

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS  
Office of Instructional Support

2004 ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRESS REPORT (APR)  
September 14, 2004

Introductory Statement

On August 31, 2004, the California Department of Education (CDE) released the 2004 Accountability Progress Report (APR) for schools and districts. The school and district reports provide data for all components of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and participation rates on the English Language Arts and Mathematics California Standards Tests (CSTs) at Grades 2-8, the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) at Grade 10, and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) at Grades 2-8 and 10; the schoolwide Academic Performance Index (API); and graduation rate.

Title I regulations require that districts annually review student academic progress at each school receiving Title I funding, provide assistance to schools that do not meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria and are identified for Title I Program Improvement, and take corrective action at schools that do not make sufficient progress to exit Program Improvement. The regulations also specify the conditions under which the state must take corrective action in districts having schools that remain in Program Improvement for four years or more.

This report brings forward a summary of the 2004 APR. The APR will be updated in September 2004 to reflect data corrections, appeal decisions, and the results of safe harbor calculations. Title I Program Improvement (PI) standings for schools and districts will be released in October 2004. In addition, the State will release its 2003-04 API Growth Report on October 21, 2004. The API Growth Report will provide information on schools and districts meeting schoolwide and subgroup API targets. The API as it is used in the Accountability Progress Report (APR) reflects schoolwide results and is used as an indicator requiring schools and districts to attain a score of 560 or show 1 point growth.

Background

**District 2004 Accountability Progress Report (APR) Summary**

The following tables summarize the results from the District 2004 AYP Report. The full report is provided as Attachment 1.

**2004 District Annual Measurable Objectives  
(Participation and Performance)**

Group	English Language Arts				Mathematics			
	Enrollment	% at or above Proficient	Met 95% Partic. Rate	Met AMO*	Enrollment	% at or above Proficient	Met 95% Partic. Rate	Met AMO*
	Number				Number			
<b>All Students</b>	79,802	<b>39.8</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	79,787	<b>39.9</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
African American	11,228	28.1	Y	Y	11,224	24.6	Y	Y
American Indian	421	50.1	Y	Y	423	43.9	Y	Y
Asian	7,028	53.3	Y	Y	7,028	61.0	Y	Y
Filipino	5,730	56.7	Y	Y	5,730	54.2	Y	Y
Hispanic	33,911	23.4	Y	Y	33,903	26.9	Y	Y
Pacific Islander	799	40.6	Y	Y	798	36.9	Y	Y
White	20,617	63.2	Y	Y	20,613	57.9	Y	Y
Econ. Disadvantaged	47,071	25.2	Y	Y	47,059	28.8	Y	Y
English Learners	30,342	18.7	Y	Y	30,333	25.9	Y	Y
Students with Disabilities	9,626	18.4	Y	Y	9,625	19.4	Y	Y

\*Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for Unified School Districts:

12.0% Proficient or above in English Language Arts and 12.8% Proficient or above in Mathematics.

**2003-2004 District Growth API**

	2004 Growth	2003 Base	Change	Met 2004 AYP Criteria
<b>Districtwide</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Criteria</b> (districts/schools must meet at least one)	Minimum of 560	---	Minimum 1 point growth	

**District Graduation Rate**

	Rate for 2004 (Class of 2002-03)	Rate for 2003 (Class of 2001-02)	Change	Average 2-Year Change	Met 2004 AYP Criteria
<b>Districtwide</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>-0.2</b>	<b>-1.8</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Criteria</b> (districts/schools must meet at least one)	Minimum 82.8	---	Minimum +0.1	Minimum +0.2	

**District Subgroup Growth (2003 to 2004)  
on Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)**

Group	English Language Arts			Mathematics		
	% Proficient or Above			% Proficient or Above		
	2003	2004	Diff.	2003	2004	Diff.
<b>All Students</b>	38.6	39.8	+1.2	35.9	39.9	+4.0
African American	27.0	28.1	+1.1	21.4	24.6	+3.2
American Indian	52.8	50.1	-2.7	42.1	43.9	+1.8
Asian	49.7	53.3	+3.6	54.4	61.0	+6.6
Filipino	55.2	56.7	+1.5	48.7	54.2	+5.5
Hispanic	21.9	23.4	+1.5	23.0	26.9	+3.9
Pacific Islander	37.5	40.6	+3.1	32.5	36.9	+4.4
White	62.4	63.2	+0.8	54.3	57.9	+3.6
Econ. Disadvantaged	23.7	25.2	+1.5	24.9	28.8	+3.9
English Learners	18.6	18.7	+0.1	22.9	25.9	+3.0
Students with Disabilities	18.5	18.4	-0.1	18.7	19.4	+0.7

**School-Level APR Results**

The table below summarizes the performance of district schools according to the 2004 APR. Attachment 2 provides a school-by-school listing; individual school reports are available at <http://ayp.cde.ca.gov/reports.asp>.

SCHOOLS	Total #	Made AYP All Criteria		Made Participation Rate and Annual Measurable Objectives		Made API Indicator		Made Graduation Rate <sup>^</sup>	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Elementary	118	101	86%	101	86%	116	98%	N/A	N/A
Middle	21	6	29%	6	29%	21	100%	N/A	N/A
Senior High	20	9	45%	11	55%	16	80%	18	90%
Contract	4	2	50%	3	75%	4	100%	1	50%
Charters	20	14	70%	14	70%	19	95%	5	100%
<b>ALL</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>89%</b>

<sup>^</sup> 27 high schools have graduation rates (20 Senior High Schools, 2 Contract schools, and 5 Charter schools).

**Large Urban School District and State Level APR Summary**

The release of the 2004 APR confirms that San Diego Unified School District has **met** all AYP criteria – performance levels, participation rates, API, and graduation rate. The following table provides APR information for the district, several other large urban California school districts, and the State.

**2004 APR Data for Selected California Urban School Districts\***

<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>Made AYP All Criteria</b>	<b>Met 95% Participation Rate</b>	<b>Met Annual Measurable Objectives</b>	<b>Made API Indicator</b>	<b>Made Graduation Rate</b>
Fresno	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Long Beach	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Los Angeles	N	Y	N	Y	N
Oakland	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Sacramento	N	Y	N	Y	Y
San Bernardino	N	Y	N	Y	Y
<b>San Diego</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
San Francisco	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>STATE</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>

*\*Results may change due to incomplete or changing data for calculating the API and AYP.*

**Large Urban School District Growth (2003 to 2004)**

<b>District</b>	<b>English Language Arts</b>			<b>Mathematics</b>		
	% Proficient or Above			% Proficient or Above		
	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004*</b>	<b>Diff.</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004*</b>	<b>Diff.</b>
Fresno	21.7	24.8	+3.1	23.7	25.7	+2.0
Long Beach	34.2	40.8	+6.6	38.8	42.2	+3.4
Los Angeles	24.9	25.7	+0.8	29.2	31.4	+2.2
Oakland	21.5	22.7	+1.2	24.7	27.1	+2.4
Sacramento	32.7	33.0	+0.3	36.2	38.1	+1.9
San Bernardino	21.1	21.4	+0.3	25.9	25.4	-0.5
<b>San Diego</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>+1.2</b>	<b>35.9</b>	<b>39.9</b>	<b>+4.0</b>
San Francisco	39.7	41.9	+2.2	45.7	47.7	+2.0
<b>STATE</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>+1.0</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>+1.5</b>

*\*Results may change due to incomplete or changing data for calculating the API and AYP.*

### **A Review of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Criteria for 2004**

The *No Child Left Behind* Act expects that 100 percent of the students in public schools in the United States will meet state standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics by the year 2014. To ensure annual progress toward this goal, each state has established Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for each subject area. California's AYP definition, as approved by the United States Department of Education in June 2003, includes the following four components:

1. **Meeting Standards.** The percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level on the California Standards Tests (CSTs) in English Language Arts and Mathematics (Grades 2-8), the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in English Language Arts and Mathematics (Grade 10), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) for students with severe disabilities.
  - Grades 2-8: achievement of the 2004 statewide AMOs of 13.6 percent in English Language Arts (ELA) and 16 percent in Mathematics assessments (CSTs).
  - Grade 10: achievement of the 2004 statewide AMOs of 11.2 percent in English Language Arts (ELA) and 9.6 percent in Mathematics assessments (CAHSEE).
2. **Assessment Participation Rate.** The percentage of students taking the statewide standards-based assessments (95 percent or above).
  - For the 2004 AYP, a two-year average participation rate will be considered for districts, schools, and subgroups that did not meet the one-year participation rate criteria.
3. **Academic Performance Index.** Schoolwide API Growth:
  - Growth in the API from 2003 to 2004 of at least one point **or**
  - A minimum 2004 API Growth score of 560.
4. **High School Graduation Rate.** The AYP criteria provide high schools and school districts with high school students three options for meeting the 2004 graduation rate requirement:
  - Achievement of a graduation rate of 82.8 or above; **or**
  - A one-year improvement of at least 0.1 in the graduation rate; **or**
  - A two-year average improvement of at least 0.2 in the graduation rate.

Prior to calculating the API or AYP, the California Department of Education makes decisions about how to include, exclude, or account for test scores or records that will be used in the calculations. These inclusion/exclusion rules (e.g., excluding student not continuously enrolled at the school since the beginning of the school year) are applied prior to calculating the API or AYP and result in data that will not necessarily match the raw assessment data released in mid-August (STAR, CAHSEE, and CAPA).

### **Title I Program Improvement**

The 2004 AYP results will be used to develop the 2004 Title I Program Improvement (PI) report that identifies the PI status of a school or school district that receives Title I funding. Schools and school districts must meet all criteria to make AYP for 2004. Currently, the consequences of not making AYP apply only to schools and school districts receiving federal Title I funds.

Title I regulations require districts to annually review each school receiving Title I funding to determine whether the school is making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Schools that do not make AYP for two consecutive years are identified for Title I Program Improvement. These schools must develop or revise a school plan, engage in professional development, and receive technical assistance from the district as they develop and implement the improvement plan. Any PI school that does not make AYP for two years after identification enters District Corrective Action (Year 3). If a Year 3 school again does not make AYP, it becomes a Year 4 school and must begin planning to restructure.

The Title I Program Improvement status reports will be released in October 2004.

### Instructional Implications

The federal accountability system, which includes Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as well as intervention programs, has significant implications for instruction. The district and each of its schools are accountable for the improvement of student achievement as measured by the California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA), and the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). With the inclusion of these test results in the AYP calculation, it is essential that curriculum and instruction are aligned with and support students to meet the state content standards. On-going improvements in data reporting at the state and district level will provide school site and district staff with better tools to identify specific student academic needs and target instruction. Through the district's professional development process, principals and teachers will continue their efforts to improve instructional practice around standards-based curriculum and monitor student progress toward meeting the state content standards.

### Facilities Implications

There are no facilities implications associated with this report.

### Budget Implication

There are no immediate district budget implications associated with this report. However, newly identified PI schools or those schools moving to Year 2 will require additional Title I funds to provide choice transportation or supplemental services.

### Public Support and Engagement Implications

The entire San Diego community has a vested interest in the improvement of student achievement at all district schools, and particularly at those schools identified by the state for intervention. In addition, the district has informed staff, parents, and the community about each school's AYP and will provide further notifications when the Title I Program Improvement status report is released in October 2004.

Policy Implications

The information contained in this report is consistent with Board of Education policies F-1700 and F-7030.

Recommendation

There are no recommendations associated with this report.

Attachments

1. 2004 Accountability Progress Report – District Level
2. 2004 Accountability Progress Report – List of Schools

Prepared by Linda Dusharme, Program Manager of the Planning and Accountability Department.