



Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D.
Commissioner of Education
Tel. 603-271-3144

Paul Leather
Deputy Commissioner of Education
Tel. 603-271-3801

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, N.H. 03301
FAX 603-271-1953
Citizens Services Line 1-800-339-9900**

October 1, 2013

2013 Adequacy Report

Introduction:

In June 2009, the NH State Legislature passed Senate Bill 180, now [RSA 193-E](#) that “establishes an accountability system to ensure schools are providing the opportunity for an adequate education.”

193-E:3-b Accountability for the Opportunity for an Adequate Education. Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, a school shall demonstrate by the end of the school year that it provides the opportunity for an adequate education under RSA 193-E:2-a... Beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, a school shall demonstrate by the end of the school year that it provides the opportunity for an adequate education by meeting the requirements of either paragraph I or II of this section. Following the adoption of the performance-based accountability system as provided in RSA 193-E:3-c and RSA 193-E:3-d, the department shall evaluate all schools using both the input based school accountability system under paragraph I of this section and the performance based accountability system under RSA 193-E:3-c and RSA 193-E:3-d. A school that satisfies the requirements of either system shall be providing the opportunity for an adequate education. [Chapter 193-E Session Laws of 2012]

The law defines the two components of the accountability system: an input-based system, and a performance-based system.

The purpose of this report is to notify the Governor and the Legislature as to the status of whether New Hampshire public schools are providing the opportunity for an adequate education as defined in state law. In so doing, we will also describe how the reports from the two systems factor into these determinations. Additionally, there are two additional exclusions, High Schools that are fully credentialed by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, (NEASC), and Chartered Public Schools, as per RSA 193-E:3-b-I(c) and 194-B:3-I(a).

The NH adequacy reports at the school level have been developed in response to RSA 193-E:3-b. They were designed by a statutory designated task force over multiple years, 193:3-c. The reports are comprised of a number of different indicators or components. For elementary and middle schools there are 6 components; for high schools there are 9 components.

Reports for NH schools are available online at: <https://my.doe.nh.gov/Profiles/reports.aspx> . This is the “School and District Profile” section of the NHDOE web site. The reports may be found under the “Reports” tab, and then by selecting “Adequacy”.

PART I Input-based Accountability System (IBAS):

Over the last two years, schools and districts have been required to complete an on-line survey to identify how each school meets the self-assessment requirements of the [Input-based system](#): As indicated in 193-E:3-b I, Schools can demonstrate that they provide an opportunity for an adequate education by meeting twelve of the existing [school approval standards](#). Ten of the twelve are curriculum and instruction standards: English language arts and reading; mathematics; science; social studies; arts; world language; health education; physical education; information and communication technologies; and technology education.

Two additional input standards are included in the twelve: school year and graduation credits.

Process: Using the on-line survey, school principals or their designees submitted evidence that they have met each of the input-based standards. Reporting “YES” for the standard and providing the evidence for this answer provides the documentation to affirm that the school meets the specifications of the standard as defined in [Ed306 \(Minimum Standards for School Approval\)](#). Reporting “NO” indicates that the school does not meet the specifications defined by the school approval standards, and the school must explain why it does not comply with the specifications. As a third option, schools may report “OTHER” and submit evidence to demonstrate that they meet the standard by alternate means.

In addition, and according to RSA 193-E:3-b-I(c), a school that furnishes the Commissioner with evidence that it has received full accreditation from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) shall be deemed to be in compliance with the provisions of the IBAS.

The department has established a regular series of on-site reviews to verify the information gathered through the self-assessments, as required under 193-E:3-d. Although the department has been completing these on-sites on an informal basis for several years, recently the process has been changed for validation purposes.

All such site visits will now follow the following process upon completion of the report:

- a. The Bureau of School Approval and Facility Management assemble the report from visiting team members and draft a summary and transmittal letter.
- b. The report is addressed to the Commissioner and signed by the Administrator of the Bureau of School Approval and Facility Management.
- c. The transmittal letter is prepared for the Commissioner's signature.
- d. The Director of the Division of Program Support reviews and approves the draft report and transmittal letter to be brought to the cabinet.
- e. Following review and approval by the Commissioner, the draft report is sent to the superintendent(s) of the schools that were visited for their review.
- f. The Superintendent has 15 days from the receipt of the report to respond with factual corrections.
- g. Following review of submitted corrections, a final report is prepared and distributed to superintendent(s) and school principals.
- h. Reports do not include the names of school staff contacted during the visits.
- i. The content of the reports focuses solely on compliance with the 12 standards that make up the definition of an adequate education in RSA 193-E. Comments indicate if the standard is met or not met and why it is not met. Suggestions for improvements are no longer included as part of the on-site report, but will be addressed during the corrective action noted in k. after the release of this report.
- j. The outcome of a report may lead to an immediate change in the status of one or more schools in the accountability system under RSA 193-E. In other words, a school with prior deficiencies that are found to have been corrected may change to approved status. A school in approved status may change to conditionally approved if deficiencies are identified during the visit.
- k. The final report includes requirements and timelines for completion of any corrective actions by the school district.

PART II Performance-Based school Accountability System (PBAS):

Beginning with the 2011-2012 academic year, "a school may demonstrate by the end of the school year that it provides the opportunity for an adequate education through the performance-based school accountability system [PBAS]," (RSA 193-E:3-b). PBAS allows schools that did not meet adequacy through the Inputs-Based Accountability System (IBAS) to demonstrate an "opportunity for an adequate education" through performance.

The Performance-Based school Accountability System (PBAS) as determined by the Task Force established two years ago, as per 193-E:3-c, is made up of various indicators:

Academic achievement and growth includes performance and growth (for grades 4-8) on the annual state assessments in reading/English language arts, mathematics, science and writing, under the New England Common Assessment Program, (NECAP). Another indicator is the ACCESS for English Learners (EL), a test that measures whether students who are English

language learners have reached proficiency in English sufficient to enable them to effectively communicate their academic learning on standardized tests.

In addition, students with significant disabilities are given the New Hampshire Alternative Learning Progressions Assessments, or (NH-ALPs). Currently, more than 1,300 students state-wide from grades 2 through 8, 10 and 11 participate in the NH-ALPs and are tested in mathematics, reading, science, and writing. The NH-ALPs results, based on index scores, are currently included in the PBAS for writing and science at all grades assessed, and for grade 11 reading and mathematics only. Growth results for the NH ALPs are not yet available for students participating in the assessment at grades 3-8. Therefore, student performance in reading and mathematics through grade 8 on the NH-ALPs is not included in this report.

Additional indicators are used to help determine a school's success at engaging students and encouraging them to persist. These measures include participation rates (in assessments), attendance, graduation, and dropout rates.

The NH PBAS differentiates among certain student groups:

- Whole school results
- English learners (EL)
- Students with disabilities (SWD)
- Economically disadvantaged (ED)
- All others

Whole school is determined as all students in the school. The "all others" subgroup includes any student who is not a member of the three sub-groups of English learners, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged students.

This definition of sub-group is different from the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) definition in that students only belong to a single sub-group. The following rules were constructed by the task force to ensure accuracy of student inclusion in the other sub-groups. For Adequacy determination these sub-groups are defined as follows:

- Students identified for English language learner services were classified as the EL group,
- Students identified for special education services, but NOT EL services, were classified as the students with disabilities (SWD) group,
- Students eligible for free or reduced lunch services who are not EL or SWD are classified as the economically disadvantaged (ED) group, and
- Students not classified into any of these three groups were classified as the "all other" group.

The PBAS calculates a "Score for Adequacy Decision" for each school based on the data and indicators described above. The "score" is an average of points earned in each of the indicator categories.

For elementary and middle schools there are six categories:

- Reading growth (student growth percentile or SGP)
- Mathematics growth (SGP)
- Science index
- Writing index
- Assessment participation
- Excessive absence

Reading and mathematics growth account for 60% of the total score.

For high schools there are nine categories:

- Reading index
- Mathematics index
- Writing index
- Science index
- Assessment participation
- Excessive absence
- Four-year graduation rate
- Five-year graduation rate
- Dropout rate

Each category is weighted equally.

Attached to this report, there is a description of each of the measures that feeds into the system and a short description of the growth model used to calculate student growth.

Once the performance level descriptors were drafted, the Task Force members were divided into four groups to review school profiles—i.e., scores on each of the indicators in system—for high school and elementary/middle school separately to find the overall score and school profile that best matches the descriptor. The Task Force as a whole determined that **an overall performance score of 2.3 indicated the opportunity for an adequate education for Elementary and Middle Schools. For High Schools, the performance score standard was set at 2.1.**

Schools not meeting the requirements of the Input-Based Accountability System (IBAS) and not scoring 2.3 or greater on PBAS for elementary and middle schools, or 2.1 or greater for high schools, have been classified in this report as: “Not providing an opportunity for an adequate education.” Schools so designated must begin corrective action as describe in RSA 193-E:3-e. In the first year, these schools will be required to submit an action plan to the Commissioner that includes specific actions and a timeline for corrective action.

The PBAS Reports will be available publicly October 1, 2013 on the department’s website. File layouts, a detailed mapping of the data on the enclosed reports as to the fields in the files, and a detailed description of the subgroups are included under “accountability,” (http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/school_improve/account_sys_performance.htm).

The following indicators make up the system:

- **Achievement Indicators:** Annual state assessments (NECAP) are the primary achievement measure included in the NH Performance Based Accountability System. Elementary and middle school indicators include:
 - growth in student academic achievement in reading and mathematics (for more details on growth see the description at the end of this report)
 - school level index values for student achievement in science and writingHigh school indicators include:
 - school level index values for reading, mathematics, science, and writing
- **Achievement Index Scores:** The index score is a method of converting performance levels on the NECAP tests for these subjects such that performance of proficient or greater is equal to full credit (100 points) and scores below proficient are awarded partial credit based on a relative scale. The index system has been used to report NECAP scores in New Hampshire since 2006.
- **Inclusion Indicators:**
 - Participation in state assessments. For both elementary/middle schools and high schools, the participation rate of students on state assessments was chosen as a performance indicator to demonstrate that the school is accountable for all of its students. Participation is reported for the whole school and for each of the subgroups: English learners, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and the remaining group referred to as ‘all others.’
 - Excessive absence. A second measure of the school’s ability to motivate students to engage in the educational program is attendance. The task force examined attendance data in a variety of ways, and defined an indicator labeled “excessive absence” as the percentage of students in a school absent more than 10% of their enrolled days (typically 19 days out of a 180 day school year). The task force relied on the existing educational research literature in selecting this indicator instead of the more common “average daily attendance,” because students absent more than 10 or 15% of the school year are found to be at risk of school failure. The task force chose to use the more conservative/lower threshold of 10%.
- **Persistence/readiness Indicators:**
 - Persistence or readiness indicators are applied at the high school level and are designed to evaluate the extent to which schools help prepare students for the next level of schooling. Ideally, the system would employ credible postsecondary readiness measures, but those are not available at this time within the constraints of the data requirements. Therefore, the task force

agreed that graduation and dropout rate are two critical indicators that signify a school's ability to provide high school students with an opportunity to move beyond high school.

- Graduation rate. A major indicator of a school's ability to provide an adequate education is the graduation rate. The task force included the "four year cohort graduation rate" as an indicator. This is the percentage of students who began as 9th graders and who graduate in four years with a standard diploma.
- Given evidence that some students may take longer than the typical four years to graduate due to many circumstances, the task force included the "five year cohort rate." Students who take five years to complete their graduation requirements are included in this calculation.
- Dropout rate. In addition to graduation rate, the dropout rate was selected by the task force as an indicator that describes whether a school has provided the opportunity for an adequate education. The assumption is that schools with low dropout rates engage their students and provide essential supports to students at risk. Dropout rate is the average percentage of students in a 9th, 10th, or 11th grade cohort who do not return to school the following year. Those who graduate early or earn a GED are not counted as dropouts.

Student Growth Percentile (SGP):

One major difference between the elementary/middle school achievement indicators and the high school indicators is the use of growth as a measure of achievement in reading and mathematics for K-8 students. State assessments are administered in those two subjects each year for grades 3 through 8 affording the state the opportunity to calculate a growth measure that follows each student from year to year. However, high school students are assessed only once, at 11th grade and there are insufficient data from which to calculate a growth score for accountability purposes.

A student growth percentile (SGP) indicates how much a student's performance has improved from one year to the next relative to his or her academic peers: other students statewide with a similar test score history. The model, developed by Dr. Damian Betebenner from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA), describes whether a student demonstrated academic performance greater than, the same as, or less than the students' academic peers. New Hampshire is one of approximately fifteen (15) states implementing the student growth percentile model.

An example can help clarify what the student growth percentile tells us. When one takes a toddler for a yearly checkup, the pediatrician might mention that the daughter’s measured height puts her in the 75th percentile. That tells us that the daughter is taller than 75% of other toddlers her age. The percentile gives a better understanding of whether the toddler’s height is “typical” for children the daughter’s age. For students, the SGP tells the parent and the school whether a child is progressing at the same rate as those who performed similarly in previous state tests. These expected scores are indicated as “targets” on the state adequacy report.

For elementary and middle schools, a student growth percentile (SGP) is calculated for each student in grades 4 through 8 for mathematics and reading using state assessment (NECAP) scores. In each school, the median (or middle) growth percentile of all tested students in the school is calculated for the whole school and each subgroup. This value is used as an indicator of the school’s performance. A school earns credits towards the adequacy determination based on whether the median growth percentile of its students indicate they are on track to meet proficiency targets in three years or by eighth grade, whichever comes first.

Using a measure of whether a student is “on track” to achieve proficiency on state assessments allows the growth indicator to incorporate both criterion and normative information. For instance, it is likely that some students, perhaps newcomers to this country, could exhibit high growth in achievement, yet still remain below proficiency because they started well behind their grade level. Similarly, there will be some students who exceed the state proficiency score yet who advance at a rate less than their peers, who would earn a low growth percentile.

Conclusion:

Of the total of 450 public schools in New Hampshire, all met the test this year of offering the opportunity for an adequate education. In addition, when looked at separately, 358 schools met all input-based standards and 413 schools met the performance-based standards. Below is a charted summary of the findings. Lists of all NH schools and their status on the performance-based system and those that did not meet the test of “providing the opportunity for an adequate education” are attached, as per 193-E:3-c VI.

SUMMARY			
<i>Status</i>	<i>Performance</i>	<i>Self Assessment</i>	<i>Meets Adequacy</i>
YES	413	358	450
NO	37	92	0
TOTAL	450	450	450
YES	91.78%	47.32%	100%
NO	8.96%	52.68%	0%