement plan and implement on-going formative assessments to monitor progress in meeting the standards. Depending on the level of improvement status (4 years and beyond), the schools formative assessment process will be subject to state approval. The state specialty teams will assist the schools in developing the formative assessment process based on the school's data. The state provides intensive professional development in selecting and utilizing assessments for data driven decision making. More important than the frequency of the assessment, the instructor must have the knowledge and understanding to disaggregate the data to determine the learning needs of the students. Ultimately, there must be an alignment of the standards, curriculum, objectives, assessments, available resources and the effective interpretation of the data for a school to function at the highest performance level.

Schools with more systematic needs would require more comprehensive, systemic interventions to improve student performance. Schools may self assess using the *Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement* or be required to schedule a scholastic audit, in addition to providing targeted interventions for students through SES, PCS and AIP/IRI. This approach encourages schools to develop self-assessment strategies and improve upon the school's internal capacity to analyze the effectiveness of its policies and practices and institute changes. These interventions would occur with increasingly more extensive technical assistance from ADE where needed.

In order to monitor the effectiveness of the self-assessment and self-correction process, schools shall maintain AIP/IRI records on-line using the existing online AIP/IRI system available through NORMES' Monitoring Academic Improvement System (MAIS). This system is currently available to all schools in Arkansas on an optional participation basis. This step would be required for all schools in school improvement under this proposal. NORMES' MAIS provides a transactional, online system to collect implementation action, academic improvement plan and intensive reading intervention data to aid schools in keeping dynamic documents of student progress toward proficiency. Concurrently, the system allows administrators at the school, district and state levels to monitor both compliance with the AIP/IRI requirement and content of the plans and student progress. Evidence of the effectiveness of this system is

provided through the results of the Arkansas Reading First evaluation. Excerpts from the yearly evaluation are in *Appendix C*. NORMES provides Arkansas Reading First schools with a similar system that collects implementation data and student progress monitoring data. The system dynamically reports information to teachers and literacy coaches at each school to allow them to plan appropriately for students at risk academically

A series of interventions are planned for each student based on analysis of progress. The Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Plan will only support professional development focusing on research-based instructional strategies. Arkansas teachers and administrators will be familiar with these best instructional practices in order to plan and implement effective instruction. Training and professional development will be provided to *Targeted Improvement* schools in the areas of principles of teaching, principles of learning and principles of curriculum. Research-based instructional strategies target improvement for all students in all subject areas and therefore will not create a perception of discrimination.

Arkansas' professional development will include meaningful, well recognized and research-based strategies for increasing student achievement. All students will be given on-going standard-based assessments to determine individual student instructional needs and as a tool to determine effective instructional methods. This process not only benefits the struggling learner but it is also proven to benefit all students.

The intent of this proposal is to ensure that targeted subpopulations are receiving appropriate intervention, not to exclude other students from receiving services.

Academic progress monitoring and implementation actions are collected at the student and teacher levels. Student level progress and aggregated class, grade and school progress are produced on the system to allow literacy coaches to target their support of teachers and to allow principals to monitor implementation and progress. School level data are also collected for documenting teacher activity, professional development and credentials. Instructional time, literacy coach modeling and principal observation time are documented in activity logs. These data are reported in individual detailed reports or grouped summaries. Professional Development Associates (PDA) from the ADE are assigned to a set of Reading First schools to provide technical assistance, professional development and monitor implementation fidelity. The NORMES Reading First site provides a secure login for PDAs to monitor their schools activity and student progress. This monitoring allows PDAs to pinpoint schools that need additional attention in carrying out program requirements. This data driven technical assistance allows PDAs to target their time to schools with greatest needs.

Schools that persist in school improvement will receive more intensive interventions, such as a scholastic audit. The use of the scholastic audit results along with student and school data enables the school to make data-driven decisions and design interventions specific to the needs of the systems within the school, build capacity and focus on student achievement. In consideration of the Arkansas proposal for a differentiated system, the sequence is designed to allow the school/district to diagnose its own needs and give the community an opportunity to solve local problems. If the local community is not successful with extensive ADE assistance, ADE will mandate interventions.

The School Level Performance Descriptors for the *Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement*, also called the Scholastic Audit Rubric, were developed in Kentucky and are based upon solid research (*Appendix D*). Past literature suggests that school-level reform often occurs in a piecemeal, fragmented fashion and does not adequately account for the interconnectedness of the system (Datnow & Stringfield, 200; Hill & Celio, 1998; Sashkin & Egermeier, 1993). Ideally, all efforts in the educational system would be directed toward a common vision of improvement (Berman & Chambliss, 2000; Dana

Center, 2000; Fullan, 2000, Newmann, King & Youngs, 2000). This attention to system alignment should be reflected in the work of the State Specialty Team and the school as the data is used to determine appropriate interventions and actions for the ACSIP. As the State Specialty Team works with schools to understand the data from the audit, design a three-year improvement plan, implement the plan and evaluate the plan, it will be critical that the work remains focused on creating systems within the school culture that demonstrate success for all students. “Simple plans” work best – those with a direct focus on straightforward actions and opportunities (Collins, 2001, p. 177). Schmoker suggests the focus should be on a coherent curriculum and regular opportunities for teachers to continuously improve their instruction (2006). A “guaranteed and viable curriculum” has the most impact on student achievement (Marzano, 2005, p. 83).

The Report of the National Reading Panel recommended attention to the five essential elements of reading. Reading Next (2004) and Writing Next (2007) offered additional recommendations for quality literacy instruction. The Final Report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel (2008) recommends the mathematics curriculum in grades PreK-8 should be streamlined and should emphasize a well-defined set of the most critical topics in the early grades. But Schmoker goes on to point out that you can’t “guarantee” what you don’t monitor. He recommends state departments randomly visit schools asking for standards maps, quarterly assessment results, and samples of student work. State Specialty Teams will adhere to a state plan to provide regular on-site monitoring and technical support for schools in school improvement.

Monitoring of implementation is enhanced with transactional web-based systems that aggregate input quickly. NORMES provides the ADE leadership and Arkansas schools a transactional system for monitoring compliance with the requirement for student academic improvement plans and intensive reading interventions. This site will be expanded to provide more administrative reports to assist ADE technical assistance personnel in monitoring implementation of intensive improvement interventions regardless of geographic location. These implementation data will supplement the on-site visits to provide a continuous flow of implementation information. The State Specialty Team will use this data for decision-making about the progress toward school improvement.

Marzano purposely omitted leadership from the factors associated with student achievement but recognizes that leadership could be considered the single most important aspect of effective school reform (2003). He defines leadership as administrators and teachers involved in substantive decisions regarding changes that effect their day-to-day lives. Leadership will be a critical factor for communicating and monitoring expectations for the school. Extensive leadership professional development and ongoing support will be required at each status level.

**8.2 How will the state align its resources to increase state and local capacity to ensure substantive and comprehensive support for consistently underperforming schools including plans to leverage school improvement funds received under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, and Title II funds to provide targeted intervention, particularly to those schools subject to the most intensive interventions?**

The Arkansas State Legislature assisted all public school districts by removing various identified educational barriers. The state provides approximately \$430 million to improve and provide adequate facilities for all schools. State Public School Foundation funding per student increased significantly over the last few years in order to provide equal educational opportunities for students in all parts of the state.

All school districts may qualify for additional funding through the National School Lunch Act (NSLA). These supplemental state funds may be used for expenditures such as, class-size-reduction, math or literacy specialist, after school programs, or materials for improving student achievement. Other

supplemental funds, based on calculations, ensure equal educational opportunities in the areas of English Language Learners (ELL), Professional Development (PD), and Alternative Learning Environment (ALE).

To ensure and assist in meeting Arkansas standards, over \$11 million fund highly qualified teachers through distance learning. These funds help school districts address teacher shortages in areas such as physics, foreign languages and calculus. The funds are also designated to address student scheduling, meet various educational needs, and ensure enrichment opportunities.

Arkansas recognized the need for early childhood intervention to better prepare children and families entering school. The state funds 107 million in preschool services and resources statewide through state quality-approved preschools (ABC programs), Home Instruction Parenting Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY), Parents As Teachers (PAT), and other early childhood professional development opportunities and services. Based on the state's mandated Qualls Early Learning Screening (QELI) data, the early childhood interventions have resulted in better prepared children entering kindergarten.

The ADE will monitor all financial documentation in the school ACSIP. State supervisors will assist in reallocation of resources, including funds received under section 1003(g) of the ESEA and Title II, to build internal capacity through a systems approach, if applicable. An on going oversight of the development, implementation, and evaluation of the financial allocation or reallocation of resources noted in the ACSIP will be a priority in order to build internal capacity through a systems approach. The state may consider reassignment or replacement of school staff and/or administration if a *State Directed* school continues to fail to meet AMO.

## **CORE PRINCIPLE 9: PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE (PSC) AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES (SES)**

### **9.1 Has the state established clear eligibility criteria for PSC and SES?**

Arkansas was one of 11 states selected to participate in the Supplemental Educational Services Pilot for 2008-2009. In that proposal, Arkansas exercised the option of allowing any district in the state to be a participant in the pilot program. Currently three of the larger districts in the state, Fayetteville, Jonesboro and Pulaski County Special, have all declared their intent to participate in the program. Students in these school districts must be given the opportunity for SES if the school is classified as School Improvement Year 1 and beyond (or *Targeted* and *Whole School Improvement* with the differentiated accountability proposal). If a school in these districts is classified in School Improvement Year 2 (and beyond), schools must offer PSC as well as SES.

The state has established clear student eligibility criteria for participation in PSC and SES in districts that are not participating in the SES pilot as well. The Arkansas Accountability Workbook states that schools must provide choice options for students to attend another school in the district not in improvement beginning in School Improvement Year 1 (*Targeted* and *Whole School Improvement* schools). Schools may, at the option of the district, offer supplemental educational services if choice is not an option. If a school goes into School Improvement Year 2, the school must offer PSC and SES to all students. This sanction will continue as long as the school remains in any level of improvement status.

In this proposal, the requirements above shall apply unless a district chooses to participate in the SES pilot at which point they will follow the guidelines set forth therein.

Arkansas will continue to adhere to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 and its approved pilot explained above. Any child in a school that has not made AYP for two consecutive years or longer must be offered the option of SES and/or PSC in the district or other approved entities, not identified for school improvement, with priority being given to the lowest achieving children from low-income families.

ADE maintains a comprehensive list of approved SES providers for school districts to choose from when providing services for students. Currently the state has 58 providers, of which 28 offer services to students statewide. Therefore, every school district has at least two providers available from which parents may choose. Of the 58 providers available for 2008-2009, 28 will serve students statewide.

<b>9.2 Has the state established an educationally sound plan to increase the number of students participating, in the aggregate, in PSC and SES at the state level (even if the number of students eligible for these options decreases)?</b>
---

In cooperation with school districts, ADE monitors the quality and effectiveness of the services offered by approved providers and withdraws approval from providers that fail, for two consecutive years, to contribute to increasing the academic proficiency of students to whom they provide services or that fail to meet any of the other eligibility requirements or assurances.

ADE monitoring is in part conducted through the evaluation of the Supplemental Educational Services End-of-Year Report that is completed by both the provider and the school district. In evaluating the End-of-Year Report reviewers consider whether a provider has reached the stated goal for individual students and whether a student showed improvement in the state mandated testing conducted by the student's school. The evaluation includes other academic indicators administered by the school. If 90 percent of the students served by a particular provider reach the set goals and improve on the school's academic reporting then the provider will be considered effective and will be allowed to resubmit their application for consideration. If a provider fails to prove effective in the state's monitoring for two consecutive years, the provider will be removed from the approved state provider list.

In order to increase opportunities for students to attend a quality public school, Arkansas has had a state school choice law available to students since 1989 (A.C.A. § 6-18-206). In the 2006-07 school year, Arkansas had over 12,000 students participating in this opportunity.

ADE promulgated the following rules regarding school choice:

- Rules Governing the Guidelines, Procedures and Enforcement of the Arkansas Public School Choice Act ([http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade\\_275\\_schchoice1007.pdf](http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade_275_schchoice1007.pdf))
- Rules Governing the Guidelines, Procedures and Enforcement of the Arkansas Opportunity Public School Choice Act (to be implemented in accordance with the provisions of A.C.A. § 6-18-227) ([http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade\\_173\\_opportunity\\_school\\_choice.pdf](http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade_173_opportunity_school_choice.pdf))

## **SECTION IV: RESTRUCTURING (OR ALTERNATE LABEL)**

### **CORE PRINCIPLE 10: SIGNIFICANT AND COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTIONS FOR CONSISTENTLY LOWEST-PERFORMING SCHOOLS**

<b>10.1 How does the state ensure that interventions for the lowest-performing schools are the most comprehensive?</b>
--

After Year 5, in either *Targeted Intensive Improvement* or *Whole School Intensive Improvement*, if a school implemented required interventions and still has not been able to meet AYP the school shall precede into *State Directed* status. At this stage, the ADE will may appoint a School Improvement (SI) Director. The SI Director shall report to the Commissioner of Education (or designee) to oversee the administration of the school(s) learning environment. The SI Director will be paid out of school district funds and will share progress reports to the district Superintendent and School Board. The ADE will determine how federal and state school improvement funds will be used, replace school staff relevant to the failure of students meeting their AMOs if necessary, and determine the future of the schools status (charter, consolidation, closure, etc).

**10.2 Has the state established an educationally sound timeline for schools to enter and exit the most comprehensive interventions?**

Arkansas' accountability system is designed with the basic concept of most accountability systems where interventions are the first steps taken after a school has shown a lack of progress in meeting its goals. The Arkansas Differentiated Accountability Proposal status timeline for schools to enter and exit the most comprehensive interventions aligns with the timeline outlined in NCLB. Arkansas has proposed a plan that requires schools to improve the academic performance of its students or face more severe interventions and sanctions. All schools must address the requirements at the level of differentiation associated with their school improvement status.

The first step in the plan requires schools in Year 1 to make AYP for two consecutive years, as AYP is defined by the state's accountability system, or be identified for improvement. A school can be identified at this level in two categories, *Targeted Improvement* or *Whole School Improvement*. A school identified for improvement must make AYP as defined in the state's accountability system for two consecutive school years in order to exit school improvement status. If a school does not meet AYP for two consecutive school years and cannot exit school improvement status, it then remains at the *Targeted Improvement* or *Whole School Improvement* status. If the school receives Title I Part A funds, it must participate in the state's corrective action. The plan requires the SEA to take corrective action if a school does not make adequate progress by the end of the second full school year it has been identified for improvement.

The next level of schools designated as needing improvement will be those schools in Years 4 and 5. At this level the categories are *Targeted Intensive Improvement* or *Whole School Intensive Improvement*. Schools entering this level will participate in a restructuring phase, which is a two-step process. When a school is designated as a school in need of restructuring, the LEA has one school year to prepare a restructuring plan for the school and arrange to implement it. If, during the school year in which the LEA is formulating the restructuring plan, the school still does not make AYP, the LEA must implement the ADE approved plan no later than the beginning of the following school year. If a school continues to go through the restructuring phase and does not make AYP by the end of Year 5 of *Targeted Intensive Improvement* or *Whole School Intensive Improvement*, the school will be identified as *State Directed*.

This third and last level in the Differentiated Accountability Proposal and during this time, the state shall direct the school using the same interventions and sanctions regardless of previous *Targeted* or *Whole School* status. Schools will exit this level if and only when the state deems the school has made adequate progress which means they have made AYP for two consecutive years.

**10.3 Has the state proposed to limit the number of schools that receive the most substantive and comprehensive interventions? If so, has the state provided an educationally sound justification or rationale for this capacity cap?**

Arkansas does not propose a capacity cap at this time. However, the state clearly understands it may take a few years to implement a robust system of support. We will be using researched based practices (ex: Center for Innovation and Improvement, Mass Insight Education and Research Institute) to assist our lowest performing schools.

#### **10.4 How has the state worked with its school districts to ensure that school districts are implementing interventions for the lowest-performing schools?**

ADE recognizes that some schools may need assistance in targeting specific subpopulations for multi-dimensional intervention services including core instruction, targeted intervention, and intensive intervention in math and/or literacy. As a result, the state provides various grant opportunities with low performing schools receiving priority funding. ADE, education service cooperatives and math and science centers continue to be proactive in meeting the needs of schools by providing quality professional development and technical support, at the request of schools and school districts. Educational Renewal Zones (ERZ) provides leadership and guidance throughout the state to member schools. The Arkansas Leadership Academy provides leadership training to various schools within the state to increase capacity to implement interventions. ADE and its partners continue to work together to assist districts in implementing interventions for the lowest-performing schools.

Joyce and Showers (2002) report the value and necessity of quality and on going professional development. In addition to quality professional development in mathematics and literacy provided by regional math and literacy specialists, Arkansas has funded and implemented a professional development portal, Arkansas IDEAS. This resource provides all educators with 24/7 access to online professional development in best practices.

### **SECTION V: DIFFERENTIATION DATA ANALYSIS**

Relevant data analyses are provided in Section II, Core Principle 4.

### **SECTION VI: ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN**

In order to continually inform stakeholders of effective differentiation of consequences and interventions, the ADE will work with NORMES to implement an integrated model to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the differentiated accountability proposal. NORMES will run the same models used to determine differentiation criteria with future student achievement data in an iterative manner for continuous evaluation and improvement. An annual state-level report on differentiated accountability will be prepared to provide trend and longitudinal analyses of school performance and classification of schools based on the differentiated accountability proposal.

NORMES will employ a categorical model to investigate patterns of school classification and movement or transition within the differentiated accountability system. These patterns will be used to inform the ADE regarding the level of volatility/static in transition rates of schools among the different accountability levels. The goal of this portion of the evaluation is to understand how schools in need of improvement transition through the accountability levels and to determine the impact of differentiated consequences on school improvement.

*Targeted* and *Whole School* intervention plans will be documented in ACSIP, along with the financial resources allocated to support the interventions. These data will be examined for congruence with implementation data. Monitoring of implementation will consist of onsite visits by ADE technical support personnel using observation protocols, interviews, and document analysis, as well as online

documentation of implementation and student progress through NORMES' Web-based Monitoring Academic Improvement System (MAIS). Professional Development data for teachers and school administrators will also be collected and included in the implementation evaluation.

NORMES' MAIS provides access to student level performance results on the state exam that are linked to student level math or literacy Academic Improvement Plans (AIP) and Intensive Reading Interventions (IRI). For students who are below proficiency on the state exam, the AIP/IRIs define the students' areas of deficiency and delineates a plan for intervention or remediation beyond the core instructional program. Currently this system is used on a voluntary basis by schools to assist in maintaining records for compliance with ACTAAP. However, schools in school improvement phases would be required to use the web-based system to document student AIP/IRIs, and to document student progress.

MAIS provides a database for state and school level evaluation of both implementation integrity and student progress. Data will be collected, compiled and reported on implementation of the improvement interventions to include professional development activities of staff, curriculum and instruction interventions, and organizational/management interventions. These data will be reported in real time on the site to assist principals and ADE technical assistance personnel in monitoring implementation and intervening where necessary to insure fidelity to the ACSIP.

Annual evaluation will include analysis of student achievement outcomes to determine if schools in need of improvement receiving differentiated accountability are closing identified achievement gaps. In order to assess the impact on the achievement gap, a trend analysis will be conducted to determine progress of schools in increasing the percentage of students scoring at a proficient or advanced level on the Arkansas criterion-referenced assessments as part of the annual AYP determinations.

In addition to tracking changes in schools' AYP and aggregate proficiency levels, the mean scaled scores for math and literacy will be calculated by grade level and End-of-Course Exams. The achievement gaps will be analyzed in a simple and transparent manner by calculating effect sizes based on the mean difference in scaled scores for schools for each year. The formula utilized for calculation of effect sizes is:

$$d = (\mu_1 - \mu_2) / \sigma_{\text{pooled}}$$

where  $\mu_1$  is the cohort mean,  $\mu_2$  is the state mean, and  $\sigma_{\text{pooled}}$  is the pooled standard deviation.

The effect size represents the gap in performance between two groups or sets of matched schools. A reduction in the effect size over time would constitute a reduction in the achievement gap. Effect sizes should decrease over time relative to the effect sizes for 2005 -2007 if the differentiated accountability strategies are closing the gap. Given that 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8 are considered small, moderate and large effect sizes reduction of the achievement gap by 0.25 as measured by effect size would be considered success.

The web-based platform for delivering data back to schools and districts is already in place in Arkansas. All the information for AYP is placed on a web-site based at the University of Arkansas by the National Office for Research on Measurement and Evaluation Systems (NORMES). Included in the private side of this web-site is all the student level information for Arkansas school systems. This private site will be expanded to include information on the Differentiated Accountability (DA) process and performance.