



ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

For Immediate Release
October 9, 2009

Contact: Julie Johnson Thompson
(501) 683-4786 / (501) 766-7976
julie.thompson@arkansas.gov

LITTLE ROCK: The Arkansas Department of Education today released the 2009 results for adequate yearly progress calculations for school accountability under the federal No Child Left Behind Act and outlined how its new Smart Accountability plan will affect schools.

“Smart Accountability will allow us to better target our resources in ways that will best help those schools identified as being in need of improvement have a positive impact on their lower-performing students,” said Dr. Tom Kimbrell, Arkansas Commissioner of Education. “Smart Accountability enables us to do that by identifying schools more appropriately.

“For example, schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (please see attachment for full explanation of adequate yearly progress) because of low scores among one or two subgroups of students will be placed into ‘targeted’ improvement categories, while those that are dealing with low scores system-wide will be placed into ‘whole school’ improvement categories.” The student subgroups for which Arkansas schools are held accountable are white, black, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, English language learners and students with disabilities. Schools that have 40 or more test-takers in a subgroup must meet the same increase in test scores in each subgroup as does the student body as a whole in both mathematics and literacy subject areas.

The state’s differentiated accountability model, which is named Smart Accountability, was approved by the federal government in January 2009. The model divides schools into achieving, “targeted” or “whole school” improvement statuses based on the following criteria:

Label	Selection Criteria
Achieving Schools	Meets Standards for this year
Alert	First year not to meet standards
Targeted Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the annual measurable goal (AMO) for <u>25 percent or fewer groups</u> and <u>do not</u> miss the AMO for combined population resulting in school improvement years one through three (1-3) will be labeled as in “Targeted Improvement” TI-1, TI-2 and TI-3 Corrective Action
Whole School Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for combined population and/or <u>more than 25 percent of groups</u> resulting in school improvement years one through three (1-3) will be labeled as in “Whole School Improvement” WSI-1, WSI-2 and WSI-3 Corrective Action
Targeted Intensive Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for <u>25 percent or fewer groups</u> and <u>do not</u> miss the AMO for combined population

	resulting in school improvement for four (4) or more years will be labeled as in “Targeted Intensive Improvement” TII-4, TII-5: Restructuring
Whole School Intensive Improvement	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy and miss the AMO for combined population and/or <u>more than 25 percent groups</u> resulting in school improvement years four (4) or more years will be labeled as in “Whole School Intensive Improvement” WSII-4, WSII-5: Restructuring
State Directed	Schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress in math and/or literacy after TII-5 or WSII-5 will be labeled as in “State Directed” status

While schools classified as Targeted Improvement and Targeted Intensive Improvement will be held responsible for adopting steps to address the needs of all low-performing students, the school must select research-based interventions that specifically address the needs of those students in the subpopulations that failed to make adequate yearly progress. For example, if a school meets adequate yearly progress for all students except for the English language learner subgroup, then the school will be expected to find those strategies proven to improve the performance of English language learners.

Schools classified as Whole School Improvement or Whole School Intensive Improvement will be held responsible for adopting more systemic interventions that will address the learning needs of students throughout the school building.

When schools are in Targeted and Whole School Improvement status, the state will provide guidance to them in terms of deciding which interventions to incorporate into its Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement plan that will best address students’ deficiencies with the goal of improving student performance.

After three years in school improvement, be it Targeted, Whole School or a combination of the two, schools advance to Targeted Intensive Improvement or Whole School Intensive Improvement. At this stage, the state transitions from a more collaborative approach to a more directive one in the selection and application of interventions designed to positively impact student performance.

After year five in either school improvement category, schools are considered to be in the “State Directed” phase of improvement, and the state has the authority to appoint a school improvement director to steer the school toward improved student performance.

For the complete list of interventions for each category of schools, please refer to Attachment B of the Smart Accountability Handbook, which can be found at this Web page: http://arkansased.org/smart_arkansas/pdf/sarg_b_interventions_060809.pdf

The 2009 adequate yearly progress calculations show that:

498 schools are classified as Achieving
176 schools are classified as Alert

140 schools are classified as “Targeted Improvement Schools”
113 schools are classified as “Whole School Improvement Schools”
32 schools are classified as “Targeted Intensive Improvement Schools”
64 schools are classified as “Whole School Intensive Improvement Schools”
58 schools are classified as “State Directed Schools”

A chart with each school and its classification is located on **ArkansasEd.org**.

“Before Smart Accountability, the state was not able to provide as much direction or to help schools focus on where their true needs for improvement existed,” Dr. Kimbrell said. “Instead, the federal government mandated a broad-brush approach that was heavy on accountability but light on the tools we could use to strengthen performance. We are very excited that we now have a means to assist our under-performing schools in putting proven strategies to work for the students who truly need them.”

School districts are also held accountable under No Child Left Behind. A district is classified as being in district improvement when adequate yearly progress is not met. These labels are slightly different as the United States Department of Education does not allow Smart Accountability to apply at the district level.

Adequate yearly progress is determined by the percentage of students scoring proficient or exhibiting growth toward proficiency on literacy and mathematics exams in three grade spans across the district. The grade spans are K-5, 6-8 and 9-12. The calculations also take into account the performance of students within the same populations that are used when calculating school improvement: white, African-American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, students with learning disabilities and English language learners.

A district is placed into district improvement when it has failed to make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years. Likewise, districts must make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years to be removed from the district improvement list. Five districts on the list last year have met the standards for adequate yearly progress this year and will be removed from the list next year if they are able to do so again next year.

The summary for districts this year is:

213 districts Meet Standards
16 districts are in Alert
8 districts are in District Improvement Year 1
13 districts are in District Improvement Year 2
3 districts are in District Improvement Year 3
1 district is in District Improvement Year 4

The Arkansas Department of Education strives to ensure that all children in the state have access to a quality education by providing educators, administrators and staff with leadership, resources and training.

