

Richland County School District

One

Summary Report



2008 Results of the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Office of Accountability, Assessment, Research and Evaluation

May 2009

Criteria to Meet AYP

In order to meet AYP, schools are required to meet three major criteria for the all students group and for each of the subgroups that include at least 40 students for both ELA and Math on PACT, HSAP and SC-Alt. Subgroups that are considered for AYP are: (1) all students, (2) White, (3) African-American, (4) Asian/Pacific Islander, (5) Hispanic, (6) American Indian/Alaskan, (7) Disabled, (8) LEP (limited English proficient), and (9) subsidized meals. Subgroups for whom information are reported but who are not considered as criteria for meeting AYP include male, female, not disabled, migrant, non-migrant, non-LEP, and full-pay meals.

1. Participation Objective: One of the following two options must be met for a school/district to meet the participation objective.
 - The percent of students tested must equal or exceed 95.0%.
 - The three-year weighted average of the percent of students tested must equal or exceed 95.0%.

2. Performance Objective: One of the following five options must be met for a school/district to meet the performance objective. Note that only students continuously enrolled from the 45th day until the first day of testing are considered for AYP performance.

- Option 1: The standard error of measure (SEM) adjusted percent of students scoring proficient or advanced must meet or exceed the annual measurable objectives listed below.

| Elementary/Middle Schools | | High Schools | | Districts | |
|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| ELA | Math | ELA | Math | ELA | Math |
| 58.8% | 57.8% | 52.3% | 50.0% | 45.8% | 42.7% |

- Option 2: The three-year average standard error of measure (SEM) adjusted percent of students scoring proficient or advanced must meet or exceed the annual measurable objectives listed below.

| Elementary/Middle Schools | | High Schools | | Districts | |
|---------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| ELA | Math | ELA | Math | ELA | Math |
| 58.8% | 57.8% | 52.3% | 50.0% | 45.8% | 42.7% |

- Option 3 (Safe Harbor 1): The SEM adjusted percent of students scoring below Proficient must decline by at least 10 percent from the previous year.
- Option 4 (Safe Harbor 2): The performance index (PI) must meet or exceed the objective listed below. Note that the performance index is a weighted average of student performance levels.

| Elementary/Middle Schools | | High Schools | | Districts | |
|---------------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------|------|
| ELA | Math | ELA | Math | ELA | Math |
| 78.8 | 79.0 | 86.8 | 82.0 | 86.2 | 84.6 |

- Option 5 (Safe Harbor 3): The PI gain from the previous year must meet or exceed the required PI gain which is computed as the difference between 100 and the previous year's PI divided by the number of years until 2013-2014.

Note: If a subgroup meets the performance criteria for any of the safe harbor provisions, the subgroup must also meet the target for the other academic indicator (attendance or graduation) for the performance objective to be met.

3. Other Academic Indicator: One of the following options dependent upon whether the school contains grade 12 students must be met for a school to meet the other academic indicator. Districts may meet either option.

- Attendance Rate (for schools without grade 12):
 - The student attendance rate must meet or exceed 94.0%.
 - The student attendance rate must be at least 0.1% higher than the previous year's rate.
- Graduation Rate (for schools with grade 12):
 - The student graduation rate must meet or exceed 88.3%.
 - The student graduation rate must meet or exceed the three-year average graduation rate.
 - The student graduation rate must meet or exceed the previous year's graduation rate.

The number of objectives for each school/district depends on how many subgroups include at least 40 students. The maximum number of objectives is 37 which results from the possibility of having 18 objectives for participation (9 subgroups by 2 subjects), 18 objectives for performance (9 subgroups by 2 subjects) and one other objective (attendance or graduation).

AYP Summary for Elementary Schools

1. The number of objectives to be met ranged from 9 (Brockman) to 21 (Brennen and Meadowfield), and the percent of AYP objectives met (compliance index) ranged from 52.9% (Bradley and Caughman Road) to 100.0% (Brockman, Gadsden, South Kilbourne, and Taylor).
2. In 2008, a total of four of the 28 elementary schools (14%) met AYP, a decrease of six schools or 22% from 2007 when ten elementary schools met AYP (36%). The four elementary schools that met AYP are Brockman, Gadsden, South Kilbourne, and Taylor, all of which had met AYP in 2007.
3. Nearly one-fifth (5, 18%) of the Richland One elementary schools improved their compliance indexes from 2007 to 2008 as shown below.
 - Burnside: 84.6%, up 7.7% from 76.9%
 - Burton-Pack: 76.9%, up 23.1 % from 53.8% (tied for most improvement)
 - Carver-Lyon: 76.9%, up 16.9% from 60.0%
 - Logan: 61.5%, up 7.7% from 53.8%
 - Thomas: 76.9%, up 23.1% from 53.8% (tied for most improvement)
4. Elementary schools missed the most objectives in math performance for the subsidized meals (21) subgroup followed closely by the African-American (20) and all students (20) subgroups. Only eight elementary schools (Brennen, Brockman, Gadsden, Moore, Rosewood, Satchel Ford, South Kilbourne, and Taylor) met the AYP performance goals for all students for both subjects. All elementary schools met all percent tested objectives as well as the student attendance objective.

AYP Summary for Middle Schools

1. The number of objectives to be met ranged from 15 (Sanders) to 21 (Crayton, Hand, and Southeast), and the percent of AYP objectives met (compliance index) ranged from 47.1% (Alcorn) to 76.2% (Hand).
2. None of the middle schools met AYP.

3. More than two-fifths (4, 44%) of the Richland One middle schools improved their compliance indexes from 2007 to 2008 as shown below.

| | |
|------------|--|
| Alcorn: | 47.1%, up 0.4% from 46.7% |
| Hand: | 76.2%, up 4.8% from 71.4% |
| Perry: | 52.9%, up 6.2% from 46.7% |
| Southeast: | 71.4%, up 9.5% from 61.9% (most improvement) |
4. Middle schools missed the most objectives (9) in ELA performance for the subsidized meals subgroup and math performance for the African-American subgroup. Only two middle schools (Hand and Crayton) met the AYP performance goals for all students for both subjects. All middle schools met all percent tested objectives and only one school (Alcorn) did not meet the student attendance objective.

AYP Summary for High Schools

1. The number of objectives to be met ranged from 13 (Columbia, Eau Claire, Johnson, and Keenan) to 19 (Lower Richland), and the percent of AYP objectives met (compliance index) ranged from 53.8% (Johnson) to 100.0% (Columbia, Dreher, Eau Claire, and Keenan).
2. In 2008, four of the seven high schools (57%) met AYP, an increase of four schools or 57% from 2007 when no high schools met AYP (0%). The four high schools that met AYP are Columbia, Dreher, Eau Claire, and Keenan.
3. Nearly three-quarters (5, 71%) of the Richland One high schools improved their compliance indexes from 2007 to 2008 as shown below.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Columbia: | 100.0%, up 7.7% from 92.3% |
| Dreher: | 100.0%, up 11.8% from 88.2% |
| Eau Claire: | 100.0%, up 38.5% from 61.5% (most improvement) |
| Flora: | 82.4%, up 11.8% from 70.6% |
| Keenan: | 100.0%, up 40.0% from 60.0% |
4. High schools missed the most objectives (3) in math performance for the subsidized meals subgroup, math performance for the African-American subgroup, and ELA performance for the subsidized meals subgroup. Five high schools (Columbia, Dreher, Eau Claire, Flora, and Keenan) met the AYP performance goals for all students for both subjects. All high schools met all percent tested objectives as well as the graduation rate objective.

AYP Summary for Special Schools

1. No objectives were met for either special school (Hall and Pendergrass-Fairwold).
2. None of the special schools met AYP.

3. None of the Richland One special schools improved their compliance indexes from 2007 to 2008.
4. Special schools missed all applicable objectives including the percent tested, performance and graduation rate objectives. Note that the only objectives applicable to special schools are for the all students subgroup.

AYP Summary for Charter Schools

1. The number of objectives to be met ranged from 5 (Carolina School for Inquiry) to 13 (Midlands Math and Business Academy), and the percent of AYP objectives met (compliance index) ranged from 80.0% (Carolina School for Inquiry) to 92.3% (Midlands Math and Business Academy).
2. In 2008, neither of the two charter schools for which AYP applies met AYP.
3. One-half (1, 50%) of the Richland One charter schools for which AYP applies improved their compliance index from 2007 to 2008 as shown below.
MMBA: 92.3%, up 15.4% from 76.9%
4. Charter schools missed the most objectives (1) in math performance for the all students subgroup and ELA performance for subsidized meals students. One charter school (MMBA) met the AYP performance goals for all students for both subjects. Both charter schools met all percent tested objectives and the student attendance objective.

AYP Summary for the District

1. None of the 85 districts in South Carolina met AYP for the third consecutive year. Richland One met 22 out of 33 objectives or 66.7% compared with 23 out of 33 or 69.7% in 2007, a decrease of one objective or 3.0%.
2. More than one-tenth of the Richland One schools (8, 16.7%) met overall AYP (four elementary schools and four high schools).
3. Nearly one-third (15, 31.3%) of Richland One schools improved their compliance indexes from 2007 to 2008.
4. District schools missed the most objectives (32) in math performance for the subsidized meals subgroup, math performance for the African-American and all student subgroups (32). Sixteen schools met the AYP performance goals for all students for both subjects. Only two schools did not meet the percent tested objectives, and only three schools did not meet the student attendance or graduation rate objective.