

Assessment and Accountability in the Fifty States: 1999-2000

HAWAII

*This profile was verified by staff of the Hawaii Department of Education in April of 2000.
All information was current as of that date.*

Index:

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

Performance Standards

Reporting Performance Data

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the assessment system as the context.*

To improve student assessment, the Strategic Plan for Standards-based Reform (DOE 9/99) outlined a two-tiered assessment system comprised of (1) a redesigned statewide assessment program comprised of the abbreviated SAT9 and the criterion-referenced Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HCPS) II State Assessment, called the Hawaii Assessment Program; and (2) school/classroom assessment programs with supports from the state program. Together, both state and school/classroom assessment programs are seen by the state as forming a balanced assessment system.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state assessment system, including:*

- *Name of Assessment Instrument(s) or Program(s):*

Hawaii Assessment Program

- *Grade Levels and Subjects Tested*

1. Norm-Referenced Stanford Achievement Test (Abbreviated SAT9):

Grades 3, 5, 8 and 10 will be tested in reading comprehension and mathematical problem solving.

2. Criterion-Referenced Assessment (HCPS II State Assessment):

Grades 3, 5, 8 and 10 will be used as the sample for field-testing in:

- Reading,
- Math
- Writing.

This new criterion-referenced test will provide the basis for measuring student performance. This is a customized test with questions and assessment tasks to bring it into alignment with standards. The final assessment system (termed the **Hawaii Assessment Program**) will therefore be nationally normed and criterion-referenced. The SAT9 normed portion will be abbreviated (30 items on both reading comprehension and mathematical problem solving) and will be reported as it has been in the past.

The HCPS II will be a criterion-referenced test, operational as of 2000-2001, after field-testing. Field-testing will include four forms of the reading and math sections for each grade level, along with two forms of the writing segment.

- *Norm or Criterion Referenced:*

The abbreviated SAT9 is nationally normed but the HCPS II is criterion referenced.

- *Matrix or Census Testing:* Census

- *Item Types*

SAT9 is multiple choice until expanded by the state. The HCPS II will include multiple choice (1 score point) and constructed response (2, 3, or 4 scores points) questions ranging from short answer to essay. The writing portion of the HCPS II is an essay exam based on writing to a prompt. The other assessments outlined below use sampling or portfolios. The exact proportions for the item types will be known after field-testing once a final assessment is in place.

It is important to note that some of the abbreviated items have been judged to adequately function as standards-based items for the HCPS II and these items will be counted toward the standards-based scores along with the newly developed standards-based items. Specifically, approximately 60-70% of the HCPS II is considered to be solely standards-based.

- *Time of Testing (specific month(s) or testing window):* May 1-15, 2000

- *High School Exit Exam (date of implementation and/or phase-in timeline):*

It is intended that the Grade 10 state assessment will be used as a Hawaii public high school diploma requirement starting with the graduating class of 2007. Implementation is pending SBE review and action.

- *Other Assessments:* See question #4 below

- *Transitional or Final Assessment System:* Transitional

3. *Who designed and produced the assessment(s) used by the state?*

The new criterion-referenced test (HCPS II) was developed in cooperation with Harcourt-Brace as well as teams of teachers and specialists. An initial team of teachers, curriculum specialists and measurement specialists developed the item and test specifications for the standards-based assessment. Harcourt Educational Measurement is serving as the assessment developer and publisher. Harcourt drafted HCPS II-related items according to the state blueprints, and those items were reviewed by eight panels in January of 2000. The panelists were comprised mainly of teachers and some administrators. The review was conducted using criterion provided by the state DOE. Curriculum specialists also assisted Harcourt in identifying possible passages for the reading assessment.

No school will be field-testing all three assessment sections (reading, math and writing), but each school will be assessed in at least one of the sections. This will result in two versions for the Spring of 2001 as baseline data.

4. *What are the state requirements for local assessment, including the types of assessments and their use in areas such as reporting and accountability, as well as Title I adequate yearly progress? What grade levels and subjects are tested?*

Because the state of Hawaii is considered to be one district, no additional district requirements for assessment have been established, although schools are encouraged to use additional assessment systems to inform instruction. The following assessments are available to schools to be used to inform instruction and will not be included in the general state accountability system. However, Title I schools currently have the option of using a school-selected assessment as an additional indicator for adequate yearly progress.

Hawaii Writing Assessment: this assessment was developed by the state and includes three procedures for students and their teachers to complete:

1. Collecting student writing throughout the year
2. Selecting a piece of writing from the selection (or drafting a new piece of writing)
3. Revising the writing piece.

Students have a minimum of 1 hour and a maximum of 3 hours for fourth to sixth grade and 6 hours for secondary grades in which to select and revise their writing pieces. They are also asked to respond to a few open-ended questions that deal with self-assessment of writing. The writing piece is submitted for evaluation by a team of trained teachers using HWA rubrics and prototypes to discipline their judgments.

Holistic Reading Assessment (HRA): given in grades 2 through grades 5/6, this assessment allows teachers to gather information about students' reading interests, use of strategies, comprehension, and attitudes. The assessment can also be easily summarized using the holistic score for each student so that grade levels and schools can report the degree to which their students are becoming proficient, independent, mature readers. HRA has three parts to form a complete and useful package:

- Reading Conference Form
- Rubrics with 4 analytic Dimensions: Wide Reading, Constructing Meaning, Oral Reading/Use of Strategies, and Behavior, Attitudes, Self-Assessment.
- Suggested Instructional Activities related to each of the 4 Dimensions.

Teachers conduct a 10-minute conference with each child using the conference form to guide their observations and questions. During this conference the student is asked to retell a story, to read a passage from the book, examine his/her Reader's log, to talk about how he/she selects books to read, and to share his/her feelings about reading. Teachers first mark the rubric descriptions that best characterize the students' responses & behaviors. The 4 rubric dimensions each have descriptions for 6 points along a continuum. Using these rubric descriptions the teachers assign a holistic reading score for reporting purposes and plan instructional interventions to help the students progress toward mature reading.

The state has adapted this assessment for grades 7 and 8 as well. The adapted version is called the "Secondary Reading Assessment."

Work Sampling System: used in pre-school and K-5 this system assesses and documents children's skills, knowledge, behavior, and accomplishments as displayed across a wide variety of educational domains and as manifested on multiple occasions. It consists of three complementary components:

- Developmental Guidelines and Checklists;
- Portfolios, and
- Summary Reports.

The Developmental Guidelines and Checklists are designed to assist teachers in observing and documenting individual children's growth and progress. They are intended to reflect common activities and expectations in classrooms that are structured around developmentally appropriate activities and are based on national, state, and local curriculum standards. Each Checklist covers seven domains:

1. Personal and social development;
2. Language and literacy;
3. Mathematical thinking;
4. Scientific thinking;
5. Social studies;
6. the Arts; and
7. Physical development.

A look at the First Grade Developmental Checklist would indicate the Domain, Language & Literacy; the Functional Component, Listening; the Performance Indicator, Listens for meaning in discussions and conversations; and the Checklist Ratings, Not Yet; In Process; Proficient.

5. *Is the state assessment system aligned with the state standards? Are there plans for alignment, and if so, how will the assessment and standards become aligned? What is the state's approach for ensuring alignment and what evidence of that alignment is provided?*

In consultation with the SBE, the SDE abolished the Hawaii State Test of Essential Competencies (HSTEC) as a requirement for receiving a high school diploma starting with the class of 2000 and suspended the Credit by Examination (CbyE) program as an alternative method to acquiring course credits, effective for the 1999-2000 school year. These assessments were not properly aligned with the state standards (Hawaii Content and Performance Standards). The criterion-reference exam being field tested in April 2000 has been designed to measure the state standards. Part of the Strategic Plan engineered by the State Superintendent includes a commitment to regularly review the state assessments for alignment. The items offered by Harcourt-Brace for the criterion-referenced assessment have been reviewed by the state for alignment with the standards.

6. *How is the data included in the state assessment system used?*

The criterion-referenced assessment will not be used in an accountability system for the 1999-2000 school year, and the state has made a commitment not to hold students accountable until schools are held accountable. Eventually, there will be benchmarking for the schools. For now, the state is still using the field test to see how well the criterion-referenced testing succeeds and how well students perform. The norm-referenced and abbreviated SAT9 will be reported in the School Status and Improvement Reports (SSIRs) as has been done in past years.

7. *Are there changes planned for the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

The “state assessment instruments package” being developed and field-tested is referred to as the *HCPS II State Assessment*. The new, criterion-referenced, standards-based segment of the HCPS II State Assessment will provide the basis for measuring student performance relative to the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards and for school and student accountability. The final, overall composite assessment will include both standards-based and norm-referenced segments. The norm-referenced segments (based on the SAT9 abbreviated) will not be used in the accountability program.

Future dates and work to be completed:

- September 2000: Construct final draft forms (2 per grade level in reading and math) for the operational HCPS II State Assessment
- April 2001: Administer the HCPS II State Assessment
- August 2001: Score assessment and generate reports
Recruit school staff and community members to serve on proficiency level panels
- October 2001: SBE and Superintendent review and approve proficiency levels
- November 2001: Generate and distribute updated assessment reports

8. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of state assessment? Explain.*

The state is in transition for the 1999-2000 school year and is primarily working to create a criterion-referenced assessment system, then build an accountability system.

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

1. *What exclusions are made in the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP? Who makes the decision about exclusion of a particular child? Does the state collect data or in other ways monitor the number and types of students excluded? Does that vary by test?*

SAT9

Students are exempted from taking the Stanford Achievement Test based on their IEP and the constraints of testing using a norm referenced test. English as Second Language Learners (ESLL) in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 must have met the following conditions before they can participate in the SAT9:

- Achieved a 3 or higher English Proficiency Test (EPT) rating on either the Language Assessment Scale (LAS) or the Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL), and
- Be placed in the LEP Students of Limited English Proficiency (SLEP) Category.

If special education students are specifically exempted from the Stanford testing by the IEP the state will not include them in the statewide testing program. If the IEP requires an accommodation for testing that we cannot provide without invalidating the norm referenced scores, the student(s) is then exempt the student from taking the statewide Stanford Achievement testing.

Hawaiian Language Immersion students in grades 3 and 5 are exempted from the SAT9, while students in grades 8 and 10 are required to take the abbreviated version to be administered in May of 2000.

HCPS II

All special education students and Section 504 students will be required to participate in the spring 2000 and adhere to normal administration requirements unless the student's IEP or 504 plan includes a statement of specific test accommodations or modifications.

2. *What accommodations and/or modifications are made on the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP?*

The state does not allow for extended time, segmentation of individual subtests, students marking in books unless specifically allowed by the instructions, and other forms of accommodations on the SAT9 due to the nature of norm-referenced testing.

However, on the HCPS II, students may use the following accommodations and modifications for the criterion-referenced pilot assessment administered in the spring of 2000:

- Being tested in an individual setting or small group
- Being seated near a test administrator

- Making responses in the reusable test booklet instead of in a separate response booklet
- Having the test items read aloud for the writing and the math segments of the test only
- Providing short breaks during the administration of a single segment
- Being given extended time to complete a segment (up to double the normally allotted time)
- Being given assistance with gridding multiple-choice responses or writing constructed responses.
- Simplifying or re-wording all of the directions for a segment
- Breaking a single assessment section into multiple sessions.

3. *Does the state provide assessments in languages other than English? If so, describe. In what grades and subjects?*

No such assessments are in place for the 1999-2000 school year.

4. *Does the state provide alternative assessments for students with disabilities? If so, describe. For which students and in which subjects and at what ages?*

The state does not currently provide "alternative assessments" for students with disabilities. These are not planned until full implementation of the new statewide testing program scheduled for Spring 2001.

5. *Does the state have a goal for the inclusion of students with disabilities and/or LEP students on the statewide tests? Does the state use any strategies to encourage the inclusion of students with disabilities? LEP students?*

The new standards based tests will provide for much greater participation of special education students by allowing many more types of "accommodations". The state's current procedures require that students who are classified as LEP and earn a score of 3 or higher on the BINL or the LAS participate in the statewide testing program. In the current development cycle there are no plans for non-English versions of the new standards based test. However, discussions are still underway for further dialogue on the possibility of a Hawaiian language version in future development. These are still very preliminary in nature.

The Superintendent has mandated that ALL students must participate except for those who cannot be tested using either the new standards based test due in spring 2001 or the "alternate assessment" which is currently being piloted.

The state is also contracting with PREL (Pacific Resources for Education and Learning formerly the Pacific Regional Educational Lab) to research the viability of designing an alternative version of the new standards based test for students who may have difficulty responding to the more traditional paper and pencil instruments. These would not necessarily be LEP or special education students.

6. *Are changes planned for the inclusion of SWD and LEP students in the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

The state is working on developing the procedures for inclusion of special education students in the testing program which will now incorporate a small part of the Stanford 9 as well as a predominant number of standards based test-items addressing the new revised Hawaii Content and Performance Standards II.

Performance Standards

1. *How many and what performance levels has the state established for its assessments?*

The “benchmark grade levels” in place now are designed to measure the following:

- Grade 3: assess mastery built from grades K-3
- Grade 5: assess mastery built from grades K-3 plus 4-5
- Grade 8: assess mastery built from grades K-3 plus 4-5 plus 6-8
- Grade 10: assess mastery built from grades K-3 plus 4-5 plus 6-8 plus 9-10.

The **proposed** performance levels once the criterion-referenced assessment (augmented SAT9) is in place will report whether students have:

- Exceeded the standards
- Met the standards
- Approached the standards
- Far below the standards.

No such performance levels are in place, however, for the 1999-2000 school year. Performance levels will be determined after the assessment has been field tested and fully developed.

2. *Has the state set acceptable levels or targets for schools, districts or the state on tests, drop-out rates or other measures (e.g. 70% of students in Maryland pass the MSPAP)?*

Not applicable – see above.

3. *How are these performance standards calculated? What data are included in the calculations, and at what proportions (e.g. assessment results 60%, dropout and attendance rates 40%). How are the calculations made? What is the final unit of analysis for reporting school and district achievement levels (e.g. performance index, grade, category)?*

Not applicable – see above.

4. *Are all students, schools and districts included in these performance calculations? If not, who is excluded?*

Not applicable – see above.

5. *Are changes planned for the state performance standards (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

Such performance standards will be developed and implemented once the assessment is field tested and fully implemented.

6. *What proportion of schools and/or districts fail to meet acceptable levels on performance targets?*

Not applicable – see above.

Reporting Performance Data

1. *Describe the characteristics of the state performance data reporting system (by whom, what data, who is the audience) for each of the following levels:*

- *Student reports*

The norm-referenced scores from the SAT9 are made available to students and are not reported publicly on an individual basis.

- *School reports*

School Status and Improvement Report (SSIR)

The School Status and Improvement Reports have been prepared as part of the Department of Education's Comprehensive Assessment and Accountability System to provide regular, understandable accounts of the schools' progress. These reports fulfill the requirement of §302A-1004, Hawaii Revised Statutes, which requires annual reports that inform the people about the performance of Hawaii's public schools, individually and collectively.

Context information includes a description of the school setting and data concerning the school population, staffing levels, and facilities. Process information outlines the school's priorities and programs for improvement during the year just past. Outcome information includes data on:

1. attendance,
2. standardized test results (SAT9), and
3. school completion.

The **Senior Exit Plans Survey (SEPS)** is also administered as an annual statewide survey of public high school seniors, conducted by the Department of Education in the spring of each school year.

- *District reports*

The state is not formally divided into districts so this category does not apply.

- *State reports*

The **Superintendent's Annual Report on School Performance and Improvement in Hawaii** summarizes the state of the schools by reporting on context, process and outcome indicators (indicators are illustrative and vary by year):

Context Indicators

- School organization
- Student enrollment (including special needs, transiency and student: teacher ethnicity)

Process Indicators

- Staff
- General Revenues and Expenditures for Public Education
- Facilities
- Attendance
- School Improvement Priorities
- School/Community Based Management Implementation

Outcome Indicators

- Stanford Achievement Test (Reading, Math and Statewide Average Scores)
- State NAEP Results
- High School Completion (Dropouts and Senior Completion)
- Senior Plans post graduation
- Student suspensions (threats to safety and property)

- *Title I reports*

Title I schools are included in the general student achievement reporting system and adhere to all of the requirements of that system. In addition, Title I schools submit progress reports to the state and annually update any school-specific reports required as a Title I school, such as professional development planning. The state prepares Title I adequate yearly progress reports by school, administrative district, and statewide.

2. *How are the data distributed? When during the year (month or time period after assessment)? To whom (students, teachers, parents, the media, the community)?*

SSIR reports, including student performance data on the SAT9 are distributed to every public library in the state, as well as through the media and to schools themselves. Schools are encouraged to make the data available to parents by mailing it to each home, but they are not required to do so. The reports are distributed to schools by mid-December or early January for schools to review, and then formally printed and distributed with possible changes. They went to the Legislature, Governor, media and the SBE in March of 2000.

3. *At what level(s) are data disaggregated (state, district and school levels)? For what groups are disaggregated data reported (see Internet sites for state, district and school level report cards)?*

Disaggregated data are not reported in the SSIRs, although the state SAT9 disaggregated data at the school, administrative district and state levels. Schools are given SAT9 disaggregated data to be used in the annual school planning process. SAT-9 data are disaggregated by the following categories: special education students, limited English proficiency students, ethnicity, gender and socio-economic status. The data are not reported to the public unless requested.

5. *Does trend data exist from the state assessments (example: Texas State Assessment data is available from “1996-97 on”)?*

The state has been reporting Stanford Achievement Test data on the ninth edition since the 1998-1999 administration and on the eighth edition since 1991-1992. The state has further used three earlier editions of the SAT, in total comprising at least 20 years of data.

6. *How are the results of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency reported? Are they included in the aggregate scores reported to the public, or disaggregated by group?*

All students tested are included in statewide summaries. This practice of total inclusion of all scores generated began with the spring 1999 administration of the statewide testing program.

7. *What are the state’s requirements for the use of data in school and district improvement planning?*

All schools must submit school improvement plans to their district superintendent, regardless of their achievement status. Such improvement plans must rely on data as the basis for planning.

8. *Are changes planned for performance reporting (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the accountability system (Title I or in general)?*

From the 2000 field test, only SAT9 reports containing norm-referenced scores will be developed for the schools, district and the state. No Standards-based scores will be provided since the purpose of the field test is to validate the new standards-based items and tasks (August 2000).

From the 2001 assessment administration, two reports will be provided:

1. Interim consolidated reports that contain norm-referenced SAT9 scores and raw (total points) scores from the standards-based assessments. These reports are interim pending completion of work to establish cut-scores and the associated proficiency levels (August 2001).
2. Final reports to the schools, district and the state will show proficiency scores for the standards-based assessments as well as the previously reported SAT9 scores. These will be the model for future assessment reports (November 2001).

The state also plans to put disaggregated data on the Internet to allow for school and public access later this year.

Until recently, an **Effective Schools Survey (ESS)** was used by the state as an assessment tool that provided feedback from the school's staff, students, and parents about school effectiveness. The survey was composed of six researched-based indicators (survey scales) that focused on schooling practices over which schools have substantial control:

- Strong Instructional Leadership of the Principal,
- Strong Emphasis on Academics,
- High Expectations for Student Achievement,
- Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress,
- Positive School Climate, and
- Positive Home-School Relations.

The ESS included three forms: a Teacher/Staff Survey (60 items), a Student Survey (36 items), and a Parent Survey (36 items).

The state is in the process of pilot testing a replacement survey, the **School Quality Survey (SQS)**. Like the ESS, the new survey will poll parents and students, as well as school staff on factors related to school quality, including an augmented set of questions about perceptions of school safety.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of performance standards and reporting? Explain.*

The state tracks 15 ethnic groups, including both Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians. Because of the small numbers represented in some of these groups, disaggregation of data presents issues involving privacy and the “non-representativeness” of small samples. The state is developing a policy for the use of disaggregated data to deal with these issues.

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the accountability system as the context.*

Hawaii legislation passed in 1999 gave the SDE authority to establish an accountability system and plans are underway to do so. Outlines for student, professional and school accountability are provided in the *Strategic Plan for Standards-based Reform*, and the state legislature has several bills currently pending to provide the legal basis and clarification of authority to proceed with such plans. Accountability in the state has to this point, however, only included the reporting system using the SSIR.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state accountability system? Organize the response into the following subsections:*
 - *Student Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*
 - *School Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*
 - *District Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

As yet to be determined by the State Department of Education.

3. *What methods of measuring progress are used in the state accountability system?*
- *Relative growth*
 - *Absolute target*
 - *Narrowing the Gap between high and low achievers*
 - *Other*

As yet to be determined by the State Department of Education.

4. *Are all students included in calculating the measures of progress? If not, who is excluded (probe on inclusion of SWD and LEP students)?*

As yet to be determined by the State Department of Education.

5. *How do the general state accountability system and the system of accountability for Title I schools compare? Are they the same, or different? How?*

Only Title I schools in the state have been working under a complete system of accountability, as described in the Title I section below. All other schools have had their student performance reported to the public through the SSIR, but no formal sanctions or rewards have been developed.

6. *Are subgroup performance results used as an indicator in the calculation of state accountability measures? If so, how? To identify schools or districts in need of improvement? For recognition and rewards?*

As yet to be determined by the State Department of Education.

7. *Are charter and/or non-public schools included in the accountability system? If so, how?*

As yet to be determined by the State Department of Education.

8. *Are changes planned for the state accountability system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

Instead of submitting a school improvement plan through their district, schools will soon be required to submit a standards implementation design (SID) by May 2001, a data driven plan on how schools will work to improve.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of accountability? Explain.*

The state is in a period of transition, and so the challenge that the state currently faces is the development and implementation of an accountability system for all schools, and then

aligning that system with Title I schools in the state that have been working under a system of adequate yearly progress.

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

1. *How are schools and districts identified as low performing? Using what criteria? Do the identification processes and/or criteria differ for Title I and non-Title I schools?*

As yet to be determined by the State Department of Education.

2. *Does the district or the state decide whether a school is low performing? If the district is involved in the process, how much discretion do they have?*

Although the system of accountability has yet to be determined by the State Department of Education, the state does not have a formal system of district control, and so it may be safely assumed that such a decision would be made by the state.

3. *What types of assistance are provided to these schools and districts by the state?*

None for the 1999-2000 school year.

4. *Who provides the state assistance?*

Not applicable for the 1999-2000 school year.

5. *Does support to Title I and all low performing schools and districts differ? Is support generally provided for all schools and districts, or are services specifically designed to help those that are low performing?*

While Title I has a system of assistance in place for those schools that are not proficient, no such system has been or is in place for non-Title I schools in the state.

6. *Has the state established a set of criteria and/or a process for getting schools and districts out of low performing status? If so, what do they include?*

Not applicable for the 1999-2000 school year.

7. *Once a school or district is identified as low performing, what types of plans must it prepare? Who are they submitted to once completed? How do they differ from other planning documents?*

Title I schools in need of improvement are required to develop additional targeted assistance or schoolwide plans in addition to the school improvement plans developed regardless of performance status.

8. *Are changes planned for the state system of identifying and assisting low performing schools or districts (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

The state is currently developing an accountability system. Change will come for Title I schools when an aligned system is developed for all schools based on school performance, regardless of Title I status. According to the **Strategic Plan for Standards-based Reform**, dated September 1999:

- Students will be determined to have exceeded the standards, met them, approached them or fallen below them;
- Student progress will be measured upon the demonstration of success in learning the standards at benchmark years;
- There will be rewards and sanctions for students and schools, and assistance “when schools fall short and help is needed.” If a school receives assistance and still makes little or no progress, sanctions will be initiated.

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

1. *What criteria are included in the definition of adequate yearly progress for schools and districts under Title I?*

School adequate yearly progress under Title I is measured using the following assessments:

- Stanford Achievement Test scores in Reading and Mathematics
- Attendance, and
- School-selected student achievement indicators.

The district structure in Hawaii is loosely defined and provides primarily a regional support structure. The entire state is considered to be one district, and so district-level adequate yearly progress has not been developed or defined.

2. *What are the definitions of adequate yearly progress?*

Adequate yearly progress for Title I schools, either schoolwide or targeted assistance, has been defined as the following:

- Annual 2% gain, or 75% of students, in stanines 5-9 in reading as measured by the SAT-9 in the preponderance of grade levels tested,
- Annual 2% gain, or 75% of students, in stanines 5-9 in mathematics as measured by the SAT-9 in the preponderance of grade levels tested,
- Improved student attendance gains of at least 2% annually, or 95% attendance, and
- Annual gain of at least 2% on the school-selected student achievement indicators.

The movement of annual progress at 2% was designed to move the state’s schools into stanines 5 and above on the norm-referenced SAT-9.

The school-selected student achievement indicator could include:

1. the Hawaii Writing Assessment

2. the Holistic Reading Assessment (or Secondary Reading Assessment)
3. the Work Sampling System

or another indicator selected entirely by the school but approved by the state review panel. Most Title I schools have had their indicators reviewed. The indicator must reflect assessment data collected from all students in at least one grade in one or more subjects. The indicator should reflect the focus of the school (i.e. if the school is working to improve writing achievement, then the Hawaii Writing Assessment would be appropriate) according to the review panel.

To make adequate yearly progress overall, a school must meet the progress requirements of at least three of the four criteria, thereby creating a “preponderance of evidence of adequate yearly progress.”

Are these transitional or final definitions? If transitional, when will the final definitions be in place and what criteria and processes will they include?

The school-level definition for adequate yearly progress is transitional and will only be in place for the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 school years. A new assessment system is being field tested during May 2000, and so the new definition for adequate yearly progress will be designed and go into effect for Spring 2001 testing; the definition will be based on the new criterion-referenced assessment.

3. *What is the process for identifying those schools and districts that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools? If the districts plays a role, does the state provide guidance on local criteria?*

After reviewing the criteria outlined above, the state determines whether or not Title I schools are making adequate yearly progress. The state tracks school performance and reports annually to schools on their adequate yearly progress. Schools receive individual reports on their performance. Based on the school’s status, they are categorized as making or not making adequate yearly progress.

4. *What are the criteria and processes for identifying schools and districts in need of improvement under Title I? What plans must be prepared? How can a school or district get out of Program Improvement? Does the district or the state make this determination?*

The state determines if a school is in need of improvement under Title I, and has defined this as not making adequate yearly progress. To move out of improvement status, a school must make adequate yearly progress in any two of three years following the identification for program improvement. Districts are not so categorized as Hawaii is considered to be one district.

All schools create SSIRs or school improvement plans, but those Title I schools in need of improvement also are required to develop additional schoolwide or targeted assistance plans, as well as school safety and other documents to address the specific issues of the school.

5. *What types of assistance are provided to those in need of improvement under Title I?*

The state is required to have a school support system in place for Title I schools by law, so there has been extensive training of the state and local district support staff members, called **School Renewal Specialists**. There is also a network of Title I resource teachers, called **Linkers**, who provide support to schools and teachers in Title I schools. The state Title I team also works with low performing Title I schools to initiate the school support process. **School-based support teams** then include school administrators, parents and faculty who analyze disaggregated achievement data and determine which areas present the greatest need.

The state staff and School Renewal Specialists support the development of the **School Status and Improvement Reports (SSIR)**. These have been prepared as part of the Department of Education's Comprehensive Assessment and Accountability System to provide regular, understandable accounts of our schools' progress. Context information includes a description of the school setting and data concerning the school population, staffing levels, and facilities. Process information outlines the school's priorities and programs for improvement during the year just past. Outcome information includes data on attendance, standardized test results (SAT9), and school completion. Schools use SSIR information in their school improvement plans in determining what the school's problems are and outlining a plan(s) to solve those problems.

Monetary assistance is also provided. Grants were provided to eight schools in the most recent grant cycle to help them develop reform models.

6. *Who provides the assistance?*

As outlined above, three state-sponsored levels of support staff provide assistance:

- School Renewal Specialists
- Title I Teacher Specialists (Linkers)
- State Title I Staff.

7. *Have waivers played a role in this process?*

The state is continuing to work through the development of assessment and accountability systems, and acknowledges that a waiver request may be necessary as they approach the federal deadlines for these systems to be in place.

8. *Are there future plans for the state system for schools or districts receiving Title I funding (proposed or enacted and to be implemented) or for the definition of adequate yearly progress? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

Once the new system is in place, all schools will be held to the same expectations with regard to annual progress or achievement.

9. *Is there alignment between Title I and non-Title I systems for adequate yearly progress?*

During the transitional period, only Title I schools have the definition of adequate yearly progress applied to them.

10. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of Title I? Explain.*

The state is currently in a period of transition, which has been the issue of greatest attention.

Contact Information

Assessment

Thomas Gans, Ph.D
Evaluation Specialist
Evaluation Section
State of Hawaii
3633 Waiialae Avenue, Bldg. C
Honolulu, HI 96816-3299
(808) 733-4008
tom_gans@notes.k12.hi.us

Accountability

Francine Grudzias
Educational Administrative Services Director
Office of Accountability and School Instructional Support
Hawaii Department of Education
Queen Liliuokalanu Bldg., Room 321
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 586-3446
francine_grudzias@notes.k12.hi.us

Title I

Dr. Elaine Takenaka
Administrator
Special Programs Management Section
Hawaii Department of Education
Queen Liliuokalanu Bldg.
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 394-1387
elaine_takenaka@notes.k12.hi.us