

## Background of 2004 Elementary and Middle School AYP

1. In order to meet the overall AYP, schools are required to meet three major criteria for all student groups and each of the subgroups (that included at least 40 students) for both ELA and Math on PACT and PACT-Alt:
  - (1) Other Academic Indicator: Student Attendance Rate (95.3%)
  - (2) Participation Objective: Percent of Students Tested (95.0%)
  - (3) Performance Objectives: 17.6% Proficient or Advanced in ELA; 15.5% in Math
  
2. It is very common that schools need to meet at least 17 objectives to meet the overall AYP status.

Student Attendance for all students	(1) +
Participation Rates for all students in both areas	(2) +
Participation Rates for white students in both areas	(2) +
Participation Rates for black students in both areas	(2) +
Participation Rates for Free/Reduced lunch students in both areas	(2) +
Performance Objectives for all students in both areas	(2) +
Performance Objectives for all white students in both areas	(2) +
Performance Objectives for black students in both areas	(2) +
Performance Objectives for Free/Reduced meal students in <u>both areas</u>	(2) +
Total=	17

3. There are a few changes in 2004 AYP computations that have impacted on the positive results of AYP:
  - The minimum number to be included in the performance objective for “**Disabled**” and “**Limited English Proficient** (LEP)” subgroups was increased from 40 to 50.
  - Students who took off-grade level testing were not converted to “below proficient” automatically as it was previously done. Students who performed at Proficient or Advanced level were treated as Proficient or Advanced as long as the percent of students performing Proficient or Advanced on off-grade level PACT and PACT-Alt was not more than 1% of the total students tested in grades 3 through 8.
  - One Standard Error of Measurement (SEM), the average score of all possible scores for each individual student if test were administered multiple times, was added to each individual student’s scale score. After the addition, if the scores for students, especially those who performed at the high “Basic” level, reached the cut score of “Proficient” level, students were treated as ‘Proficient.’”
  - The methods to meet AYP objectives increased. Schools can meet attendance objective by comparing current year’s attendance rate with last year’s or three year average, and they can meet participation objective by comparing current year’s percent tested with last year’s or two year average.

## Background of 2004 High School AYP

1. In order to meet the overall AYP, schools are required to meet three major criteria for all student groups and each of the subgroups (that included at least 40 students) for both ELA and Math on HSAP and HSAP-Alt:
  - a. Other Academic Indicator: Graduation Rate
  - b. Participation Objective: Percent of Students Tested (95.0%)
  - c. Performance Objectives: 33.3% Proficient or Advanced in ELA; 30.0% in Math
  
2. It is very common that schools need to meet at least 17 objectives to meet the overall AYP status.

Student Attendance for all students	(1) +
Participation Rates for all students in both areas	(2) +
Participation Rates for white students in both areas	(2) +
Participation Rates for black students in both areas	(2) +
Participation Rates for Free/Reduced lunch students in both areas	(2) +
Performance Objectives for all students in both areas	(2) +
Performance Objectives for all white students in both areas	(2) +
Performance Objectives for black students in both areas	(2) +
Performance Objectives for Free/Reduced meal students in <u>both areas</u>	(2) +
Total=	17

3. There are a few changes in 2004 AYP computations that have impacted on the results of AYP:
  - The minimum number to be included in the performance objective for “**Disabled**” and “**Limited English Proficient (LEP)**” subgroups was increased from 40 to 50.
  - One Standard Error of Measurement (SEM), the average score of all possible scores for each individual student if test were administered multiple times, was added to each individual student’s scale score. After the addition, if the scores for students, especially those who performed at the high “2” level, reached the cut score of “3” level, students were treated as “3”-‘Proficient.’”
  - The methods to meet AYP objectives increased. Schools can meet graduation objective by comparing current year’s graduation rate with last year’s or three year average, and they can meet participation objective by comparing current year’s percent tested with last year’s or two year average.

## **I. AYP Summary for Elementary Schools**

1. The number of objectives to be met ranged from 9 (Brockman) to 21 (Meadowfield) and the percent meeting AYP objectives (Compliance Index) ranged from 84.6% to 100%.
2. All elementary schools met the overall AYP status except three schools: Burnside, Hyatt Park, and Meadowfield.
  - Burnside failed to meet two objectives (11/13=84.6%): math performance by African American student subgroup and Free/Reduced Lunch subgroup.
  - Hyatt Park failed to meet one objective (12/13=92.3%): attendance rate.
  - Meadowfield failed to meet two objectives (19/21=90.5%): math performance by Disabled student subgroup and Free/Reduced Lunch subgroup.
3. In 2003 only seven schools (7/28=25%) met the overall AYP and 25 schools (89%) did in 2004.

## **II. AYP Summary for Middle Schools**

1. The number of objectives to be met were 17 (Alcorn, Gibbes, Perry, Sanders, and St. Andrews), 21 (Hand, Hopkins, and Southeast), or 23 (Crayton). The percent meeting AYP objectives (Compliance Index) ranged from 47.1% to 95.7%.
2. Although none of the middle schools met AYP, four schools (Crayton, Hand, Sanders, and Southeast) met all objectives except one and St. Andrews met all objectives except two.
3. Despite that none of the middle schools met AYP in both 2003 and 2004 years, the Compliance Index improved in 2004 than in 2003 where they ranged from 35% to 81% .
4. The number of schools that did not meet half of the objectives (50%) decreased from two in 2003 to one in 2004.

## **III. AYP Summary for High Schools**

1. The number of objectives to be met from 9 (Johnson) to 19 (Flora) and the percent meeting AYP objectives (Compliance Index) ranged from 63.2% to 100.0%.
2. Keenan was the only high school that met AYP in 2004. None of the remaining schools met all of the participation objectives (at least 95.0% of the students were tested).
3. Except Columbia and Lower Richland, all schools met performance objectives.
4. None of the high schools met AYP in 2003 and there were two schools that did not meet any of the objectives (0%). In 2004 one school did meet the overall AYP and the remaining schools that failed to meet overall AYP met at least two-thirds of the total objectives.

#### IV. AYP Summary for the District

1. According to the state release, a total of 17 districts met AYP, and Richland One was one of the 18 districts that missed AYP by just one objective.
2. Richland One met 32 out of 33 objectives (97.0%). The missed objective was math performance by the disabled students. Had we had 114 more disabled students, that is, two more students per school, who performed proficient or better, the district would have met the overall AYP.
3. The following table demonstrates the profile of each of the 17 districts that met AYP, using the data from 2004 Report Card on the website. According to the EOC criteria of similar districts solely based on poverty index (5% higher or lower than our poverty index), Bamberg 1 and Sumter 2 are the only two districts “like ours.” As it can be seen that most of these districts had much lower poverty index than ours and all districts except Bamberg 1 received either “Good” or “Excellent” absolute ratings in 2004.

Met 2004 AYP		Sources From 2004 Report Card			
School District	Total Objectives	Absolute Rating	Number of Schools	Number of Students	Poverty Index
Anderson 1	29	Excellent	14	7,947	44.2%
Anderson 2	21	Excellent	7	3,650	54.9%
Anderson 5	31	Good	14	11,506	57.3%
Bamberg 1	21	Average	5	1,602	73.4%
Dorchester 2	37	Good	16	17,456	45.0%
Edgefield	21	Good	7	3,856	66.6%
Horry <sup>a</sup>	37	Good	41	30,467	64.5%
Lexington 1	33	Excellent	19	18,301	38.5%
Lexington 2	33	Good	16	8,716	61.7%
Lexington 5	33	Excellent	18	15,408	28.4%
Pickens	33	Excellent	24	16,004	49.0%
Richland 2	33	Good	21	18,969	44.5%
Spartanburg 1	21	Excellent	10	4,482	52.9%
Spartanburg 2	33	Good	12	8,487	49.5%
Spartanburg 3	29	Excellent	7	3,029	62.7%
Sumter 2	29	Good	15	9,207	76.1%
York 4	29	Excellent	8	6,226	21.4%
<sup>a</sup> Horry was included in one of the 17 districts that met AYP, but the Compliance Index was reported as 94.6%, instead of 100.0%, on the SDE website.					
Richland 1	33	Average	47	25,233	73.8