This evening we will be presenting summaries of selected 2005 STAR assessments for students in the Fresno Unified School District.

We have spent a great deal of time looking at the assessment results as they have become available, and as a result have taken the step to establish performance targets for 2005-06 based on our 2005 STAR results. The performance targets have also been established in alignment with the first two goals adopted by the Board as recommended from the *Choosing Our Future* report.

This presentation is organized around these performance targets. But we begin with a review of Fresno Unified’s performance as a District.
The Federal Accountability model has 4 main components for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

1 - 95% of students must participate. Even students with parent waivers are calculated in the denominator of this equation, so make-up exams are really important.

2 – The percent of students scoring proficient or advanced on the CST or CAHSEE

These are the big two components. Both schoolwide and ALL subgroups with enough students have to meet the proficiency and participation targets.

There are also two additional indicators that have to be met.

3 - API (The goals for AYP are different than for state accountability).

4 – Graduation Rates (High Schools Only)
Here is a review of the District AYP report.

Our API score started at 623 and went to 643, on a scale from 200-1000.
Adequate Yearly Progress: FUSD 2005

Fresno Unified Proficiency Status: English/Language Arts

AMO for 2005, 2006, 2007 23.0%

LEA-wide African Am. Am. Indian Asian Filipino Hispanic Pacific Islander White SED EL Disability

2004 22.4 18.0 25.3 17.8 43.1 16.9 35.1 45.9 16.0 10.4 7.2
2005 26.2 21.5 27.9 22.3 47.2 21.2 38.1 49.4 20.3 13.3 7.1
## Fresno Unified Proficiency Status: Mathematics

### Chart
- **AMO for 2005, 2006, 2007**: 23.7%

### Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LEA-Wide</th>
<th>African Am.</th>
<th>Am. Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>SED</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Did Fresno Unified Do?

- 77 of 88 schools (with scores for 2 years) increased the percentage of proficient/advanced students in ELA.
- 78 of 88 schools (with scores for 2 years) increased the percentage of proficient/advanced students in Math.

Reminder: This does not include data from 7 Direct-Funded Charters and 2 programs reported as K-12 schools (Fresno Adult School, Year-Round Achievement Center).
FUSD Districtwide 2005-06 Performance Targets: A Roadmap for Improvement

1. Make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2005-06
2. Students score “proficient/advanced” on the CST
3. Non-proficient students advance at least one level on the CST
4. Special Education students score “proficient/advanced” on the CST/CAPA
5. English Learners advance at least one level on the CELDT

FUSD has set the following performance targets. Each of these is presented in more detail on the following slides.
This part of the presentation provides an overview of California’s implementation of NCLB as well as FUSD AYP performance in 2005 and performance targets for the 2005-2006 school year.
Our schools must make AYP in order to exit PI status. Every school must make the “AYP” target at a minimum, in order to begin the process of meeting our accountability expectations from the federal government. These include: Participation, Proficiency, API and Graduation Rate.
FUSD AYP Summary in this presentation include data from...

95 Schools
- 8 Comprehensive High Schools
- 15 Middle Schools
- 61 Elementary Schools
- 11 Alternative Schools

(Charters and Special Programs Omitted)

However, the school counts that will be used throughout the remainder of this presentation will only include the non-charter schools.
## How Did Fresno Unified Do?
### Schools Making AYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addicot</td>
<td>Hoover High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayer Elementary</td>
<td>Holland Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird Middle</td>
<td>Jackson Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullard High</td>
<td>Kratt Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullard TALENT</td>
<td>Lawless K-8th (Safe Harbor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWolf West High</td>
<td>Malloch Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Poly High</td>
<td>Manchester GATE Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Elementary</td>
<td>McCardle Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Computech Middle</td>
<td>Powers-Ginsberg Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison High</td>
<td>Robinson Elementary (Safe Harbor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figarden Elementary</td>
<td>Starr Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forkner Elementary</td>
<td>Thomas Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Special Education</td>
<td>Vinland Elementary (Safe Harbor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Congratulations to all those schools meeting AYP in 2005.
How Did Fresno Unified Do?

- **Participation** (Schoolwide and all subgroups):
  - 94 of 95 schools made AYP

- **Proficiency** (Schoolwide and all subgroups):
  - 33 of 95 made English Language Arts (ELA) AYP
  - 59 of 95 made Mathematics AYP
  - 33 of 95 met Both Subject Areas

- **API**
  - 88 of 95 Made the API schoolwide additional indicator for AYP

- **Graduation Rate**
  - 15 of 16 Schools where this was applicable made AYP

Reminder: This does not include data from 7 Direct-Funded Charters and 2 programs reported as K-12 schools (Fresno Adult School, Year-Round Achievement Center)

This slide summarizes how Fresno Unified did in each of the four major components.

- We did great in participation and graduation rates.
- We did very well in API.
- Where we are struggling is in proficiency.

Let’s take a closer look at each of these four components…
Participation

95% of students are required to take Standards Tests (CST, CAHSEE, and CAPA)

As a reminder 95% of students are required to take the appropriate tests.
This graph shows how well we did in meeting the participation goals.

If a school had a “numerically significant” subgroup, then it is reported here. Since not every subgroup meets this threshold at every school, the numbers go up and down a little.

Both subject areas by subgroup show the number of schools that met the participation requirements. Out of the 95 schools here, 94 met the participation goal in all areas.
As a reminder **SCHOOLS** are evaluated based on the **percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in ELA and Mathematics** (2 separate subject criteria).

These performance targets are called, Annual Measurable Objectives – or AMOs for short.
### Annual Measurable Objectives

**AMOs - 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grades 2-8</strong></td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 10</strong></td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unified School District</strong></td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This slide summarizes the AMOs for all grade levels and is available for district level presentations.
Now that we have discussed what the expected levels of achievement are, let’s take a look at how the district did…

This graph shows, for each subgroup, the number of schools that met or missed the AYP target for proficiency.

As a reminder, the proficiency is the percentage of students scoring at proficient or above as defined by the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).
Since we have shown results based on subgroups, let’s talk about what the reporting subgroups are.

• Everyone in the school is part of the “schoolwide” subgroup.

• For this purpose, every student has to declare one ethnicity.

• The Socioeconomically Disadvantaged is the same at SWP schools. For TAS schools, this group includes ONLY TAS identified students.

• Then we have English learners and
  • Students with disabilities.

Keep in mind that a single student can count in up to 5 different groups. When we consider that each of the 5 different places is counted for both participation AND performance, that student could now count in up to 10 categories; BUT there are also two subject areas, so now that student could count in up to 20 reporting categories!
Here is the status bar for API. Like the other AMOs this one “stair-steps” until 2006-2007 when it becomes steep.

For 2005 results and the upcoming 2006 and 2007 tests, you can meet the API by either of two ways:

1) Have and **API of 590** or higher

**OR**

2) If the API is below 590, then showing **at least 1 point of growth** meets the “API for AYP” criteria
Graduation Rate
as an “additional” Indicator for AYP

A school meets this “other” indicator for high schools by...
- Having a rate above the “status bar”, OR
- Showing growth of at least 0.1 point growth, OR
- Showing growth in the rate of at least 0.2 in the average two-year rate

For our High Schools, Graduation Rate is also an indicator that goes into the AYP determination. There are three main methods by which a school may make AYP for Graduation Rate:

a) Having the previous year’s graduation rate be above the status bar (next page),
b) showing a graduation rate growth of at least 0.1%, or
c) having the latest two-year average be 0.2% more than the previous two-year average.

Some schools with small numbers of 12th graders and graduates may be assigned the “District” graduation rate as a proxy for their school.
This graph shows the status bar for graduation, which, like the proficiency targets, increases incrementally as we move toward 2013-2014.

The rate for last year, the current year, and next year is 82.9%
Here is a list of the posted graduation rates for our main comprehensive and continuation high schools. As we can see, each school obtained a “yes” using one of the available methods.

All of these schools made AYP for Graduation Rate.

Remember that this is calculated using data from the previous year, so in this case, the 2003-04 rate is used to compute the latest graduation rate.
As we complete our description of the AYP process, we move to the consequence section of the NCLB Accountability model.

Under the model, a school is identified as PI after missing AYP in the same subject or indicator for two years in a row.

That means, if my school missed a subject, say ELA, in year one, then the school would have to miss in ELA again in year two to be identified as a Program Improvement (PI) school.

While that may help a school that misses in ELA one year, then mathematics the next, keep in mind that a subject is considered “missed” if any of the criteria (participation or proficiency) or any of the subgroups misses. So a school could miss in Hispanic ELA participation in year one, and White ELA proficiency in year two, and we would still be identified for PI.

This goes for the additional indicators (API or Graduation Rate) as well.
So how did FUSD do, with regard to making AYP?

For the 95 schools, 27 made AYP on all indicators.
Only 1 out of the 21 Year-round schools in FUSD made AYP.

This slide shows the breakdown by PI status.
- 8 Schools will be in PI Year 1 (9 If Roosevelt Continuation Counts)
- 17 Schools will be in PI Year 2
- 11 Schools will be in PI Year 3
- 5 Schools will be in PI Year 4
- 16 Schools will be in PI Year 5

57 Total Schools in PI Status
The chart here summarizes again for you the expectations required under each level of Program Improvement.

We have also provided this as a full-page handout.
Exiting PI Status

- Meet **ALL** criteria for two years in a row ...
  - Both ELA and Mathematics **AND**
  - **ALL** Numerically Significant Subgroups

Once in Program Improvement (PI) status, a school needs to meet **all** AYP criteria for two years in a row in order to exit PI status.

That means the school needs to make all participation rates and all proficiency rates, as well as API and Graduation Rate (if applicable), regardless of what originally was missed that put the school into PI status.

Once in PI status, you have to make everything two years in a row in order to get out.

But we must also keep in mind that the AMOs will only stay at current levels for this year and next, so we need to shoot higher if we are going to make academic recovery a reality in Fresno Unified.
This part of the presentation provides information and status of FUSD with regard to Performance Target #2.
So we are setting a District goal of 40% proficient overall for CST tests in ELA and in mathematics. Our current rates of 23-24% will need to nearly double in order for us to meet this target, and this provides our challenge for 2005-06.

When broken down to a more manageable level, we are talking about getting 2 out of every 5 students to the “proficient” band or above.
2004 and 2005 Students scoring Proficient/ Advanced on the CST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This part of the presentation provides information and status of FUSD with regard to Performance Target #3.
Students advancing at least one level on the CST

- **75%** of students who are “Far Below Basic” in 2005 will advance at least one level in 2006.
  - (In 2005, 57% in Mathematics and 47% in ELA)

- **50%** of students who are “Below Basic” in 2005 will advance at least one level in 2006.
  - (In 2005, 26% in Mathematics and 34% in ELA)

- **50%** of students who are “Basic” in 2005 will advance at least one level in 2006.
  - (In 2005, 23% in Mathematics and 21% in ELA)

No student will drop to a lower level.

We also want to ensure that our students are moving from the non-proficient performance bands up. We’ve had some success at moving students out of “Far Below Basic” and want to increase that percentage to **75% Districtwide** in 2005-06.

For students who are currently at “Below Basic” or “Basic,” our District target is to move **50% out** in 2005-06.

And for all of these, we want to eliminate students dropping to a lower performance band.

The message here is, although everybody may not be proficient by the end of 2005-06, more students will move up than ever before!
Percentage of Students advancing at least one level on the CST in ELA from 2004 to 2005

- Far Below Basic: 47% Advanced, 53% Same, 0% Dropped
- Below Basic: 34% Advanced, 42% Same, 24% Dropped
- Basic: 21% Advanced, 58% Same, 21% Dropped

Source: FUSD database: STARCST2004and2005
Percentage of Students advancing at least one level on the CST in Mathematics from 2004 to 2005

Source: FUSD database: STARCST2004and2005
This part of the presentation provides information and status of FUSD with regard to Performance Target #4.
One of the extremely important groups of students in our District that has not been as successful, is our group of students receiving Special Education services.

While only a few schools have “Students with Disabilities” reported as a numerically significant subgroup on accountability reports, reaching this group is critical to the success of the District.

The FUSD target has therefore been set to mirror the overall targets for scores. **40% will achieve “proficiency,”** in 2005-06.
Adequate Yearly Progress: FUSD 2005

2004 and 2005 Special Ed Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced on the CST

Source: FUSD database STAR CA Standards 2004 and 2005
Target #5: Students Advancing One Level Annually on the CELDT

Fresno Unified School District 2005 Achievement Summary

This part of the presentation provides information and status of FUSD with regard to Performance Target #5.
We recognize that another subgroup in need of attention are our English Learners.

FUSD sets the District target for 2005-06 at **75% of students making annual advances on the CELDT**. This target is consistent with other school districts, and is achievable for FUSD as well.
English Learners advancing at least one level on the CELDT

Source: CDE Title III Reports
If you have any questions about accessing, analyzing or using data
OR
If you need more clarification regarding accountability guidelines,
please contact the Administrative Analysts of the Office of Research,
Evaluation and Assessment (REA).
Additional Information

(Not included in Presentation)
No Child Left Behind is “Federal” in the sense that general guidelines are followed by each state completing and submitting an accountability workbook to the federal government. The federal department of education approves and oversees each state’s plan. So it’s really a collection of 50 different plans.

This act was signed into law in January 2001 with a goal of 100% of students reaching proficiency when they take the test in 2014.

This is a status-bar model. It is standards-based. Students are not evaluated against one another, they are evaluated against the California content standards.

The model assumes increasing percentages of students will achieve the proficiency level, so it is measuring SCHOOL PERFORMANCE through the CST, CAPA, and/or CAHSEE.
When results were released on August 31, the California Department of Education (CDE) included data from 21 year round schools with incomplete data. So the data for these schools, and the district is incomplete.

Safe harbor is a way for schools to seek TEMPORARY shelter from the AYP storm, but these calculations were also not included in the August 31st press release.

With regard to API, only the schoolwide results were released from CDE, not comparable subgroups or decile rankings.
Steps for Getting your 2005 AYP Report From the Internet

1. Go to: http://ayp.cde.ca.gov/reports.asp
2. Click on School Level Reports
3. Type only the first part of your school name
4. Pick the right school from the drop down list
5. Click the Submit button

HIDDEN SLIDE

This slide is for reference, for those that want to provide the detailed information regarding how to obtain a copy of the AYP report from the California Department of Education (CDE) website.
This slide is for reference, for those that want to provide the detailed information regarding how to obtain a copy of the AYP report from the California Department of Education (CDE) website.

To actually see the AYP report go to this website and click on the box indicated.
The FUSD District Report Includes Data from...

104 Schools
- 7 Direct Funded Charter Schools
- 8 Comprehensive High Schools
- 15 Middle Schools
- 61 Elementary Schools
  - 21 Year-Round Schools
  - 40 Traditional or Modified Traditional Schools
- 11 Alternative Schools
- 1 Fresno Adult School
- 1 Year-Round Achievement Center

HIDDEN SLIDE
These are the number and types of schools that were included in the August 31st press release.
Here are the English Language Arts AMOs laid out year by year.

At the end of the 2003-2004 school year, the minimum performance level was

- 13.6 percent of students would score proficient or advanced on the CST (since this is an elementary/middle school example).

In the 2004-2005 school year, the minimum performance level increased to 24.4 percent of students scoring proficient or advanced. This will be the minimum ELA level for elementary and middle schools for 2005-06 and 2006-07.
At the end of 2003-2004 school year, the minimum performance level was that 11.2 percent of 10th grade students would score proficient or advanced on the CAHSEE.

In the 2004-2005 school year, the minimum performance level increased to 22.3 percent of students scoring proficient or advanced. This will be the minimum ELA level for high schools for 2005-06 and 2006-07.
Here are the AMOs for ELA at the districtwide level laid out year by year.

At the end of the 2003-2004 school year, the minimum performance level was that 12 percent of students would score proficient or advanced.

In the 2004-2005 school year, that expectation increased to 23 percent of students scoring proficient or advanced. This will be the ELA minimum Districtwide performance level for 2005-06 and 2006-07.
Here are the Mathematics AMOs laid out year by year.

At the end of the 2003-2004 school year, the minimum performance level was

• **16 percent** of students would score proficient or advanced on the CST (since this is an elementary/middle school example).

In the 2004-2005 school year, the minimum performance level increased to 26.5 percent of students scoring proficient or advanced. This will be the minimum math level for elementary and middle schools for 2005-06 and 2006-07.
HS PRINCIPALS: Unhide this slide for MATH.

Here are the AMOs for Math laid out year by year.

At the end of 2003-2004 the minimum performance level was
• **9.6 percent** of 10th grade students would score proficient or advanced on the CAHSEE

In the 2004-2005 school year, the minimum performance level increased to **20.9 percent** of students scoring proficient or advanced. This will be the minimum MATH level for high schools for 2005-06 and 2006-07.
Here are the AMOs for MATH at the districtwide level laid out year by year.

At the end of the 2003-2004 school year, the minimum performance level was that 12.8 percent of students would score proficient or advanced.

In the 2004-2005 school year, that expectation increased to 23.7 percent of students scoring proficient or advanced. This will be the MATH minimum performance level for 2005-06 and 2006-07.
### Numerically Significant Subgroups

- Reporting for groups with at least 11 students, but...
- Schools held accountable for groups of:
  - 100 students, OR
  - 50 students who comprise 15% of the student population

**HIDDEN SLIDE**

Although AYP reports will show results for groups of 11 or more students, you will notice the “—” (Double Dash) or “N/A” in the MET 2005 AYP CRITERIA Column when the categories are not “numerically significant”

So what is numerically significant?

Simple rule – Part 1: ANY group with 100 or more students IS **Numerically Significant**

Simple rule – Part 2: ANY group with less than 50 students IS **NOT NUMERICALLY SIGNIFICANT**

**Tricky Rule**: If a group has between 50-99 students AND it is at least 15% of the school population, then it IS numerically significant

**NOTE**: The denominator for these calculations is done separately for participation and performance.
- Participation uses total enrollment on first day of testing at the schoolwide level as the denominator.
- Percent Proficient (AMOs) uses the total number of VALID scores as the denominator,
The rules for determining who is a “VALID STUDENT” are not the same rules for invalidating a test score because of problems like cheating. In the context of AYP a “VALID SCORE” refers to students who were “continuously enrolled”

The process works like this.

Was the student enrolled at this school since the CBEDS date in October?
If the answer is yes, then the student is counted on our school level accountability report AND the district level report AND the state level report.

If the answer is NO, then we have a new question.
The question is: Was the student enrolled at this school since the CBEDS date in October?
If the answer is yes, then the student is counted on our District level accountability report AND the state level report.

If the answer is NO, then the student is only counted on the state level report.
In California, the API was added as another indicator in this process.

The API used as an additional indicator is the schoolwide score and growth score.

You can meet “API for AYP” in one of two ways
1) be above the status bar
   OR
2) make 1 point of growth.

Making the API for AYP does **NOT necessarily** mean that the API growth target was met for state accountability purposes.