

MEMO

To: Faculty
From: Pat Michel
Date: September 1, 2005
Re: Update NYS State Standards/NCLB

NYS Standards, Assessment, and Federal Requirements

We have been reporting each year to staff about our efforts together to raise standards, implement new curriculum, and improve our students' academic achievement as measured by New York State Assessments. These efforts have involved revising curriculum and providing professional development; providing supports to students in the form of extended day programs, in-school support, and summer programs; and measuring our student success through the use of TONYSS and New York State Assessments.

Federal Legislation enacted in 2002 placed new demands on all states to insure the achievement of students. The following information is from the New York State Education Department's website; it provides an overview of information related to No Child Left Behind.

Background: In January 2002, the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was signed into law by President Bush. NCLB establishes a revised framework for New York State and schools that is closely aligned with our current policies and our State reform agenda for standards, assessment, accountability and school improvement.

Key Provisions Include:

1. Requires States to develop standards in reading and math, and assessments linked to those standards for all students in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006. This testing will be implemented this year.
2. Requires a single, statewide accountability system for all school districts and public schools.
3. Requires states to develop annual adequate yearly progress (AYP) objectives—disaggregated by student groups based on poverty, race and ethnicity, disability, and limited English proficiency—that will result in all students achieving proficiency in reading and math within 12 years.
4. Requires schools identified for improvement (after failing to make AYP for two consecutive years) to develop two-year improvement plans incorporating strategies from scientifically based research on how to strengthen the core academic subjects and address the specific issues that caused the school to be identified for improvement.
5. Requires states to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. States and school districts must report annually, beginning with the 2002-03 school year, on progress toward this goal.
6. Requires all teachers of core academic subjects hired after the first day of the 2002-03 school year and teaching in a program supported by Title I funds to be highly qualified. School districts must develop a plan to ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the school district are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.
7. Requires all paraprofessionals (teaching assistants) to meet highly qualified standards by 2006 if employed before 2002; all newly hired paraprofessionals must be highly qualified if hired after 2002.

8. Requires schools identified in September 2002 for school improvement (year 2) or corrective action to arrange for the provision of supplemental educational services to eligible students from a provider with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. Providers' services must be located within the school district or be reasonably available.
9. Requires schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress for three years or more to offer supplemental services to eligible students. The Robert J. Kaiser Middle School has offered Progressive Learning Tutorial (an approved provider of an online program) to students as well as contracted with Orange-Ulster BOCES to offer tutorial.
10. Requires school districts who are identified as “persistently dangerous” to offer unsafe school choice option of attending another district school.
11. Requires Notification of Parents by School Districts in the following ways:
 - A. Prepare and disseminate local school report cards each year.
 - B. Notify parents of all students enrolled in Title I schools identified for school improvement (years 1 and 2) or corrective action that they have the option of transferring their children to another public school served by the LEA that has not been identified for school improvement.
 - C. Notify parents of each student attending a Title I school that the parents may request information regarding the professional qualifications of the student’s classroom teachers.
 - D. Notify parents of students who become the victim of a violent criminal offense while in or on the grounds of the public school he or she attends, of their right to transfer their child to a safe public school within the district.

Elementary and Middle School Accountability: Target accountability standards have been created for English Language Arts (Grades 4/8) and Math (Grades 4/8). A school accountability test score is based on the number of students scoring at the mastery level (levels 3 & 4).

School	2001 Score	2002 Score	2003 Score	2004 Score	2005 Score	Target 2005
Chase ELA	144	151	179	185	173	131
Chase Math	161	170	191	187	189	142
Duggan ELA	167	168	180	152	179	131
Duggan Math	175	178	191	200	190	142
Rutherford ELA	144	166	138	138	143	131
Rutherford Math	157	152	160	172	177	142
RJ Kaiser ELA	118	122	125	126	138	116
RJ Kaiser Math	91	103	116	143	140	93
High School ELA*			142	151	156	141
High School Math*			122	117	158	139

***School Accountability Score = (percent of students scoring at Level 3 % + percent scoring at Level 4) X 2 plus percent scoring at Level 2. The target score is the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), a score fixed by the state. A school is successful if it reaches AMO or its Effective AMO which a score based on the number of students taking the exam. School may also be successful if it shows growth based on a score referred to as Safe Harbor.**

You will note that all schools reached the accountability score for the total population. The High School is tested on a cohort's performance. A cohort consists of all the students who first entered grade 9 in the fall of the year. For example, 2001 cohort is made up of all students who entered grade 9 in the fall of 2001 and would have graduated in 2004. This is the group measured for 2004-05.

Schools are measured for the performance of student subgroups (subgroups are configured based on: gender, poverty, ethnicity, limited English Proficiency, students with disabilities). All subgroups for our elementary schools met performance targets. For the Middle School, all subgroups met their achievement target for ELA; Students with Disabilities did not meet required performance for Math. This is the first year that the Middle School met its performance targets for ELA. A second year of these improved scores would remove the Middle School from Restructuring for ELA.

At the High School in 2005, Students with Disabilities did not reach their performance target for ELA and Math. All other groups met their targets in both subjects.

Other Accountability Standards for Elementary/Middle School: Science will be used as an additional measure at the Middle School level.

High School Accountability: Monticello High School is measured based on students passing English Language Arts Regents and Course A Regents. Meeting graduation requirements is also a factor in meeting targets.

1. High School Performance Index is based on Annual High School Cohort and will measure the percentage of students attaining the State Standards within four years of entry into ninth grade as measured by passing regents exam.
2. Percentage of students who have completed high school within four years of first entry into ninth grade.

Middle School and High School Accountability Standing:

1. The Middle School has been placed in the status of Restructuring because of its scores in ELA. This required the district to take steps to improve the performance of the school with focus on the groups not achieving at the required levels. The Superintendent selected a school board member, a parent, teachers, and administrators to work with representatives of the State Education Department to develop a plan for school improvement for the 2004-05 school year; the team developed a plan of improvement for the Middle School which was approved by the Board of Education. The plan was approved by the State Education Department. The plan was revised for the 2005-06 school year. The plan has resulted in improved test scores in ELA. The plan is available for all teachers and parents on the district website or by request to the principal.

In seeking to implement restructuring, there are many aspects of the school which we will aim to improve. Some of these include:

- ✓ Improved Reading Instruction for all students; we have implemented an extensive program which has already paid dividends in improved student scores;
- ✓ Improved parent involvement in the school and communication with parents; we have implemented a parent center and have increased the number of activities involving parents;
- ✓ Additional support for students including summer school, after school programs;
- ✓ Additional Supervision by the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of programs;

2. Monticello High School was classified as a School in Need of Improvement in 2004-05 based on its scores for mathematics; it did not reach its performance targets for its total population, black students and economically disadvantaged students. In 2005; all of its groups reached their targets except students with disabilities. The High School is taking steps to improve the test scores for these students. The High School developed a School Improvement Plan and the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent will be working with the Principal, district directors and coordinators and the staff to monitor the plan and work toward improving student achievement at the High School.

Monticello High School, as well as most other schools across the state, is working to improve test scores in Mathematics and all state assessments. We have taken a number of steps to improve instruction and provide support to students. These include:

1. Revising and aligning the curriculum with the New York State Mathematics Standards.
2. Promoting differentiated instruction to provide each student with the help that they may need in learning the material.
3. Providing students with extra help through the afternoon tutorial program.
4. Helping students with test taking techniques to better attack test questions.
5. Reviewing the pattern of student answers to better identify student strengths and weaknesses.
6. Math Classes for attached lab for students identified at risk of not meeting testing requirements.

School Performance Categories: Attached is rubric for rating each school/district's progress towards meeting Annual Yearly Progress. The school or district must meet performance targets for the general population as well as all subgroups.

**Basic Rules for State and
Federal Accountability
Improvement Status Identification**

- To be identified for improvement status, a school must fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two consecutive years in the same grade and subject.
- If a previously identified school fails to make AYP in the grade and subject in which it was identified, it moves to the next highest status on the continuum.
- If an identified school makes AYP, it remains in the same status on the continuum.
- To be removed from improvement status in a subject and grade, the school must make AYP in that subject and grade for two consecutive years. The school may remain or be placed in improvement status in another subject and/or grade for which it has not made AYP.

Please Note: Annual Yearly Progress is now referred to as the Annual Measurable Objective

Accountability Status and Failure to Meet Requirements

Years of Failure Under Title I to Make Annual Measurable Objective in a Subject and Grade Level	Status
Is Meeting Standards	Good Standing
1 Year of Failure	Good Standing
2 Years of Failure	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)– Year 1
3 Years of Failure	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2
4 Years of Failure	School in Corrective Action
5 Years of Failure	School Planning for Restructuring
6 Years of Failure	School in Restructuring

- Chase, Cooke, Duggan, and Rutherford are schools classified as in Good Standing since they have achieved at the required levels in ELA and Math for all groups.
- The Robert J. Kaiser Middle School is a School in Restructuring for 2005-06.
- Monticello High School is a School in Corrective Action for 2005-06, based on its results for 2005.

Annual Measurable Objectives for 2002–03 to 2013–14

School Year	Elementary-Level		Middle-Level		Secondary-Level	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	English	Math
2002–03	123	136	107	81	142	132
2003–04	123	136	107	81	142	132
2004–05	131	142	116	93	148	139
2005–06	138	149	126	105	154	146
2006–07	146	155	135	117	159	152
2007–08	154	162	144	129	165	159
2008–09	162	168	154	141	171	166
2009–10	169	174	163	152	177	173
2010–11	177	181	172	164	183	180
2011–12	185	187	181	176	188	186
2012–13	192	194	191	188	194	193
2013–14	200	200	200	200	200	200

NOTE: Individual Schools have their own achievement based on the number of students taking an exam and schools have yearly targets based on pasted performance. The aim is to have all students performing at mastery level by 2013-14.

MEMO

To: Board of Education
From: Pat Michel
Date: August 17, 2005
Re: Update NYS State Standards/NCLB

We report to the staff each year the status of our schools in regard to accountability under NCLB. I have attached the memo which will go out on September 1, 2005. I hope that it provides the Board of Education with a good update on our status and progress.