

Request_Date	Request Details	Resolution
7/30/2012	<p>Two Virtual Charter Schools</p> <p>The two virtual public charter schools that serve grades K-12 are missing the graduation rate column for their high school matrix.</p> <p>[NAME REDACTED] http://ed.sc.gov/data/embargoed/esea/emesea12mg5/school.cfm?SID=[NAME REDACTED]</p> <p>[NAME REDACTED] Charter School http://ed.sc.gov/data/embargoed/esea/emesea12mg5/school.cfm?SID=[NAME REDACTED]</p>	<p>For two schools; High School matrixes now show GradRate.</p>
8/3/2012	<p>This issue looks like it may be some kind of technical gliche.</p> <p>First Name: [NAME REDACTED] Last Name: [NAME REDACTED]</p> <p>Topic: School Report Cards Office: Chief Information Office</p> <p>Message: Can someone explain how the new school ratings A - F are determined and what the process entails? Thanks</p>	<p>Provided link to technical document on the web</p>

Request_Date Request Details
8/6/2012 Jay W.,

Resolution

O:\Accountability\DataManagement_Analysis\RES\REQ
UESTS\ESEA Inquiries\Questions - Reward Schools.docx

Thanks for helping me out with these questions.

- The Technical Document says the state has been recognizing Title 1 schools for years for either closing the achievement gap and performance as part of the Title 1 Distinguished Schools program. Do you know what the major differences between that and this new Reward Schools recognition program are i.e. why was it modified?
- Do you know whether more or less schools are being recognized now vs in the past (I know there are fewer schools facing consequences i.e. Focus and Priority, so just wondering whether the same logic applied here)?
- For both Reward performance and progress schools, the technical document says part of that is based on these schools getting certain grades in the previous two years. How were those decided this year (since this was the first they got grades)?
- For Reward progress schools, how do we know whether the school is receiving the award for making progress with all students or just one or more subgroups?
- Finally, the technical document says the state will release a list of semi-finalists and winners for the Reward schools program. When do you expect that to happen?

I think that's it for the moment. Appreciate you helping me run these answers down today!

[NAME REDACTED]

8/13/2012

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/1/2012	<p>My name is [NAME REDACTED] and I am the Director at the [REDACTED] Charter School ([REDACTED]CS) in [REDACTED] County. I just spoke with [NAME REDACTED] the Head of Federal Programs, and learned the [NAME REDACTED]CS received an "F" on our Report Card. However, as we began going over the sub-groups, the information listed in some cases was incorrect. For example, the Report Card indicates not all male students were tested for PASS. This is incorrect. All male students were tested. Yet, our school did not receive any points for that accomplishment. [NAME REDACTED] also explained there is no appeals process to dispute current Report Cards. As a charter school with a small student population, any inaccuracy hurts our Report Card scores tremendously. I am sending this email with the hope your office can assist my school. We would appreciate an opportunity to see how information was obtained and to correct any errors on our Report Card. Our staff has work diligently this past school year and it is hurtful to know we may have a passing score, but the public will be told we failed when this news is released tomorrow. I look forward to hearing from you and appreciate any assistance you can offer. Thank you.</p>

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. [NAME REDACTED] Charter School (CS)

in [REDACTED] County achieved lower than 95% in percent tested for ELA for Males due to the fact that 2 male students received non-standard accommodations in Reading and Research and thus their scores were counted as missing, or not tested. This methodology has been in place for federal and state accountability since 2010-2011 as outlined the in South Carolina Accountability Workbook:

“For the 2010-2011 school year and going forward, students with non-standard accommodations will be excluded from participation calculations -- that is, they are treated as "not tested" in the numerator. Non-standard accommodations include oral administration of ELA and the use of a calculator for Math on PASS in grades 3 and 4.” (page 3)

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
7/31/2012	<p>We are concerned about one of our high schools report card grade: [NAME REDACTED] High. They have incorrect subgroups.</p> <p>I have listed the correct subgroup numbers for [NAME REDACTED] High African-American: XX Hispanic: XX Disabled: XX LEP: XX Subsidized Meals: 98</p> <p>Your calculations have them with an African American subgroup, a Hispanic subgroup and Disabled subgroup.</p> <p>Please let me know if this will be corrected before I write a</p>
8/9/2012	<p>I know that we have recieved the school and district report card grades, but will schools and districts be receiving absolute and growth ratings for this year. We are just not sure of this.[NAME REDACTED]</p>

Resolution

Checked [NAME REDACTED] high school data on web. The following groups are not in calculation but just N report. Please see the detail file not N file. And we are using 2011 end of course data.

My calculations did not have African American subgroup, a Hispanic subgroup and Disabled subgroup.

African-American: XX
Hispanic: XX
Disabled: XX
LEP: XX

Schools and districts have received the ESEA Federal Accountability System grades (the old AYP). They will receive their state accountability report cards in November as usual. Unless directed by the Education Oversight Committee to do something differently, Absolute and Growth ratings will be calculated for the 2012 report cards.

Cynthia

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/2/2012	See letter located in "Program Location" in this database. Provide clarification of calculations for [REDACTED] Elementary School and Elementary Grades points on District view.

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. The difference between the district level Elementary School Matrix and the school level Elementary School Matrix is due to one student (stateid=[REDACTED]) who in 2011 was listed as not continuously enrolled in the school (she entered the school on March 18, 2011), but was listed as continuously enrolled in the district. This student therefore drops out of growth calculations at the school level, but is included in growth calculations at the district level.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Request_Date	Request Details	Resolution
8/1/2012	<p>The question I have is around [REDACTED] High School in [REDACTED]. Last year the school had 5 students that should have graduated and didn't. The school just concluded its second year, and does not have any prior graduation rates to show improvement.</p> <p>How can a school with only a baseline graduation rate have this measure included? Also, does the sample size of 30 apply to graduation rate?</p>	<p>The 2011 Graduation rate (as used in ESEA 2012) was not limited by student count in the ALL STUDENTS category. However, any subgroup with fewer than 10 students are considered insufficient data and the graduation rate for such groups is blocked and not used in calculations for ESEA 2012. We applied an N size of ≥ 30 only to performance and percent tested in ESEA 2012 calculations for the base line year.</p> <p>When a school had no graduation rate in 2010 we used 2011 rate only in ESEA 2012 calculation for other schools also in the state as the starting point. In other words, if the school only had a graduation rate in 2011 and met the 73.1 objective at school or subgroup level we issue one point in the calculation for the school or subgroup. When the school had a 0 graduation rate in 2011 there was no point issued.</p> <p>When [REDACTED] High School had some students graduated in 2012, we are able to calculate improvement partial points compared with 2011 data in case the graduation rate objective for</p>
8/1/2012	<p>Wants percentage of students that passed the HSAP on the first attempt for all high schools in her district</p>	<p>Talked with CH. Concerning the nature of the data request. She'll handle this issue.</p>

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

7/31/2012

Needs an understanding of the Absolute Rating and Improvement Rating formula.

Resolution

"[NAME REDACTED],I was informed that you contacted us here at the State Dept of Education asking for clarification of the Absolute and Growth Rating calculations for the state report cards. I am attaching to this email the Education Oversight Committee's 2011-12 accountability manual which describes the exact methodology for these calculations. You will find what you need beginning on page 16.Thank you.
Best, Sylvia Sievers"

Request_Date
7/31/2012

Request Details
FOLLOW-UP

[REDACTED] HS is not populating on [REDACTED] webpage.

<http://ed.sc.gov/data/embargoed/esea/emesea12mg5/district.cfm?SID=XXXX>

Jay W. Ragley
Legislative and Public Affairs

Resolution

The high school [REDACTED] was taken out together with other 5 schools due to too few students at school took science or history.

RE: ESEA Federal Accountability System - technical documentation

Ms. Hearn: I noticed that there is no report card grade for our secondary school [REDACTED] High- [REDACTED], SC.

I assumed that the grade was reflected with the middle school's report card- [REDACTED] Middle. Both schools are separate entities with each school having individual BEDS Code. Please inform me on the procedures to follow in submitting a review of the calculations and grades issued for [REDACTED] Middle and [REDACTED] High Schools, both located in [REDACTED] School District X.

From: [NAME REDACTED] [mailto:XXX@XXX]

Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 9:55 AM

To: Hearn, Cynthia

Cc: [NAME REDACTED]; [NAME REDACTED]

Subject: Missing Data for [NAME REDACTED] School

Good morning, I have a question in reference to no data reported for [NAME REDACTED] High School. Please note that our middle school and high school are separate schools. Each school has its own Beds code. I know that this is an extremely busy time for you. I have called several times but I could not leave a message because your system is full and cannot take any additional messages. Please give

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

7/31/2012

I noticed that there is no report card grade for our secondary school, [NAME REDACTED] High- [REDACTED], SC. I assumed that the grade was reflected with the middle school's report card- [NAME REDACTED] Middle. Both schools are separate entities with each school having individual BEDS Code. Please inform me on the procedures to follow in submitting a review of the calculations and grades issued for [NAME REDACTED] Middle and [NAME REDACTED] High Schools, both located in [NAME REDACTED] School District XX.

"[NAME REDACTED],I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. [NAME REDACTED] High in XXXXXX, SC did not receive an ESEA grade because there were fewer than 30 students in that school that took the End of Course Science test. Because the End of Course Science test is one of the five components used in calculating an ESEA composite

score, and because we apply a minimum group size of 30 students for all performance and percent tested components of the calculations, we could not calculate an ESEA composite index score (nor grade) for this school. Their data is not, as you suggested, combined with the Middle school data; but rather they have been omitted from the calculations altogether because of a missing Science component.Sincerely,Sylvia Sievers"

8/1/2012

Good morning, I have a question in reference to no data reported for [NAME REDACTED] High School. Please note that our middle school and high school are separate schools. Each school has its own Beds code. I know that this is an extremely busy time for you. I have called several times but I could not leave a message because your system is full and cannot take any additional messages. Please give me a call at your convenience. Work XXX-XXX-XXXX Cell XXX-XXX-XXXX. Thanks

[NAME REDACTED],
We are acknowledging receipt of your ESEA inquiry. We are reviewing your information and we will be responding as soon as possible.
If we have any questions we will contact you directly.
Thank you.
Cynthia Hearn

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

8/2/2012

Good afternoon, I am [NAME REDACTED], principal of [NAME REDACTED] High School. I know how busy you are. [NAME REDACTED] and [NAME REDACTED] has been trying to get some answers. [NAME REDACTED] High School more than 30 students who took the science End of course assessment. Can we get this data to you? ALSO [NAME REDACTED] Middle data needs to be revisited to ensure that our English and Algebra I grades are added to the middle school's grade. We also have two middle school students who should not have been in our calculations. May we get this data to you also? We know you are busy but please contact us. [NAME REDACTED] abring The are: [NAME REDACTED] and

[NAME REDACTED], Principal
[NAME REDACTED] Middle/High School
(XXX)XXX-XXXX

It would be very helpful if you could share your calculation numbers (numerators and denominators)

with us.

Comparing numbers usually allows us to more quickly see possible problems rather than just re-running our numbers.

Thanks.

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

8/3/2012

Appeal letter for [NAME REDACTED] High

8/7/2012

I worked with a consultant. I have been trying to reach him. I will keep trying. Thanks.

[NAME REDACTED], Principal
[NAME REDACTED] Middle/High School
(XXX) XXX-XXXX

Request_Date
8/13/2012

Request Details

I am in [NAME REDACTED]. We have a Board presentation on the New Federal Accountability Report. I am having trouble understanding how our District score of XXX was calculated. Can someone provide an explanation for me? I have read the technical support document and have tried to replicate the score, but have been unsuccessful.

What is the AMO incremental improvement for graduation rate?

Please call me at the number below or email me as soon as you can.

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry about the ESEA calculations for districts. To begin with, for district level calculations we make sure that test scores are based on students who are continuously enrolled in the district between the 45th day and the first day of testing. We then calculate matrixes for each grade level of students (3-5, 6-8, and 9-12) to get an elementary level composite index, a middle level composite index and a high school level composite index. We also count the number of students used in each matrix, so, for example, in your district there were XXXX students in the elementary grades matrix that resulted in a composite score of XXX; there were XXXX students in the middle grade matrix that resulted in a score of XXX; and XXX students in the high school matrix that resulted in a score of XXX. From there we bring them together in a weighted average in the following way:

$$\frac{(XXX \times XXXX) + (XXX * XXXX) + (XXX * XXX)}{(XXXX + XXXX + XXX)} \text{ which equals XXX.}$$

Please let me know if you need further clarification.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

This is very easy to understand. Thank you for making it so simple. Can you tell me what the AMO for graduation rate will be for 2012-13? Is there a planned improvement index for graduation rate by year?

[NAME REDACTED], Ed.D.

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

8/13/2012

I am in [NAME REDACTED]. We have a Board presentation on the New Federal Accountability Report. I am having trouble understanding how our District score of XXX was calculated. Can someone provide an explanation for me? I have read the technical support document and have tried to replicate the score, but have been unsuccessful.

Please call me at the number below or email me as soon as you can.

Thank you,

[NAME REDACTED], Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and
Administrative Services
[NAME REDACTED] School District
XXXXX
XXXX, SC XXXXX
(XXX)XXX-XXXX

Resolution

Administrative Services
[NAME REDACTED] School District
XXXXXX
XXXXX, SC XXXX
(XXX)XXX-XXXX
[NAME REDACTED],

The Objective is 73.1% of students graduated at school and for each subgroup in ESEA 2012 calculation. If the objective is not met we calculate improvement. Please see more details from the Technical Manual on page 58 at the web site:

<http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2012/index.cfm>

Hope this helps.

Wei Yao
Education Associate
Office of Data Management and Analysis
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street, Columbia, SC 29201
803-734-8439
wyao@ed.sc.gov

Request_Date Request Details
8/14/2012 FOLLOW UP

Silvia, would you be willing to share [NAME REDACTED] subgroup percentages for graduation rate? The areas where we didn't earn a 1.0 were males, disabled and subsidized meals. I know my board will ask me what our graduation percentages were for those subgroups. Since the state is using the lag graduation rate (2011 numbers), I am hoping it won't be a problem for you to share those. Our 2011 State Report Card for [NAME REDACTED]High presents the 2010 subgroup graduation rate information.

Thank you,

[NAME REDACTED], Ed.D.

8/7/2012 Not a ESEA12 related request, deleted per discussion with CH 8-23-2012

Resolution
[NAME REDACTED],

Your question concerning graduation rate calculation on [NAME REDACTED] High school is forwarded to me through Dr. Sievers in my office. To earn a point of 1 the subgroup needs to meet 73.1 in 2011 graduation rate. If the subgroups did not meet 73.1, we compare 2011 graduation rate of the subgroup with 2010 graduation rate, when there is improvement from the previous year, the subgroup will get partial credit from 0.1 to 0.9. Please refer to more details in the Technical Manual at the website : <http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2012/index.cfm>

Please check for the very bottom of the right side on the page.

For your information here are the graduation rates of 2010 for the 3 subgroups that you concerned:
2011: Male XX; Disabled XXX; F/R lunch XXX
2010 Male XX; Disabled XXX; F/R lunch XXX

Hope this helps
Sincerely yours

Wei Yao

Request_Date

8/30/2012

Request Details

Good morning Cynthia!
First- I want to let you know that Dr. Butler gave me a one week extension on my grad rate spreadsheet since I have to find documentation for the [REDACTED] students now that they will not be removed.

Also, as I reviewed our data in response to the news that [REDACTED] students would stay on our file, I found that even though you and [NAME REDACTED] assured me those students wouldn't count last year, they did. This means I did not have the opportunity to get documentation for the removal of those students last year.

Now for my ESEA questions:
These came from principals yesterday as we were reviewing the ESEA reports as a group.

2 schools had a case where the subgroup for ELA and/or math was less than 30 but they received a zero for % tested in that category; why?

If the N group in the 10-11 data is less than last year's n group of 40, how was that comparison done? If it was less than 30, was a comparison done, even if this year's is >30?

Students Not Tested- how was this information given to you?

[NAME REDACTED] (XXXX-XXX) had XXX as the mean scale score for disabled math but received a zero, why?

Thanks for looking at these!

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. The data used for ESEA calculations is located in the ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL STATE ASSESSMENTS Review2 MAY file available on the ADT ("ELEM_MIDD_2012_MAY_Review2_XXXX.xls"). The students flagged as having a handicapping condition are located in COLUMN O marked "DISABLED". This field is based on the EFA Primary Code field in PowerSchool, which I also included in that excel file in Column P "EFA PRIMARY CODE".

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/22/2012	Paul and staff:

I wasn't sure to whom to refer the following question that we received on the federal ratings under the ESEA waiver. Can you help me with the answer to the following question?

Was the SEM applied to the % of students scoring MET or EXEMPLARY in a given school or district? Or were SEMs the same for all grades, subject areas, etc. For example, at an elementary school XXX% of 3rd graders (XX students) are shown as scoring "MET" on the 2012 PASS in ELA. Is that XX% (XX students) with or without the application of the SEM? Is this the percentage and number who actually scored "MET" without any help from SEM?

And again, [NAME REDACTED] and I would love to have a class, 101-level on the federal ratings to learn more about the calculations.

Many thanks!

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

The SEMs are applied to the scale scores for ELA and Math for the ESEA calculations, but I don't quite understand what that person is looking at when they say they are looking at the 2012 percent MET. The new ESEA calculations use means rather than percent MET or EXEMPLARY, so if they are referencing percent MET then perhaps they are just looking at the PASS data that comes from Assessment (<http://ed.sc.gov/data/pass/2012/>). If so, those do NOT have SEMs attached to them.

FYI see the attached SEMs for PASS and HSAP.

Best,

Sylvia

Request_Date Request Details
7/30/2012 Requesting to who how the calculations determined.

Resolution
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. Attached you will find the technical manual that describes how the calculations were carried out for the 2012 ESEA Federal Accountability System. This document is also posted on the main ESEA website along the right hand column under DATA FILES>>Technical Documentation:
<http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2012/index.cfm>

Let me know if you have additional questions.

Thank you.

Best,

Sylvia Sievers

Those 0s indicate that you tested fewer than 95% of your disabled students.

Please remember, as in the past, disabled students tested with a non-standard accommodation are counted as not having tested.

I see on the detailed "numbers" file that XX students were in the cohort. Is that less than 95% of all the disabled students in the school?

The numbers used in the calculations appear in the "Numbers" files under "Data Files" on the ESEA Waiver results web page.

Cynthia Hearn
Education Associate
Office of Data Management & Analysis

8/6/2012 Hi Mrs. Hearn,

We have a question about the ESEA waiver in regards to the number of students tested in the disability column. Under the Met/Improved columns, we have partial percentages. However, under the number of students tested, we have a zero in ELA and MATH. Could you please advise us as to why we did not receive credit in this category. All students with disabilities were tested at this particular school. Any assistance would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you,
[NAME REDACTED]
Testing Coordinator

Request_Date

8/8/2012

Request Details

Our list for [NAME REDACTED] Elementary school has XX kids names that were classified as disabled. We tested XX for PASS. We are really having trouble finding XX. Is there any way that we can get the file that would have those XX students names listed? Does SC-Alt count as part of the XX? I do appreciate your help. Thank you for hanging in there with us during this time of transition.

Thank you!!

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data.

QUESTION: Our list for [NAME REDACTED]Elementary has XX kids names that were classified as disabled. We tested XX for PASS. We are really having trouble finding XX. Is there any way that we can get the file that would have those XX students names listed? Does SC-Alt count as part of the XX? I do appreciate your help. Thank you for hanging in there with us during this time of transition.

ANSWER: In [NAME REDACTED] Elementary, there were XX students who were flagged as disabled in the EFA Primary Code field in PowerSchool. XXX of those students took SC-ALT, leaving XX students who should have taken PASS. Of these XX, XX took PASS ELA and PASS Math, which is XXX percent of the disabled students who were tested. These students are listed in the ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL STATE ASSESSMENTS Review2 MAY file on the ADT.

Let me know if you have additional questions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Request_Date	Request Details	Resolution
8/3/2012	<p data-bbox="420 138 1344 495">Good morning Dr. Nalin. My name is [NAME REDACTED] and I am the Director of Elementary Education for [NAME REDACTED] District XXX. I am sending this email as a request for review of information as it relates to one of our schools, [NAME REDACTED] Elementary. [NAME REDACTED] received a report card grade of an "X" (XXX) of which we are very pleased; however, the school was identified as a Focus School due to the performance gaps in two areas, African American students and the students receiving subsidized meals. As a result we have the following questions:</p> <ul data-bbox="420 527 1134 852" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="420 527 1134 600">• we would like clarifications on how the data is calculated to determine if a school is a Focus School<li data-bbox="420 600 1134 706">• since the data is based on a 2 year analysis would it be possible for us to receive that data from last year so we can further review the gaps?<li data-bbox="420 706 1134 852">• what gaps are considered as significant (range or the cut-off score/s in specific subgroup areas) that would qualify a particular subgroup to be considered as underperforming?	Bobby this was resolved and yes we did discuss this.
	Thank you Dr. Nalin for taking the time to help us further	

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
9/4/2012	Please share with me the methodology used to complete the district composite score. Upon reviewing page 13 of the ESEA Technical manual, it appears that the district score should mirror the score for the High School. I am sure that I am missing something. [NAME REDACTED] had a composite score of XXX and I am trying to determine how we arrived at that score. I understand the matrix for each of the three schools, but cannot determine how the district score was derived. Please advise.

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry about the ESEA calculations for districts. To begin with, for district level calculations we make sure that test scores are based on students who are continuously enrolled in the district between the 45th day and the first day of testing. We then calculate matrixes for each grade level of students (3-5, 6-8, and 9-12) to get an elementary level composite index, a middle level composite index and a high school level composite index. We also count the number of students used in each matrix, so, for example, in your district there were XXX students in the elementary grades matrix that resulted in a composite score of XXX; there were XXX students in the middle grade matrix that resulted in a score of XXX; and XX students in the high school matrix that resulted in a score of XXX. From there we bring them together in a weighted average in the following way:

[FORMULA REDACTED TO CONCEAL DISTRICT] which equals XXX.

Unfortunately, there is an error in the technical manual which we have put in a request to delete for the next draft: There are no separate weights for district matrixes.

Please let me know if you need further clarification.

Thank you.

Best,

Request_Date	Request Details	Resolution
7/30/2012	<p>[NAME REDACTED] High has a X ... XX total composite index score. They believe the graduation rate used has a X ... XX total composite index score. School is incorrect. They say it should be XX% and not 73.1%. Jay Ragley said they looked at the AMO, which is 73.1%. [NAME REDACTED] High School receives full points for graduation rate in all subgroups except disabled students. So I think they misread their report card. He asked for it in writing and will forward it along when it comes in. Copied Cynthia Hearn. He thinks and Sylvia confirmed that they misread their report card. They believe the graduation rate used is incorrect. They say it should be XX%, not 73.1%. Jay thinks they looked at the AMO of 73/1%. They receive full points for graduation rate in all subgroups except disabled students. Jay Ragley emailed Cynthia. He thinks they may have misread their report card. Sylvia said they did misread. He's asked for it in writing and will forward. Sylvia said they misread their data; they do have a gradrate of XXX. I believe they were looking at the AMO table and misunderstanding what they were looking at.</p>	<p>Ok. Jay received the email from [NAME REDACTED] X and responded to that effect. He'll see if they have further questions. For now, let's consider [NAME REDACTED]X closed.</p>
7/30/2012	<p>FOLLOW-UP questions from [NAME REDACTED] X regarding [NAME REDACTED] High School.</p> <p>#1 They did misunderstand the 73.1 rate as an AMO. So that issue was resolved.</p> <p>#2 Regarding HSAP ELA and Math, what is the expected progress/rate of improvement?</p> <p>#3 Regarding End of Course Biology, how many points on the Biology assessment did it take to increase by 0.1 on the federal report card? For the other assessments, is it the same conversion factor or is there a different conversion for the different assessments? (Hypothetical example: it takes 10 point increase in Biology EOCEP mean scale score to gain 0.1 on the federal report card, if you did not meet AMO).</p> <p>#4 What is the graduation rate expected progress/rate of</p>	<p>#2. If the Met/improve =1 then the group is expected to meet or exceed AMO , other wise if there is improvement the group gets partial credit. (please see the technical Manual)</p> <p>#3 Please see the technical Manual</p> <p>#4 Please see the technical Manual</p>

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

7/30/2012

School has A rating, but it's listed as Focus school

Request_Date	Request Details	Resolution
7/30/2012	<p>1)How was the N-size established for the graduation rate AMOs? We do not see these on the “Numbers” data files. Can we get these?</p> <p>a.For the following high schools, we found subgroups (including all students) with N<30 (based on the 2011 High School Performance Data File – SCDE website), yet graduation rates for these subgroups were included in AYP calculations for 2012:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. [NAME REDACTED] – B, Hii. [NAME REDACTED] – LEPiii. [NAME REDACTED] – H, LEPiv. [NAME REDACTED] – LEPv. [NAME REDACTED] – AP, LEPvi. [NAME REDACTED] – SWD, LEPvii. [NAME REDACTED] – SWD, LEPviii. [NAME REDACTED] – LEPix. [NAME REDACTED] – AP, SWD, LEPx. [NAME REDACTED] – AP, H, LEPxi. [NAME REDACTED] – Hxii. [NAME REDACTED] – H, LEPxiii. [NAME REDACTED] – B, FRLxiv. [NAME REDACTED] – Mxv. [NAME REDACTED] - ALL <p>2)How was the N-size established for each EOCEP AMO? We have noticed that there are several high schools that had 30+ students in a subgroup and no performance objective reported. Conversely, we have noticed that there are several high schools that had <30 students in a subgroup and a performance objective was reported. This appears to be happening more frequently in the US History EOCEP objective.</p> <p>3)What are the AMOs for SC-Alt?</p> <p>4)How were SC-Alt scores included in schools that also administer PASS or HSAP?</p> <p>5)If a student is expected to test, but there is no test</p>	<p>#1 : The 2011 Graduation rate (as used in ESEA 2012) was not limited by student count in the ALL STUDENTS category. However, any subgroup with fewer than 10 students are considered insufficient data and the graduation rate for such groups is blocked and not used in calculations for ESEA 2012. We applied an N size of >=30 only to performance and percent tested in ESEA 2012 calculations for the base line year .</p> <p>#2. The N size is determined by using the end of course file with students who had Biology or History score. Please note that we used 2011 end of course file in 2012 ESEA calculation.</p> <p>#3, SC-ALT H School are not in ESEA12 calculation. Please refer to the technical manual when it is up to the web.</p> <p>#4 SC-AIT/E/M in PASS , SS may have a better answer.</p> <p>#5. No, the means contain only the performance of the test scores that are available. If a student did not test and was supposed to test those data appear in the PERCENT TESTED columns, lowering the percent that tested. This process follows the same methodology as the previous AYP system. [NAMES REDACTED], I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data.</p> <p>1. Q: How was the N-size established for the graduation rate AMOs? A: The 2011 Graduation rate (as used in ESEA 2012) was not limited by student count in the ALL STUDENTS category. However, any subgroup with fewer than 10 students are considered insufficient data and the graduation rate for such groups is blocked and not used in calculations for ESEA 2012. We applied an N size of >=30 only to performance and percent tested in ESEA 2012 calculations for the base line year .</p>

Request_Date Request Details
score, is a score of 0 included in the mean?

Resolution

2. Q: How was the N-size established for each EOCEP AMO?...

A: The N size is determined by using the end of course file with students who had Biology or History score. Please note that we used 2011 end of course file in 2012 ESEA calculation. We checked [NAME REDACTED] data ON web on the N size and the calculation expected 'performance objective' the results are consistent. Please note we reported Ns in the NUMBERS file of less than 30 for districts' information only; subgroups less than 30 should not have 'performance objective'.

3. Q: What are the AMOs for SC-Alt?

A: SC-ALT H Schools are not in ESEA12 calculation. Please refer to the technical manual when it is up to the web at the bottom of right side.
[Http://webdev.ed.sc.org/data/embargoed/esea/emes ea12mg5/](http://webdev.ed.sc.org/data/embargoed/esea/emes ea12mg5/)

4. Q: How were SC-Alt scores included in schools that also administer PASS or HSAP?

A: Please refer to the Technical Manual posted online (p. 53) for more information about how the SC-ALT scores were included in calculations. Also, please note, high school level SC-ALT were excluded from calculations due to the absence of a history component.

5. Q: If a student is expected to test, but there is no test score, is a score of 0 included in the mean?

A: Yes.

Sincerely,

7/30/2012 Requesting information on Federal Accountability

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
7/30/2012	<p>Follow-up - see ESEA Inquires for part two of email containing additional questions in blue Were the SNT data processed for AYP data?</p> <p>Can you send us information about which students were approved/not approved? We are confused when looking at some of our high schools' percent tested for first attempt HSAP.</p>
7/30/2012	<p>According to the embargoed link, [NAME REDACTED] Elementary has been calculated as having a disabled population for ELA, math, science, and social studies performance and percent tested for ELA and math. [REDACTED]'s disabled population is not large enough to have this subgroup as a counted category/objective. [NAME REDACTED] had XX students with IEPs participate in PASS testing; fewer than XX of the disabled students were continuously enrolled. According to our in house calculations using the PASS data file and the continuously enrolled file, XX disabled students counted for ELA and math, XX counted for science, and XX counted for social studies.</p> <p>Would you please check the calculations? We believe that [NAME REDACTED] rating should be higher. Thank you for your time in reviewing [NAME REDACTED] Elementary's rating and we look forward to hearing back from you.</p>

Resolution

1) Preview 2 for HSAP First Time Test takers will have the results for Students Not Tested (SNT)

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. According to the data we downloaded from PowerSchool, [NAME REDACTED] Elementary has 30 disabled students who were continuously enrolled between the 45th day and the first day of testing. If you would like to see the list of stateid's, handicapping condition and continuous enrollment indicator for these students, I can create that for you and put it on the ADT for your review. Please let me know.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Request_Date Request Details
8/7/2012 FOLLOW UP

Cynthia,

I know that Sylvia is out of the office this week, therefore I am directing this e-mail to you. I have two questions.

1) I retrieved the Disabled list from the ADT for [NAME REDACTED] Elementary (XXXXXXX). There are two students on the ADT list that appear in my PASS data file as a "no" under the IEP column, nor are they marked in the IEP_LD column. How is it that you all have these two students in your list but they are not marked as a special education student in our district data file? The students are in our file with scores but there is no marker to indicate Disabled.

2) Please look at [NAME REDACTED] Science and Social Studies Disabled subgroups. According to the ESEA_Waiver_ELEM_NS file downloaded from your website, [NAME REDACTED] had XX students count for Science Disabled and XX students count for Social Studies Disabled. Since these numbers are less than 30, it seems that there are not enough students to count as a subgroup for Science and Social Studies. However, [NAME REDACTED] received a "0" in their calculations for Disabled Science and Disabled Social Studies.

We also have concerns about the fact that this school has been identified as a Focus School. We question those calculations due to the Disabled subgroup.

Thank you for your review of this matter. We look forward to hearing from you.

Resolution
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data.

1) I retrieved the Disabled list from the ADT for [NAME REDACTED]. There are two students on the ADT list that appear in my PASS data file as a "no" under the IEP column, nor are they marked in the IEP_LD column. How is it that you all have these two students in your list but they are not marked as a special education student in our district data file? The students are in our file with scores but there is no marker to indicate Disabled.

ANSWER: Please refer to your PowerSchool EFA codes, not the IEP data found on a PASS data file or elsewhere. The state uses the EFA codes in PowerSchool to determine funding for disabled students, which is why we use these fields in accountability. As to why there are two students with disabled codes in the EFA fields in PowerSchool and yet do not have an IEP in the PASS files you would have to speak to the person who entered the data in PowerSchool at the school for that student.

2) Please look at [REDACTED]'s Science and Social Studies Disabled subgroups. According to the ESEA_Waiver_ELEM_NS file downloaded from your website, [REDACTED] had XX students count for Science Disabled and XX students count for Social Studies Disabled. Since these numbers are less than 30, it seems that there are not enough students to count as a subgroup for Science and Social Studies. However, [REDACTED] received a "0" in their calculations for Disabled Science and Disabled Social Studies.

ANSWER: ESEA calculations for elementary and middle schools use the number of students continuously enrolled in the school for each subgroup, not per subject. Because PASS social studies and science are

Request_Date

Request Details

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

only given to about half the students in a school, some schools that have 30 students in a subgroup will thus have fewer than 30 students taking those tests, but that does not matter to the calculations because the minimum size limit is placed on the number of students continuously enrolled in the school.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Request_Date	Request Details
8/7/2012	<p>Thank you for assisting me on the phone this afternoon with the questions concerning the identification of Focus schools for Title I.</p> <p>At [NAME REDACTED] Elementary - beds code XXX, we had 30 students with disabilities tested for ELA and Math. However, since science and social are a random sampling of students for testing, we did not have 30 "students with disabilities" to take those two content areas. However, based on the spreadsheet that Bobby sent to me, a gap was calculated for students with disabilities and students without disabilities for science and ss. According to the ESEA_WAIVER_ELEM_NS file, XX students with disabilities took the Science test and XX for Social Studies.</p> <p>In addition, after our conversation, I am also seeking information about the calculation method for the overall GAP (column E). Were zeros (no presence of a gap) included in the calculation or not?</p> <p>Thanks so much for taking the time to walk through this process. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>

Resolution
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data.

1. QUESTION: At [NAME REDACTED] Elementary - beds CODE XXXXX, we had 30 students with disabilities tested for ELA and Math. However, since science and social are a random sampling of students for testing, we did not have 30 "students with disabilities" to take those two content areas. However, based on the spreadsheet that Bobby sent to me, a gap was calculated for students with disabilities and students without disabilities for science and ss. According to the ESEA_WAIVER_ELEM_NS file, XX students with disabilities took the Science test and XX for Social Studies.

ANSWER: ESEA calculations for elementary and middle schools use the number of students continuously enrolled in the school for each subgroup, not per test. As you mentioned, because PASS social studies and science are only given to about half the students in a school, some schools that have 30 students in a subgroup will thus have fewer than 30 students taking those tests, but that does not matter to the calculations because the minimum size limit is placed on the number of students continuously enrolled in the school.

2. QUESTION: In addition, after our conversation, I am also seeking information about the calculation method for the overall GAP (column E). Were zeros (no presence of a gap) included in the calculation or not?

ANSWER: No, zeros were not included.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date Request Details
8/23/2012 FOLLOW UP

Sylvia and Team,

Thank you for your time in reviewing our appeal. We believe that the discrepancy was related to the "SC IEP Ind" field in PowerSchool. Do you know if the "SC IEP Ind" field is the PowerSchool field that determines special education coding in the PASS data file?

Again thank you for your time and the answers you have provided.

[NAME REDACTED]

8/1/2012 JW,

Here is where we appealed AYP last year and it was granted due to us not having a 12th grade in 09-10. We still did not have a 12th grade in 10-11 so shouldn't this be waived also.

Thanks

Resolution

Hi [NAME REDACTED],

Sorry for the delay. I double-checked these details and found the answer for you. The "IEP flag" in the PASS contractor data file IS based on EFA disability codes as well as other codes (Deaf and Blind and Multiple Disability), but it is precoded earlier in the year (around the 135th day rather than First Day of Testing in May), which means that the EFA codes could be updated/changed in PowerSchool between these time points. Also, and perhaps more importantly, if a student wasn't precoded then these fields are hand coded at the time of testing and thus are not always accurate. This is why we pull these data directly from PowerSchool to ensure the data are accurate as of the first day of testing in May and match the test scores to that.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Page deleted per Paul.

Request_Date

8/1/2012

Request Details

[NAME REDACTED] would like to know how his school grade was calculated.

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. Attached you will find the technical manual that describes how the calculations were carried out for the 2012 ESEA Federal Accountability System. This document is also posted on the main ESEA website along the right hand column under DATA FILES>>Technical Documentation:
<http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2012/index.cfm>

Let me know if you have additional questions.

Thank you.

Best,

Sylvia Sievers

Request_Date	Request Details
8/1/2012	<p>I have several concerns and comments about the ESEA accountability report card and procedures at this time. As we continue to delve into the data, we may have more.</p> <p>1.What were the procedures for getting the composite grade for schools which spanned more than one school type? Specifically, we have a middle school and high school which are one. The middle school and high school each received a grade and then the entire school received a grade. How were those two individual grades merged to get one overall grade.</p> <p>2.Also, we have some concerns about some of the subgroups which were reported. We have several instances when the subgroup does not have 30 students in it, but it was used in the accountability calculations. Conversely, we have some subgroups which are not used in the accountability calculations, but had 30 students in them. How will this be fixed?</p> <p>3.We also feel there are some incorrect results on the report cards. What will be the procedure for fixing these?</p> <p>4.We are very concerned that this data is being released to the public tomorrow with errors in it. What is being done to address this concern?</p>

Resolution
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data.

1. What were the procedures for getting the composite grade for schools which spanned more than one school type? Specifically, we have a middle school and high school which are one. The middle school and high school each received a grade and then the entire school received a grade. How were those two individual grades merged to get one overall grade.

ANSWER: As outlined in the Technical Manual posted online (http://webdev.ed.sc.org/data/embargoed/esea/emes_ea12mg5/ go to DATA FILES>>Technical Documentation), for schools with unusual grade spans (overlapping school types) we calculated a middle school matrix for their middle school grades (6-8) and then calculated a high school matrix for their high school grades (9-12) and then combined the final index scores from these two matrixes by weighting their scores by the number of students used in the calculations. Please see page 52 in the Technical Manual for more details.

2. Also, we have some concerns about some of the subgroups which were reported. We have several instances when the subgroup does not have 30 students in it, but it was used in the accountability calculations. Conversely, we have some subgroups which are not used in the accountability calculations, but had 30 students in them. How will this be fixed?

ANSWER: For PERFORMANCE (ELA/Math/Science/Social Studies) the number of students continuously enrolled in the school between the 45th day and the first day of testing is used and a minimum number of 30 is applied to be included in calculations; for PERCENT TESTED the

Request_Date Request Details

Resolution

number of students enrolled as of the first day of testing is used and a minimum number of 30 is applied to be included in calculations. For Graduation there was no minimum size limit set for the total students category, however a minimum size limit of 10 was applied to the subgroups for graduation to be included in calculations.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Request_Date 8/1/2012	Request Details FOLLOW-UP I have three more questions: 1. At [NAME REDACTED] High School for the SS Proficiency Met/Improved, we should have 5 total number of objectives – not 6. 2. At [NAME REDACTED] Elementary, for LEP we have a score for each ELA Proficient (1) and Math Proficient (1) , however the cell is blank for ELA % tested and Math % tested. I am not sure how this could happen.
--------------------------	---

Resolution

Dear [NAME REDACTED],

One of your questions was forwarded to me concerning [NAME REDACTED] High School ESEA 2012 report on the web.

Question:

At [NAME REDACTED] High School for the SS Proficiency Met/Improved, we should have 5 total number of objectives – not 6.

Next time when we update web file, African American students under history will have a value of 0 and the mean of history for this group, XX. It will not cause any changes on the final Grade for [NAME REDACTED] High School .

Thank you for your inquiry !

Wei Yao

For the elementary school here was my response:
[NAME REDACTED],

The ESEA calculations follow the AYP methodology in determining which students are counted in each subgroup.

For Performance calculations, the LEP subgroup contains students with the following codes entered into the English Proficiency Field in Powerschool: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, A, B, C, D.

For Percent Tested, the LEP subgroup contains students with the following codes entered into the English Proficiency Field in Powerschool: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, A, B, C, D.

At [NAME REDACTED] Elementary, there were XX students with codes pulled for Participation (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, A, B, C,

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date Request Details

8/3/2012 FOLLOW-UP
I have three more questions:
1. At [NAME REDACTED] High School for the SS Proficiency Met/Improved, we should have 5 total number of objectives – not 6.

Resolution

D) and XX more students with an LEP code of “6” which is pulled for Performance, bringing the Performance N up over the cut-off of 30.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Next time when we updated web file African American students under history will have a X and the mean of history for this group is XX. This did not cause any changes on school final grade.

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/7/2012	I have a question about [NAME REDACTED] Intermediate's % tested in ELA in the disabled subgroup. The principal feels that it should not be a X. Thank you!

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. At [NAME REDACTED] Intermediate, the reason why the ELA percent tested did not meet the AMO of 95% for the disabled subgroup was due to the fact that there were XX disabled students whose test scores were not counted because they received non-standard accommodations, and one student whose test score was not counted because s/he was tested at a grade lower than the grade in which s/he is enrolled.

The students stateids are as follows:

Received non-standard accommodations

[NAME REDACTED]
[NAME REDACTED]

Received off-grade testing

[NAME REDACTED]

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date Request Details
8/7/2012 FOLLOW-UP - I mistakenly entered into wrong database -
Please respond ASAP if you haven't already.

[NAME REDACTED] Elementary, received a 0 for % percent tested in ELA. We are concerned that this is an error. My files have all Disabled students testing in ELA. Could you please double-check this. I appreciate you assistance.

I have a question about [NAME REDACTED] Intermediate's % tested in ELA in the disabled subgroup. The principal feels that it should not be a 0. Thank you!

=====

I have two questions about subgroups on the ESEA Federal Accountability System.

1. We are trying to match student demographics to our end-of-course tests in Biology 1 and US History. The technical manual says the "first-day-of-testing PowerSchool extraction" is what is used to identify subgroups. However, there is not a scheduled PS extraction for end of course testing. What file did you use for the demographics for the students taking the end-of-course tests mentioned above?

2. How are you determining if there is a difference in an achievement gap between any of the race/ethnicity? For example, in determining the achievement gap for Hispanics, I would determine the mean scale score for all Hispanic students who took the test and compare that mean to the mean scale score of all other students. There has been some discussion that to determine this achievement gap, the calculation was done by comparing the mean scale score for all Hispanic students to just the white students.

Again, thank you for helping me to work through the

Resolution
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. At [NAME REDACTED] Elementary, the reason why the ELA percent tested did not meet the AMO of 95% for the disabled subgroup was due to the fact that there were XX disabled students whose test scores were not counted because they received non-standard accommodations.

The students stateids are as follows:

[NAME REDACTED]
[NAME REDACTED]
[NAME REDACTED]
[NAME REDACTED]
[NAME REDACTED]
[NAME REDACTED]
[NAME REDACTED]

As for your other questions, I have answered them below:

1. We are trying to match student demographics to our end-of-course tests in Biology 1 and US History. The technical manual says the "first-day-of-testing PowerSchool extraction" is what is used to identify subgroups. However, there is not a scheduled PS extraction for end of course testing. What file did you use for the demographics for the students taking the end-of-course tests mentioned above?

ANSWER: The Fall End of Course test scores were matched to the 90th day PowerSchool extraction. The Spring and Summer End of Course test scores were matched to the 180 day PowerSchool extraction.

2. How are you determining if there is a difference in an achievement gap between any of the race/ethnicity? For example, in determining the achievement gap for Hispanics, I would determine the

Request_Date

Request Details

myriad of questions I have!

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

mean scale score for all Hispanic students who took the test and compare that mean to the mean scale score of all other students. There has been some discussion that to determine this achievement gap, the calculation was done by comparing the mean scale score for all Hispanic students to just the white students.

ANSWER: The Achievement Gap for the racial/ethnic groups were determined by calculations the gap in scores between the various subgroups compared to the white subgroup, so long as both groups had at least 30 students within them.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/7/2012	I have two questions about subgroups on the ESEA Federal Accountability System.

1. We are trying to match student demographics to our end-of-course tests in Biology 1 and US History. The technical manual says the "first-day-of-testing PowerSchool extraction" is what is used to identify subgroups. However, there is not a scheduled PS extraction for end of course testing. What file did you use for the demographics for the students taking the end-of-course tests mentioned above?

2. How are you determining if there is a difference in an achievement gap between any of the race/ethnicity? For example, in determining the achievement gap for Hispanics, I would determine the mean scale score for all Hispanic students who took the test and compare that mean to the mean scale score of all other students. There has been some discussion that to determine this achievement gap, the calculation was done by comparing the mean scale score for all Hispanic students to just the white students.

Again, thank you for helping me to work through the myriad of questions I have!

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

Just called her. I had already worked with the Title I coordinator to explain the definition and the calculation. Her questions have been addressed, so she said she doesn't need anything else.

Robert Rykard

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
9/5/2012	<p>Could you please provide the methodology for how the district level grades were calculated. I have been asked several times and don't know how to answer this question.</p> <p>Thank you for your assistance.</p>
8/2/2012	<p>FOLLOW UP</p> <p>I also asked about [NAME REDACTED] High School's results 1. At [NAME REDACTED] High School for the SS Proficiency Met/Improved, we should have 5 total number of objectives – not 6</p> <p>... is there a process for alerting you to these mathematical errors should we come across others?</p>

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry about the ESEA calculations for districts. For district-level calculations, we make sure that test scores are based on students who are continuously enrolled in the district between the 45th day and the first day of testing. We then calculate matrixes for each grade level of students (2-5, 6-8, and 9-12) to get elementary school, middle school, and high school level composite indexes. We also count the number of students used in each matrix. From there, we bring the scores together into a weighted average. Unfortunately, there is an error in the technical manual that will be removed in the next draft; the correction is that there are no separate weights for district matrixes.

Please let me know if you need further clarification.

Best,
Brandon Loudermilk
[NAME REDACTED],

We accept emails regarding ESEA inquiries from all school districts, deposit them into a database, and begin the process of resolving the issues immediately. Using email allows us to keep a record of issues and helps ensure quality and timeliness; therefore, we ask that you continue to utilize emails, like before, whenever you or someone from your district has an inquiry regarding the ESEA calculations.

Thank you,
Brandon Loudermilk

Request_Date
8/8/2012

Request Details

First Name: [NAME REDACTED]

Last Name: [NAME REDACTED]

Office:Accountability

Message: Hello Ms. Hearn,

I have looked at the ESEA Wavier reports that are posted online for each school district and have read the ESEA Federal Accountability System draft manual. I understand how schools are meeting the AMO according to the manual.

How are schools are getting the 0.1 through 0.9 for improvement? I know it says to subtract the previous and current year mean to get the difference. Is that difference divided by the previous year or current year mean?

Is the growth only counted for students who have test scores for both previous and current year?

The chart below was used to calculated growth. Is this chart still being used for elementray and middle schools?

I would appreciate any information that you can share. My phone number is (XXX)XXX-XXXX.

Thanks for your support in this matter.

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

The number 0.1 through 0.9 is the increase in the average (mean) score for a school from the 2010-11 school year to the 2011-12 school year. We are calculating an average for the school as a whole and students do not have to be in both files in order to have their score count.

Using the same file that we used last year to calculate AYP, we calculated an average ELA score and an average Math score for each of the subgroups. We then did the same thing with the 2011-12 data. One number was subtracted from the other. If the average score goes up from one year to the next, but DOES NOT meet the AMO, the school is given credit for the increase in the average. If the 2011-12 average score is greater than or equal to the AMO, the school receives a 1.

Hope this helps.

Cynthia Hearn

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

Education Associate

Office of Data Management & Analysis

8/8/2012

I am principal of [NAME REDACTED] Middle School in [NAME REDACTED] [NAME REDACTED],

County and I have a question about the ESEA draft. On page 10 of the ESEA draft, in step 4, it says: If the mean is less than AMO, calculate the difference between the mean for the current year and the mean for the previous year.

My question pertains to science PASS scores and the "all students" subgroup. Do I calculate the mean for all students in science for this year and for last year, or do I only use matched students who took PASS science at our school both years?

Thanks so much,

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data.

QUESTION: I am principal of [NAME REDACTED] Middle School in [NAME REDACTED] County and I have a question about the ESEA draft. On page 10 of the ESEA draft, in step 4, it says: If the mean is less than AMO, calculate the difference between the mean for the current year and the mean for the previous year.

My question pertains to science PASS scores and the "all students" subgroup. Do I calculate the mean for all students in science for this year and for last year, or do I only use matched students who took PASS science at our school both years?

ANSWER: Calculate the mean for all students who were continuously enrolled in the school between the 45th day and the first day of testing and who took Science for each year. Then compare the two means to see if there was positive improvement.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Request_Date	Request Details	Resolution
8/9/2012	<p>Cynthia, I would like to know the appeal process for ESEA ratings. Based on the documentation I have reviewed for our high schools, in the graduation rate calculation subgroups of less than 30 were included in the ratings.</p> <p>For [NAME REDACTED] High School, disabled students subgroup should not be included. [NAME REDACTED] High School should not have African American and Disabled included. [NAME REDACTED] High should not have Hispanic or LEP subgroups, and [NAME REDACTED] High should not have African American, Hispanic, or LEP subgroups.</p>	<p>The graduation rate for subgroups of between 10 and 30 students ARE included in the ESEA Federal Accountability System ratings. It was never the intent of the Department to exclude subgroups from graduation rate calculations except where privacy is an issue. That is why graduation rates for fewer than 10 students are not reported.</p>
8/3/2012	<p>Thanks for your assistance, [NAME REDACTED] [NAME REDACTED] County School District</p> <p>We are under a deadline to notify the parents of students in Focus Schools about school choice. In the sample letter given to us by the Title One office, it indicates that we are to tell parents which subgroups caused the school to be a Focus School. I have looked at it a number of ways but I don't really think I am interpreting the data correctly.</p> <p>I can't use all the subgroups with negative numbers because I know we have schools that are not Focus that also have negative numbers. I considered that it may be the subgroups that got zero points. Is there any data file that you can link me to that will show specifically the subgroups that resulted in the Focus designation for XX #1 and [NAME REDACTED] Academy for the Arts in [NAME REDACTED]?</p> <p>I really appreciate your help. I do understand you are swamped. Your mailbox was full! If you are not the correct person to ask, please refer me to the appropriate person. Thanks again.</p>	<p>Cynthia Hearn Education Associate Office of Data Management & Analysis</p> <p>[NAME REDACTED],</p> <p>Please see the attached data for determine Focus Schools. It is an average of current year assessment scores by subgroup to determine the gap by subgroup. Then, the gaps were ranked and the top 55 schools in the ranking were identified.</p> <p>Bobby</p>

Request_Date	Request Details	Resolution
8/1/2012	<p data-bbox="420 138 1218 243">Here are some initial questions based on the information provide in the Technical manual v2 released yesterday afternoon.</p> <p data-bbox="420 276 1218 747">1. Why is the SEM applied to some subtets but not others? Pages 10 and 50 reference applying the "appropriate" SEM, and the table on page 50 lists all four PASS subjects...however on the next page it says to adjust ELA and math only and to use the unadjusted science and social studies What is the rationale for not applying the SEM for PASS Science, PASS Social Studies, and EOCEP? Or conversely, what is the rationale for applying the SEM to the PASS ELA, PASS Math, HSAP? Our calculations show that applying the SEM consistenly across the subtets results in a letter grade increase in three of our elemenary schools</p> <p data-bbox="420 779 1218 1063">2. I noticed the following line in Mr. Wragleys email: "The URLs below are not active until Thursday, August 2, at which time the above "embargoed" URLs will no longer be available – these URLs will be the final publicly available URLs." What is meant by 'final publicly available"? that any corrections made after tomorrow will not be presented to the public.</p> <p data-bbox="420 1096 1218 1209">3. Can we get the information on the comparative subgroups used in the determination of focus schools (e.g. not disabled, not susidized meals).</p> <p data-bbox="420 1242 1218 1356">4. Are you going to recalculate excluding subgroups with n size less than 30? (Usually science and social studies but I understand that is also in the graduation rate.</p> <p data-bbox="420 1388 1218 1455">Thanks, [NAME REDACTED]</p>	

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date Request Details

8/1/2012 FOLLOW-UP

Hello again,

4. We have been able to duplicate the counts for the elementary and middle counts for all subgroups and subjects EXCEPT for African American Social Studies. We are using the same algorithm provide in the technical manual for all subjects so it seems odd that the difference would only be in social studies. Although the counts wouldnot change around the 30 student threshold, it could possibly effect mean scores.

5. This is expansion of question 3, can we get the detail data that was used to identify the focus schools? We are still trying to determine how 25% of our elementary schools are in this group.

6. Do you plan to post the answers from all the districts's questions in a common place?

Thanks again,
[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

Referred to Federal and State Accountability.

Request_Date

8/1/2012

Request Details

I am the principal at [NAME REDACTED] Elementary in [NAME REDACTED] and looking for a list of the achievement gap scores. I would like to confirm my own calculations. Where could I find this list achievement gap scores for the state? Thank you in advance for any assistance you might be able to provide.

Resolution

Special Education - Defined by any of the following EFA codes AU – Autism EM – Mental Disability - Mild EH – Emotional Disability HH – Deaf/Hard Hearing LD – Spfc. Learning Disability OH – Orthopedically Impair. SP – Speech/Lang Impair. TM – Mental Disability – Mod. VH – Visual Impairment DD-Developmental Delay OHI - Other Health Impair. TBI - Traumatic Brain Injury PMD – Mental Disability-Severe Please note HO - Homebound is not considered a handicapping condition in this case.

This information can be found on page 44 of the Technical Documentation found at the bottom of this web page <http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2012/index.cfm>

-----Original Message-----

From: [NAME REDACTED]

[mailto:[NAME REDACTED]@[NAME REDACTED]]

Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2012 9:11 AM

To: Hearn, Cynthia

Cc: [NAME REDACTED]

Subject: Students with disabilities

Good morning,

Thank you again for all your help. I was wondering which codes in the EFA Code 1 field are considered to be a Student with Disability for the ESEA calculations. We may have a school that was given a Student with Disability subgroup without the adequate number of students (30). Again, you have been wonderful and I appreciate your support of our schools.

Request_Date Request Details

Resolution

NOTICE: This communication including attachments is being sent by or on behalf of an employee of [NAME REDACTED] School District X and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. All e-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to public disclosure under the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The sender does not intend to waive any confidentiality or privilege, including the work-product and/or attorney-client privilege, that may attach to this communication. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to intercept, read, print, retain, copy, forward, or disseminate this communication. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and delete this communication and all copies.

Request_Date

8/1/2012

Request Details

I found the technical manual online, and I've read through it several times. However, I still have a few questions. They concern graduation rate. What graduation rates did you use? I tried to repeat your calculations using the graduation rates from the 2010-2011 accountability link on your site. I started with [NAME REDACTED] HS. For graduation rate, you have XXX for all students - from the Mean data file for high schools on the embargoed link. The accountability link has graduation rate as XXX. Neither one of these is higher than 73.1 so we look for improvement, correct? Then, you look at improvement from 2011 - 2012? Are we using the projected graduation rate that we will send in on August 31 for 2012? I'm not sure what numbers I should use. Could you please point me in the right direction? Thanks!! I really want to understand how this is calculated so that I can help principals set improvement goals. Especially, those

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. First off, if you open the MEANS file on the ESEA homepage (<http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2012/>) you will see [NAME REDACTED] High has an overall gradrate of XXX%. This graduation rate comes from 2010-11 which you can also find listed in the high school performance files on the report card website from last year (<http://ed.sc.gov/data/report-cards/2011/index.cfm>) as well as on [NAME REDACTED] High report card for 2011 (<http://ed.sc.gov/data/report-cards/2011/high/c/h3401002.pdf>).

Since it does not meet the AMO of 73.1 you then should look for improvement between the previous year and that year, which for graduation rate means comparing the 2010-11 gradrate with the 2009-10 gradrate. As you can see on the 2011 report card mentioned previously, the 2010 gradrate for all students was XXX.

This means that the gradrate improved 7.5 points between 2010 and 2011, and using the table displayed in the technical manual is converted into 0.8 in the matrix.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

From: [NAME REDACTED]

[mailto:[NAME REDACTED]]@ [NAME REDACTED]]

Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2012 2:11 PM

To: Sievers, Sylvia

Subject: Re: ESEA Inquiry

Request_Date

Request Details

schools that received F's.

Resolution

Thank you! I understand now. The data files on the website are helpful. I would like to see the MEAN scores from 2011 that were used to compare the 2012 scores - are those mean scores there? I used the means on the 2011 PASS page - if that makes sense. I've gone to schools in my district explaining our ESEA rating and how we received it. I think we are all clear.

[NAME REDACTED], NBCT, Ed.S.

[NAME REDACTED] County School District

Coordinator of Accountability, Testing, Gifted and Talented, and Special Programs

Data-driven decision making at the classroom level

Phone: XXX-XXX-XXXX ext XXXX

[NAME REDACTED],

No, we haven't posted the 2011 mean scores anywhere since we already have so many data files posted online as it is. We may post the 2011 mean scores at a later date, however, as districts become more familiar with the basic ESEA methodology and require additional data for simulations. Please note that the 2011 PASS scores as posted on the PASS pages online won't give exactly the correct information for comparison because those data do not control for a student's continuous enrollment in the school.

Thank you for your feedback.

Best,

Sylvia Sievers

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/21/2012	Follow Up

Thank you! I understand now. The data files on the website are helpful. I would like to see the MEAN scores from 2011 that were used to compare the 2012 scores - are those mean scores there? I used the means on the 2011 PASS page - if that makes sense. I've gone to schools in my district explaining our ESEA rating and how we received it. I think we are all clear.

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

No, we haven't posted the 2011 mean scores anywhere since we already have so many data files posted online as it is. We may post the 2011 mean scores at a later date, however, as districts become more familiar with the basic ESEA methodology and require additional data for simulations. Please note that the 2011 PASS scores as posted on the PASS pages online won't give exactly the correct information for comparison because those data do not control for a student's continuous enrollment in the school.

Thank you for your feedback.

Best,

Sylvia Sievers

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/10/2012	Regarding subgroups on p. 9 of the manual, where does the ethnicity = M fit? Are you using the Scheduling/Reporting Ethnicity field? White (coded as W in the PowerSchool ethnicity field) African-American (coded as B, AB, BI, BP, BW, ABI, ABP, ABW, BPW, BIW, ABPW, ABIP, or ABIPW in the PowerSchool ethnicity field) Asian/Pacific Islander (coded as P, A, or WA in the PowerSchool ethnicity field) Hispanic (coded as H in the PowerSchool ethnicity field) American Indian/Alaskan (coded as I or IW, IPW, AIW, or AIIPW in the PowerSchool ethnicity field)

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

For question one, let me be more clear: ESEA calculations for elementary and middle schools use the number of students continuously enrolled in the school for each subgroup, not per test. In other words, if there were 30 students continuously enrolled in a school it doesn't matter that only 15 took Science and 15 took Social Studies. They are still counted across all subjects.

For question two, last year the AYP system combined all PASS and SC-ALT students and test scores together to be evaluated for the calculations, but this year, for the 2012 ESEA, the SC-ALT students have been separated from the PASS students and evaluated with their own AMOs and subgroup size limits. So, while yes it is true that there were 36 disabled students continuously enrolled in the school in 2011, 12 of these students took SC-ALT, leaving 24 disabled students who were continuously enrolled in the school that took PASS. Because there were fewer than 30 in 2011 that took PASS we could not calculate a mean for them to be used for improvement scores.

Thank you for allowing me to explain these issues in greater detail as we will be documenting this discussion in order to assist other districts with similar questions.

Request_Date
8/17/2012

Request Details
Follow Up

I understand what you're saying and I realize I have to accept this decision. Indulge me a minute if you will. A few years ago, NWEA redid their norming study for MAP scores. Some of the RIT scores in the new norms corresponded to different percentiles. This became an issue when identifying Gifted and Talented students because SC uses MAP data for GT identification. A student who made 94th percentile in 2008 would not have qualified in 2011. However, the State made it clear that we would not go back and say the student was no longer GT. In other words, the student owned that score and it couldn't be taken away. I believe the stakeholders at [REDACTED] deserve to know the stance that SCDE has taken on this matter. To me, this only disenfranchises the very people we are recruiting to support us as we build an accountability system that is trustworthy.

[NAME REDACTED] Elementary owns its AYP data – this year and all previous ones. I can't be convinced to look at it any other way.

Resolution

Thank you for your feedback. I will forward your concerns up the ladder to those in charge of the policy decisions.

Best,

Sylvia

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

7/30/2012

[NAME REDACTED]Middle/High School has only one matrix on the website - but it should have a middle and a high school matrix.
Accept this as a written appeal

Referred to Dr. Busbee.

Please accept this as a written appeal from [NAME REDACTED]. I just spoke to [NAME REDACTED], superintendent, and he pointed

out that [NAME REDACTED]middle/high school only has only one matrix on the website – but it should have a middle and a high school matrix. Please let me know what you find out about this school.

Thanks,

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

8/9/2012

I would like to appeal [NAME REDACTED] Elementary's AYP grade on the following basis:

1. In its matrix, there is a zero in the cell for disabled science performance. However, the n count was less than 30.
2. There was also a zero in the cell for disabled social studies performance. However, the n count was less than 30.
3. There is a zero in the cell for disabled ELA performance. This group did not meet the AMO. However, my calculations for the adjusted mean score in 2012 is XXX, rounded to the nearest integer. The adjusted mean score for 2011 in ELA was XXX, rounded to the nearest integer. [NAME REDACTED] should be awarded XX points for this improvement.

Once these 3 issues are reconciled, [NAME REDACTED]'s grade improves from a X to a X. This is the sole reason for my appeal. I have found errors at other schools but it wasn't enough to change the letter grade.

I read the technical document and counted only those students who should be part of the calculations, e.g. continuously enrolled, and I excluded the appropriate students, e.g. "self-contained over/under age." For 2011 I used the Excel file that was provided by the SCDE last summer during the PASS review period so I am confident that the State will agree with this calculation. As for 2012, I used my calculations but I followed the methodology as outlined in the manual.

My only unsure part is the inclusion of SC-ALT students. As of right now, they have been removed from the calculations. If I am to include them in [NAME REDACTED]'s data, I will do so per your instructions.

I will be glad to send the actual data for both years to whomever would check my calculations per your instructions.

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data.

QUESTION:

I would like to appeal [NAME REDACTED] Elementary's AYP grade on the following basis:

1. In its matrix, there is a zero in the cell for disabled science performance. However, the n count was less than 30.
2. There was also a zero in the cell for disabled social studies performance. However, the n count was less than 30.

ANSWER: ESEA calculations for elementary and middle schools use the number of students continuously enrolled in the school for each subgroup, not per test. Because PASS social studies and science are only given to about half the students in a school, some schools that have 30 students in a subgroup will thus have fewer than 30 students taking those tests.

QUESTION:

3. There is a zero in the cell for disabled ELA performance. This group did not meet the AMO. However, my calculations for the adjusted mean score in 2012 is XXX, rounded to the nearest integer. The adjusted mean score for 2011 in ELA was XXX, rounded to the nearest integer. [NAME REDACTED] should be awarded XX points for this improvement.

ANSWER: Unfortunately, in 2011 [NAME REDACTED] Elementary did not have 30 or more disabled students continuously enrolled in the school, so a 2011 mean could not be calculated to compare to the 2012 mean for an improvement score.

QUESTION:

My only unsure part is the inclusion of SC-ALT students. As of right now, they have been removed from the

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED]

calculations. If I am to include them in [NAME REDACTED]'s data, I will do so per your instructions.

ANSWER: There were not enough SC-ALT test takers in [NAME REDACTED] Elementary to be included in the calculations, so removing them from your calculations is correct.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/8/2012	FOLLOW UP: Thanks!! I may need to look a lot more on the page. I'll check again and let you know if I don't see it on that particular page. Should I still go to the 2011 - 2012 data page for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver to look for those particular data files?

Thanks,
[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiries regarding the ESEA 2012 data. I have listed your various questions below and addressed each one separately.

1. I just got off the phone with DRC because I have several students who are currently at [NAME REDACTED] Elementary in 4th grade that had a fall assignment school as [NAME REDACTED] Middle School. We had 54 students who were accidentally coded as this and of course we know that the 4th grade students will not be attending this middle school in the Fall. Because these 54 students were accidentally coded wrong with their fall assignment code, would this impact how our federal and state report cards are calculated? I just need to make sure.

ANSWER: We use only students in our calculations who are actively enrolled in a given school on the first day of testing. I cannot think of a situation in which it would matter what the DRC inserts on their test files for a fall assignment. Are you referring to End of Course data perhaps?

2. I see the data files on the SCDE website where I can view the mean scores and double check the calculations for my district for the 2012 - 2013 school year? Are the data files, showing the mean scores for the district/schools for the 2010 - 2011 school year also available on the website? If not, where I could I get access to that information?

a. I did go back to the website and couldn't locate the 2010 - 2011 means for [NAME REDACTED]X. I went to the AYP data link and saw the means for all of the individual grade levels for the school and district but not the way it is presented on the 2012 ESEA link to review the data. If you could send that to me, that would be awesome!

Resolution

ANSWER: The data files posted online are for the 2011-2012 school year only. We won't have the 2012-2013 datafiles until next year. No, we haven't posted the 2010-2011 mean scores anywhere since we already have so many data files posted online as it is. We may post the 2010-11 mean scores at a later date, however, as districts become more familiar with the basic ESEA methodology and require additional data for simulations.

3. I was reviewing my districts data for the ESEA waiver and saw a discrepancy with the elementary school data. I noticed that [NAME REDACTED] X received a 0 in ELA Percent Tested but when I review all of my elementary schools plus the continuous enrollment file for my district, I am not sure why we received a 0 on this particular objective.

ANSWER: The reason for the difference between the district level data and the school level is due to the number of students included in the Matrixes. Two of your district's elementary schools did not meet 95% testing in ELA ([NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY and [NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY) but they also did not have 30 students in the disabled subgroup so their data are not displayed or used at the school level. However, when these students are combined at the district level, the overall percent tested for all disabled elementary level students drops down to just XXX%.

4. I do notice that one of our elementary schools did receive a 0 on math percent tested but we did receive 1 point for this category for the elementary level. If at all possible, can you check on this for me to see if the calculations for this was accurate or just let me know what you see from your end on why we received a 0 for ELA Percent Tested for the elementary grades for [NAME REDACTED] X.

Resolution

ANSWER: The reason for the difference between the district level data and the school level is due to the number of students included in the Matrixes. Although one of your district's elementary schools did not meet 95% testing in Math ([NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY), when these students are combined with all the other elementary students at the district level the overall percent tested for all disabled elementary level students increases to above 95%.

5. In the technical manual, is there any where showing how K-8 schools were calculated and how these scores were then calculated in the districts grade?

ANSWER: Yes, see page 52.

6. How does the state department calculate the districts overall weighted points total when the points total are there for the elementary, middle, and high school grades?

ANSWER: Calculate District and State ESEA INDEX SCORES and GRADES in a similar way as school level except control for district/state level continuous enrollment and district/state level percent tested data. For PASS students, divide all calculations by grade level (3-5 vs. 6-8) and create separate index scores and counts for each grade level to be combined with high school calculations at district/state level. For SC-ALT students, divide all calculations by FORMTYPE (Elementary vs. Middle) and create separate indexes and counts for each formtype level to be combined with high school calculations at district/state level. (NOTE: For 2012, High School level SC-ALT students have been excluded from calculations due to the absence of an SC-ALT social studies/history component.) Calculate the district composite score by combining the Elementary, Middle, and High scores (and SC-ALT for Elem and Middle) at the district/state level by

Request_Date
8/8/2012

Request Details

FOLLOW-UP EMAIL

This is [NAME REDACTED] from [NAME REDACTED] X. Thank you for speaking with me a few minutes ago. My question is below.

I just got off the phone with DRC because I have several students who are currently at [NAME REDACTED] Elementary in 4th grade that had a fall assignment school as [NAME REDACTED] Middle School. We had 54 students who were accidentally coded as this and of course we know that the 4th grade students will not be attending this middle school in the Fall. Because these 54 students were accidentally coded wrong with their fall assignment code, would this impact how our federal and state report cards are calculated? I just need to make sure.

I look forward to your response.

Thanks,
[NAME REDACTED]

Good Morning Paul,

This is [NAME REDACTED] from [NAME REDACTED] X again. I have another question for you. I see the data files on the SCDE website where I can view the mean scores and double check the calculations for my district for the 2012 - 2013 school year? Are the data files, showing the mean scores for the district/schools for the 2010 - 2011 school year also available on the website?

If not, where I could I get access to that information?

Thanks,

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

Hi!

You can just send any ESEA Inquiry questions directly to me and I will forward it to the appropriate staff person in our office. If you would also please cc: Crystal Dennis, that would be extra helpful.

Thanks,

Paul

Request_Date	Request Details
8/9/2012	FOLLOW UP

Good Morning,

I was reviewing my districts data for the ESEA waiver and saw a discrepancy with the elementary school data. I noticed that [NAME REDACTED] X received a 0 in ELA Percent Tested but when I review all of my elementary schools plus the continuous enrollment file for my district, I am not sure why we received a 0 on this particular objective.

I do notice that one of our elementary schools did receive a 0 on math percent tested but we did receive 1 point for this category for the elementary level. If at all possible, can you check on this for me to see if the calculations for this was accurate or just let me know what you see from your end on why we received a 0 for ELA Percent Tested for the elementary grades for [NAME REDACTED].

Thanks for your help and I look forward to hearing from you soon!

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiries regarding the ESEA 2012 data. I have listed your various questions below and addressed each one separately.

1. I just got off the phone with DRC because I have several students who are currently at [NAME REDACTED] Elementary in 4th grade that had a fall assignment school as [NAME REDACTED] Middle School. We had 54 students who were accidently coded as this and of course we know that the 4th grade students will not be attending this middle school in the Fall. Because these 54 students were accidently coded wrong with their fall assignment code, would this impact how our federal and state report cards are calculated? I just need to make sure.

ANSWER: We use only students in our calculations who are actively enrolled in a given school on the first day of testing. I cannot think of a situation in which it would matter what the DRC inserts on their test files for a fall assignment. Are you referring to End of Course data perhaps?

2. I see the data files on the SCDE website where I can view the mean scores and double check the calculations for my district for the 2012 - 2013 school year? Are the data files, showing the mean scores for the district/schools for the 2010 - 2011 school year also available on the website? If not, where I could I get access to that information?

a. I did go back to the website and couldn't locate the 2010 - 2011 means for [NAME REDACTED] X. I went to the AYP

data link and saw the means for all of the individual grade levels for the school and district but not the way it is presented on the 2012 ESEA link to review the data.

If you could send that to me, that would be awesome!

Request_Date Request Details

Resolution

ANSWER: The data files posted online are for the 2011-2012 school year only. We won't have the 2012-2013 datafiles until next year. No, we haven't posted the 2010-2011 mean scores anywhere since we already have so many data files posted online as it is. We may post the 2010-11 mean scores at a later date, however, as districts become more familiar with the basic ESEA methodology and require additional data for simulations.

3. I was reviewing my districts data for the ESEA waiver and saw a discrepancy with the elementary school data. I noticed that [NAME REDACTED] X received a 0 in ELA Percent Tested but when I review all of my elementary schools plus the continuous enrollment file for my district, I am not sure why we received a 0 on this particular objective.

ANSWER: The reason for the difference between the district level data and the school level is due to the number of students included in the Matrixes. Two of your district's elementary schools did not meet 95% testing in ELA ([NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY and [NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY) but they also did not have 30 students in the disabled subgroup so their data are not displayed or used at the school level. However, when these students are combined at the district level, the overall percent tested for all disabled elementary level students drops down to just 87.5%.

4. I do notice that one of our elementary schools did receive a 0 on math percent tested but we did receive 1 point for this category for the elementary level. If at all possible, can you check on this for me to see if the calculations for this was accurate or just let me know what you see from your end on why we received a 0 for ELA Percent Tested for the elementary grades for [NAME REDACTED] X.

Request_Date Request Details

Resolution

ANSWER: The reason for the difference between the district level data and the school level is due to the number of students included in the Matrixes. Although one of your district's elementary schools did not meet 95% testing in Math ([NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY), when these students are combined with all the other elementary students at the district level the overall percent tested for all disabled elementary level students increases to above 95%.

5. In the technical manual, is there any where showing how K-8 schools were calculated and how these scores were then calculated in the districts grade?

ANSWER: Yes, see page 52.

6. How does the state department calculate the districts overall weighted points total when the points total are there for the elementary, middle, and high school grades?

ANSWER: Calculate District and State ESEA INDEX SCORES and GRADES in a similar way as school level except control for district/state level continuous enrollment and district/state level percent tested data. For PASS students, divide all calculations by grade level (3-5 vs. 6-8) and create separate index scores and counts for each grade level to be combined with high school calculations at district/state level. For SC-ALT students, divide all calculations by FORMTYPE (Elementary vs. Middle) and create separate indexes and counts for each formtype level to be combined with high school calculations at district/state level. (NOTE: For 2012, High School level SC-ALT students have been excluded from calculations due to the absence of an SC-ALT social studies/history component.) Calculate the district composite score by combining the Elementary, Middle, and High scores (and SC-ALT for Elem and Middle) at the district/state level by

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date Request Details

Request_Date Request Details

8/9/2012 FOLLOW UP

Hey Paul,

I did go back to the website and couldn't locate the 2010 - 2011 means for [NAME REDACTED]. I went to the AYP data link and saw the means for all of the individual grade levels for the school and district but not the way it is presented on the 2012 ESEA link to review the data. If you could send that to me, that would be awesome!

I do have three more questions and I apologize for bombarding you with these questions.

1. In the technical manual, is there any where showing how K-8 schools were calculated and how these scores were then calculated in the districts grade?
2. How does the state department calculate the districts overall weighted points total when the points total are there for the elementary, middle, and high school grades?
3. Is it possible that in the upcoming months, once everything calms down, that I could possibly meet with either you or one of your team members in the data analysis department to go over how you all run the data? This will help me do better projections for my district, since this system is very new. I am reading the technical manual and have done my own simulations in the past and just want to make sure that I am doing it right. I currently use SPSS. If you or someone in your department does not have time, if you know someone in another district who does this well, please point me in the right direction. With everything new this year, I just want to

make sure that I am calculating this information correctly after I run PASS/HSAP scores in the future.

Thanks for all of your help and answering my questions!

Resolution

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiries regarding the ESEA 2012 data. I have listed your various questions below and addressed each one separately.

1. I just got off the phone with DRC because I have several students who are currently at [NAME REDACTED] Elementary in 4th grade that had a fall assignment school as [NAME REDACTED] Middle School. We had 54 students who were accidently coded as this and of course we know that the 4th grade students will not be attending this middle school in the Fall. Because these 54 students were accidently coded wrong with their fall assignment code, would this impact how our federal and state report cards are calculated? I just need to make sure.

ANSWER: We use only students in our calculations who are actively enrolled in a given school on the first day of testing. I cannot think of a situation in which it would matter what the DRC inserts on their test files for a fall assignment. Are you referring to End of Course data perhaps?

2. I see the data files on the SCDE website where I can view the mean scores and double check the calculations for my district for the 2012 - 2013 school year? Are the data files, showing the mean scores for the district/schools for the 2010 - 2011 school year also available on the website? If not, where I could I get access to that information?

- a. I did go back to the website and couldn't locate the 2010 - 2011 means for [NAME REDACTED] X. I went to the AYP

data link and saw the means for all of the individual grade levels for the school and district but not the way it is presented on the 2012 ESEA link to review the data.

If you could send that to me, that would be awesome!

Request_Date

Request Details

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

ANSWER: The data files posted online are for the 2011-2012 school year only. We won't have the 2012-2013 datafiles until next year. No, we haven't posted the 2010-2011 mean scores anywhere since we already have so many data files posted online as it is. We may post the 2010-11 mean scores at a later date, however, as districts become more familiar with the basic ESEA methodology and require additional data for simulations.

3. I was reviewing my districts data for the ESEA waiver and saw a discrepancy with the elementary school data. I noticed that [NAME REDACTED] XX received a 0 in ELA Percent Tested but when I review all of my elementary schools plus the continuous enrollment file for my district, I am not sure why we received a 0 on this particular objective.

ANSWER: The reason for the difference between the district level data and the school level is due to the number of students included in the Matrixes. Two of your district's elementary schools did not meet 95% testing in ELA ([NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY and [NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY) but they also did not have 30 students in the disabled subgroup so their data are not displayed or used at the school level. However, when these students are combined at the district level, the overall percent tested for all disabled elementary level students drops down to just 87.5%.

4. I do notice that one of our elementary schools did receive a 0 on math percent tested but we did receive 1 point for this category for the elementary level. If at all possible, can you check on this for me to see if the calculations for this was accurate or just let me know what you see from your end on why we received a 0 for ELA Percent Tested for the elementary grades for [NAME REDACTED] X.

Request_Date Request Details

Resolution

ANSWER: The reason for the difference between the district level data and the school level is due to the number of students included in the Matrixes. Although one of your district's elementary schools did not meet 95% testing in Math ([NAME REDACTED] ELEMENTARY), when these students are combined with all the other elementary students at the district level the overall percent tested for all disabled elementary level students increases to above 95%.

5. In the technical manual, is there any where showing how K-8 schools were calculated and how these scores were then calculated in the districts grade?

ANSWER: Yes, see page 52.

6. How does the state department calculate the districts overall weighted points total when the points total are there for the elementary, middle, and high school grades?

ANSWER: Calculate District and State ESEA INDEX SCORES and GRADES in a similar way as school level except control for district/state level continuous enrollment and district/state level percent tested data. For PASS students, divide all calculations by grade level (3-5 vs. 6-8) and create separate index scores and counts for each grade level to be combined with high school calculations at district/state level. For SC-ALT students, divide all calculations by FORMTYPE (Elementary vs. Middle) and create separate indexes and counts for each formtype level to be combined with high school calculations at district/state level. (NOTE: For 2012, High School level SC-ALT students have been excluded from calculations due to the absence of an SC-ALT social studies/history component.) Calculate the district composite score by combining the Elementary, Middle, and High scores (and SC-ALT for Elem and Middle) at the district/state level by

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/1/2012	After reviewing data for [NAME REDACTED] School District XX for ESEA, one of our combo schools, [NAME REDACTED] High School (XXX-H) has only one report for middle school---XXX-K is a combo school with grades 7-12, generally they get two ESEA/Federal Accountability Rating one for middle school grades 7-8 and one for high school 9-12. In reviewing documents on the website I can only find a ESEA Report for XXX-H middle school I do not see one for XXX-H high school. We have two combo schools, [NAME REDACTED] High School is our second combo school—on your website XHS has two report cards one for middle and one for high school.

8/2/2012	I would be extremely interested in receiving all data you can produce.
----------	--

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED] High School did not receive a report at high school was because this school had too few students taken history (n=XX). Paul: [NAME REDACTED], Good Day!

I am following up on the response you received from Wei Yao regarding your ESEA Inquiry. I see that Wei provided an explanation for why in the official 2012 ESEA results, just released, [NAME REDACTED] High School (XXX-H) has only one report instead of two (as you expected) – a report for the middle school.

I trust you found the explanation satisfactory. If not, by all means, do continue the Inquiry/conversation. We aim to resolve all ESEA Inquiries fully.

I just want to add that despite not being able to produce a full matrix for the high school grades for XXX-H, we do have partial information that we would be pleased to share with you, once we get past the current ESEA Inquiries, so that you could use the additional detail for formative purposes. If you would be interested in receiving additional information, please let us know.

Thank you.
Referred to Paul.

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details	Resolution
8/2/2012	<p>[NAME REDACTED] in [NAME REDACTED] X thinks her ESEA results are posted incorrectly for [NAME REDACTED] Elementary and High. Both of these schools show middle school grades in the summary at the top left of their web page and she thinks the results are not matching the school. Please have someone verify and give her a call. Thanks.</p> <p>See an example at this link for the Elementary.</p> <p>Http://ed.sc.gov/data/embargoed/esea/emesea12mg5/school.cfm?SID=XXXXXXX</p>	<p>[NAME REDACTED],</p> <p>I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. Separate ESEA composite index scores are calculated based on the criteria appropriate for each of the different grade levels—that is, grades 3-5 are calculated using the elementary school criteria and thus have an elementary school matrix displaying these results; grades 6-8 are calculated using the middle school criteria and thus have a middle school matrix displaying these results; and grades 9-12 are calculated using the high school criteria and thus have a high school matrix displaying these results. According to our records, [NAME REDACTED] Elementary School has students actively enrolled in grades Kindergarten through sixth grade and [NAME REDACTED] High School has students actively enrolled in grades seven through twelfth grade. Because of these grade spans, both of these schools get two matrixes displayed on their webpages: the elementary school receives an elementary school matrix and a middle school matrix and the high school receives a middle school matrix and a high school matrix.</p> <p>Along the top left corner of each page you can see the summary results which show the index score for each grade level and then the weighted combined overall score for the school. For more details about how these scores are combined please refer to the technical manual located on the main ESEA webpage under DATA FILES: http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2012/index.cfm</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Returned call - Issue resolved.</p>
8/9/2012	Phone Call.	

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/1/2012	<p>[NAME REDACTED], [NAME REDACTED] Report Card is not correct. The State Department has them as X/7 for % Tested in ELA and X/7 for % tested in math. The ELA should be X/7, too. The State Department has [NAME REDACTED] with a 0 for</p> <p>All Students (should be 1) Male (should be 1) African American (should be 1) Disabled (should be 1) Subsidized Meals (should be 1)</p> <p>This would move their score from a XXX to a XXX. Their % ELA tested is currently a XXX but should be a XX. I don't have the spreadsheets with me, but I'm thinking they tested 100% in all subjects. They did not test less than 95%.</p> <p>How do you want to proceed with having this corrected? Do you want to get in touch with Mr. Ragley or do you want me to?</p> <p>Just let me know what you want me to do. I'm still looking over the other report cards and I have not looked at PASS</p>

Resolution

"[NAME REDACTED] & [NAME REDACTED], I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. [NAME REDACTED] Elementary achieved lower than 95% in percent tested for ELA across several of their subgroups due to the fact that XX students received non-standard accommodations in Reading and Research and thus their scores were counted as missing, or not tested. This methodology has been in place for federal and state accountability since 2010-2011 as outlined in the South Carolina Accountability Workbook: "For the 2010-2011 school year and going forward, students with non-standard accommodations will be excluded from participation calculations -- that is, they are treated as ""not tested"" in the numerator. Non-standard accommodations include oral administration of ELA and the use of a calculator for Math on PASS in grades 3 and 4." (page 3) For your information, the following table shows the percent tested for Forest Acres across each subgroup:

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date	Request Details
8/23/2012	<p>Thanks for the reminder – Our testing coordinator is looking at the HSAP and SC-ALT test scores and I have sent this reminder to her.</p> <p>I have some questions concerning continuous enrollment items and requests that we submitted in June for the students listed below because they were not in continuous enrollment in the district From Day 45 until the first day of testing but the request is showing as not approved by SCDE on this Review2 file.</p> <p>When a student withdraws from a school, the school should enter the first school day of non-enrollment as the Exit Date in PowerSchool. The new school cannot enroll the student in PowerSchool until they actually start attending classes. If the Exit Date for School #1 and the Entry Date of School #2 in PowerSchool are not the same date then the student has days of non-enrollment in the district.</p> <p>If the student transfers within the district and we do not use W10 as the ExitCode in PowerSchool and they were enrolled in an EIA program (Early Childhood, Gifted/Talented or AP), then the district will receive double funding for the student rather than the single funding that we are entitled to.</p> <p>For these two reasons, I am not sure how to handle the in-district transfers that do not immediately enroll at the 2nd school (like [NAMES REDACTED]).</p> <p>[NAME REDACTED]-- I realize that she was an active student on the FDT submission because she was enrolled on X/XX/12 but she was not in continuous enrollment in the district from Day 45 until X/XX/12 because she was not enrolled in any SDPC school on X/XX/12 or X/XX/12.</p> <p>[NAME REDACTED] – This student was not enrolled in any SDPC school on Day 45 (11/8/11). He was a non-enrolled student for SDPC from XX/X/11 until XX/XX/11.</p> <p>Thank you for any help that you can provide for this item so that we avoid future problems.</p> <p>If you have questions or need additional information, please let me know.</p>

Resolution

Thank you for reviewing your data. In response to your inquiries:

Due to the improvements in PowerSchool reporting and the refinement of our methods of identifying student movement– we can now better account for student movement between and within districts. As indicated in the HSAP/SC-Alt Preview 1 documentation -

in addition to the HSAP first day of testing extraction, we pulled-in the re-enrollment data for students from the 135th day to determine exactly where HSAP and SC-Alt (HS) students moved and how long the it took between exiting and entering between schools. Since a student cannot be enrolled in two schools at the same time within the same district - logically, we cannot treat movement between schools within districts the same way we treat breaks in school enrollment outside the district. We did look to see if the students in fact moved within the district (validating the W10 exitcode) and also checked to see if the dates were within a reasonable time. If there is no evidence that the student went outside the district and the dates are within reason (1 to 7 days), we considered the student continuously enrolled in the district. So basically, we use the same methodology that we use for Students Not Tested allowing a 5

With regard to the second student (HSAP Unique ID # [NAME REDACTED]) on your list, I will let Wei know that that student should be a “No” to in-district. We did miss this student’s 45th day enrollment. I believe the methodology detailed in the above paragraph should resolve your question about the students on your list with one to 5 business-days break. If we missed any that were more than a week, we will be happy to review them.

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date

Request Details

Resolution

Thanks,

[NAME REDACTED]

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date Request Details
7/31/2012 FOLLOW-UP

The situation [NAME REDACTED] and I have is that the State Department of Education will be releasing information on how schools were graded for the 2011-2012 school year. The grade [NAME REDACTED] will be receiving is an XX (not too bad but not correct). [NAME REDACTED] with [NAME REDACTED] has shown how the SDE used a subgroup (disabled students) in our graduation rate. Since we do not have 30 students in that subgroup, that should not be counted against [NAME REDACTED] in our graduation rate. When that element in the calculation is corrected, [NAME REDACTED]'s grade will be an A (over 90).

[NAME REDACTED] believes this is also true for subgroups of students at [NAME REDACTED] High School and [NAME REDACTED] High School. [NAME REDACTED] and I feel as though the release of information should be delayed in being made public and corrected.

We appreciate the new grading system for schools, we just want to be sure the information released is correct.

Thank you for your help,

[NAME REDACTED]
Assistant Principal for Instruction
[NAME REDACTED] High School

I am writing to report out issues with the federal accountability data for [NAME REDACTED] School District X. [NAME REDACTED] Elementary School has been placed on the Focus School list. This was done in error. [NAME REDACTED] only has 4 subgroups: All, Male, African American and Free/Reduced

Resolution

The agency reported a school's graduation rate regardless of the n size for state and federal accountability. The old AYP also used grad rate regardless of the n size. I don't think that adding subgroups should change this practice.

From Wei:
Dear [NAME REDACTED],

We received your inquiries on graduation rate point in some sub-groups.

Question:
It appears that graduation rate points were assigned for some subgroups of less than 30 students. For three of our high schools, removing these objectives from the calculations would result in a higher score and letter grade. Below are listed the schools, subgroups where less than 30 students, the original score/grade, and the score/grade that results from excluding these subgroups in the graduation rate points assuming that no other changes are necessary.

Answer:
The 2011 Graduation rate (as used in ESEA 2012) was not limited by student count in the ALL STUDENTS category. However, any subgroup with fewer than 10 students are considered insufficient data and the graduation rate for such groups is blocked and not used in calculations for ESEA 2012. We applied an N size of ≥ 30 only to performance and percent tested in ESEA 2012 calculations for the base line year.

Thank you!

Wei Yao

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012
Lunch. They do not have enough of the "non-subgroups" to
have any achievement gap. Being that this is a National

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request_Date Request Details
Blue Ribbon school, you can imagine that we absolute do not want it to be published that this school is a Focus School. We are requesting that this change be made prior to the public release this Thursday, August 2nd.

In addition, we have determined that subgroups with less than 30 students have been reported out. Especially in the areas of science and social studies. Given that the

proper inclusion/exclusion of these students could potentially change the ratings of both our schools and our district, we would like those changes made prior to the public release this Thursday, August 2nd.

If changes and corrections to data can not be made prior the Thursday, August 2nd release, we would recommend that the public release be delayed until correct data can be shared with the public.

These are just two of our concerns. We will express the rest of our concerns once we receive the methodology of how the ratings were calculated. Which again, we certainly hope this will occur prior to the public release this Thursday.

Request_Date Request Details
8/1/2012 REFERENCE
O:\Accountability\DataManagement_Analysis\RES\REQUE
STS\ESEA Inquiries\[NAME REDACTED] Grade Change Memo
ESEA.pdf

In a cursory analysis of the federal accountability data for our district that was posted on SCDE's web site on Monday, July 30, 2012, [NAME REDACTED] School District X has identified issues which may involve letter grade changes for schools. We respectfully request that SCDE make all necessary corrections to the posted data prior to the public release of the federal accountability data.

Resolution

As I understand old AYP, N size did not factor for grad rate. As I understand state accountability, N size does not matter for grad rate. If I'm correct on both, please let me know. I'll respond to Sally Jay W.

~~~~REGARDING THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DATA--  
[NAME REDACTED] IS NO LONGER ON FOCUS LIST SO NO  
LONGER  
AN ISSUE. SS SENT THIS RESPONSE~~~  
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry that you submitted on Tuesday July 31st regarding the ESEA 2012 data. I know that Wei Yao has already responded regarding the N size for graduation rates but because the information discussed in the original inquiry from you about [NAME REDACTED] Elementary School no longer applies, I wanted to touch base with you and make sure your concerns have been addressed or if there is anything left outstanding. Please let me know.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Resolution

The 2011 Graduation rate (as used in ESEA 2012) was not limited by student count in the ALL STUDENTS category. However, any subgroup with fewer than 10 students are considered insufficient data and the graduation rate for such groups is blocked and not used in calculations for ESEA 2012. We applied an N size of >=30 only to performance and percent tested in ESEA 2012 calculations for the base line year .

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

It appears that graduation rate points were assigned for some subgroups of less than 30 students. For three of our high schools, removing these objectives from the calculations would result in a higher score and letter grade. Below are listed the schools, subgroups where less than 30 students, the original score/grade, and the score/grade that results from excluding these subgroups in the graduation rate points assuming that no other changes are necessary.

Subgroups with Less Than 30 Students

Original Revised BEDS School

Incorrectly Included in

Score/Letter Score/Letter Code Federal Accountability Grade Calculations Hispanic, Disabled, Grade

XXX =B XXX =A [NAME REDACTED]

[NAME REDACTED]

LEP

[NAME REDACTED]

XXX =B XXX =A [NAME REDACTED] High School Disabled

W. 1. [NAME REDACTED] High Disabled XXX =B

XXX=A

[NAME REDACTED] School

After we have had time for more in-depth analysis of the data, there may be more issues that need to be reported to SCDE involving changes to school or district scores. We

Request\_Date

Request Details

Resolution

will communicate those when possible. In the meantime, we strongly urge SCDE to correct these ratings before the data is released to the public on Thursday, August 2. Erroneously labeling schools and districts with letter grades would be extremely detrimental to the

Request\_Date

8/15/2012

Request Details

A couple of questions about changes that were not made from review 1. . .

1.) You did not approve the changes submitted for 11 students from HSAP review 1 for whom I requested their continuously enrolled for the district field be changed from yes to no because of a gap in their district enrollment. Your file indicates that it was not changed because PowerSchool had a W10 withdrawal code indicating transfer within district. Although I am certain that student I have submitted in previous years had these same situations, you have not rejected the changes in the past, and your instructions previously indicated that changes to the district field require no documentation. So I had expected these changes to be approved as they always have been in the past. The coding in PowerSchool of transfer within district does not necessarily indicate that the student immediately transferred within district, and so I wonder why this new procedure was added. All of these students were not actively enrolled in one of our schools for at least one school day (excluding weekends and holidays), and one student was gone for a whole month between 45th day and FDT. I think it's reasonable to assume that the definition of the term "continuously enrolled" means that the student would have to be enrolled every day between the 45th day and FDT. Can you please explain this change in policy including the details of what is and is not accepted so that I can change my procedures for the future as necessary? I really need a detailed definition of continuously enrolled because it seems that the literal translation does not apply.

2.) You did not approve the previous test scores for State [NAME REDACTED]. Am I correct that it is because her 9GR code was wrong? I understand that you will not allow us to change 9GRs anymore (and we have a plan in place to further help [REDACTED] try to do better with their 9GRs), but it seems a bit unfair to also then not allow the previous scores to be used. This means that we are penalized in

Resolution

Thank you for reviewing your data. In response to your inquiries:

1) Due to the improvements in PowerSchool reporting and the refinement of our methods of identifying student movement— we can now better account for student movement between and within districts. As indicated in the HSAP/SC-Alt Preview 1 documentation - in addition to the HSAP first day of testing extraction, we pulled-in the re-enrollment data for students from the 135th day to determine exactly where HSAP and SC-Alt (HS) students moved and how long the it took between exiting and entering between schools. Since a student cannot be enrolled in two schools at the same time within the same district - logically, we cannot treat movement between schools within districts the same way we treat breaks in school enrollment outside the district. We did look to see if the students in fact moved within the district (validating the W10 exitcode) and also checked to see if the dates were within a reasonable time. If there is no evidence that the student went outside the district and the dates are within reason (1 to 7 days), we considered the student continuously enrolled in the district. So basically, we use the same methodology that we use for Students Not Tested allowing a 5 business days lei way in order to process the student. If we missed any that were more than a week, we will be happy to review them.

2) New this year - The decision was made that no changes would be made to PowerSchool Data – so you are correct, we cannot change the GR9 for students. Same as in previous years – If a student tests too early, we do populate the scores from their first administration (or score- if they only take part of HSAP too early). We do not combine scores from two administrations. If a student’s scores have already been used in accountability, we do not use them again

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request\_Date

Request Details

two ways for one error because rather than being excluded which would be the correct thing to do based on the transcript provided, she will count as not tested for ELA even though she had taken and passed ELA previously.

I know this may not affect calculations much, but the principle concerns me. Any possibility of reconsideration?

8/6/2012

Good afternoon. If you could please answer the following questions, I would greatly appreciate it.

1. On page 12 of the Technical Documentation Draft, it says that high school students are only included in the calculations if they have been continuously enrolled from the 45th day to the first day of testing. This has always been true for HSAP, but is it now also true for EOCEP? Or does EOCEP still count every student who tests, regardless of enrollment?

2. For schools/districts that include multiple grade spans (for instance, grades K-8), how are the grade span scores combined to produce the overall score?

Resolution

(as in the case of student you referenced).

Hi,

1. This is still not true of EOCEP, we use the contractor file matched to demographics rather than matched to the 45th day to first day of testing file.
2. In your example a K-8 school would be scored by a weighted composite index of the elementary grades (3 – 5) and the middle grades (6 – 8), which have the same ESEA weights but different AMOs. The weighted composite index will be weighted by the number of students in each category, elementary or middle.

Best,  
Brandon

Request\_Date  
8/13/2012 Good afternoon,

My understanding of the new ESEA system is that the required subgroup size to receive a rating is 30 – is that correct?

If so, I have some concerns that [NAME REDACTED] (xxxxxxx) may have received ratings in categories for which they had too few students. For example, the “Numbers” document for middle schools indicates that the only subgroups at [NAME REDACTED] to contain at least 30 students were Female and White in ELA and Math. None of the subgroups for Science and Social Studies should have counted, and neither should the Male and African-American subgroups for ELA and Math. There are similar issues with [NAME REDACTED] school, and I have not studied our other schools.

Am I looking at this correctly? Thank you for your time.

[NAME REDACTED]

FOLLOWUP:

Thank you. Your response explains why Science and Social Studies were included.

I still do not understand why any subjects were reported for the African-American students, of which there were xx continuously enrolled in the middle school and xx continuously enrolled in the elementary school, or for the Male students, of which there were xx in middle school and xx in elementary.

Also, the “Numbers” file for this school’s elementary students identifies xx African-American student for ELA and Math, but “-x” for insufficient sample size for Science and Social Studies, which seems to contradict your earlier response.

Request Details Resolution  
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data.

QUESTION: My understanding of the new ESEA system is that the required subgroup size to receive a rating is 30 – is that correct? If so, I have some concerns that [NAME REDACTED] (xxxxxxx) may have received ratings in categories for which they had too few students. For example, the “Numbers” document for middle schools indicates that the only subgroups at [NAME REDACTED] to contain at least 30 students were Female and White in ELA and Math. None of the subgroups for Science and Social Studies should have counted, and neither should the Male and African-American subgroups for ELA and Math. There are similar issues with [NAME REDACTED] school, and I have not studied our other schools. Am I looking at this correctly? Thank you for your time.

ANSWER: Yes, ESEA calculations for elementary and middle schools require a subgroup size of 30 to be included for accountability. However, this number is derived from the number of students continuously enrolled in the school for each subgroup, not per test subject. Because PASS social studies and science are only given to about half the students in a school, some schools that have 30 students in a subgroup will thus have fewer than 30 students taking those tests, but that does not matter to the calculations because the minimum size limit is placed on the number of students continuously enrolled in the school.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Request\_Date

Request Details

If you could clarify a little further, I would appreciate it.

Thank you,

[NAME REDACTED]

Director of Accountability

(xxx) xxx-xxxx

[NAME REDACTED]@ [NAME REDACTED]

[NAME REDACTED]

Resolution

FOLLOWUP:

[NAME REDACTED],

[NAME REDACTED] is a school that has grades spanning x-x, which means that this school receives two separate matrixes to evaluate performance according to AMOs set for elementary grades (up through 5) and middle grades (6-8). Although the test scores are evaluated by grade level, the subgroup size limit is placed on the continuous enrollment of students in the entire school (x-x). So, for example, [NAME REDACTED] had xx African American students continuously enrolled in the elementary grades and xx continuously enrolled in the middle school grades. The fact that only xx are listed on the Numbers file is due to the fact that x of the students did not test. The reason why the numbers file lists -x for science and social studies means that there were fewer than ten students in those fields so we could not display their information.

Sincerely,

Request\_Date  
8/22/2012

Request Details  
FOLLOW UP

Thank you. Your response explains why Science and Social Studies were included.

I still do not understand why any subjects were reported for the African-American students, of which there were xx continuously enrolled in the middle school and xx continuously enrolled in the elementary school, or for the Male students, of which there were xx in middle school and xx in elementary.

Also, the "Numbers" file for this school's elementary students identifies xx African-American student for ELA and Math, but "-x" for insufficient sample size for Science and Social Studies, which seems to contradict your earlier response.

If you could clarify a little further, I would appreciate it.

Thank you,

[NAME REDACTED]

Request\_Date  
8/15/2012

Request Details  
FOLLOW UP

Ms. Hearn, I have been waiting to hear from you but I know you have been busy. Have you been able to re-assess our rating yet? With the exception of this year, [NAME REDACTED] School is one of six (6) schools in the entire that state that made AYP for three consecutive years. This included schools of all socioeconomic backgrounds and populations. This is why I am very concerned about the rating of the middle school. Please inform me of the progress that has been made concerning this situation. Thanks

[NAME REDACTED], Principal

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

[NAME REDACTED] is a school that has grades spanning x-x, which means that this school receives two separate matrixes to evaluate performance according to AMOs set for elementary grades (up through 5) and middle grades (6-8). Although the test scores are evaluated by grade level, the subgroup size limit is placed on the continuous enrollment of students in the entire school (x-x). So, for example, [NAME REDACTED] had xx African American students continuously enrolled in the elementary grades and xx continuously enrolled in the middle school grades. The fact that only xx are listed on the Numbers file is due to the fact that x of the students did not test. The reason why the numbers file lists -x for science and social studies means that there were fewer than ten students in those fields so we could not display their information.

Sincerely,

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. [NAME REDACTED] school received the ESEA Composite score that it did primarily because of the school's performance in Math.

As you can see from the datafiles posted on the SCDE website, [NAME REDACTED] mean PASS scores in Math for 2012 were as follows:

ALL STUDENTS=xxx.x

MALE=xxx.x

FEMALE=xxx.x

AFRICAN-AMERICAN=xxx.x

SUBSIDIZED MEALS=xxx.x

[NAME REDACTED] School

(xxx) xxx-xxxx

The state objective is 624 for middle schools, so each of these group fell short and did not earn a 1 in the matrix. After not meeting the objective, the next step is to see if there was improvement from the previous year. [NAME REDACTED] mean PASS scores in Math for 2011 were as follows:

ALL STUDENTS= xxx.x

MALE= xxx.x

FEMALE= xxx.x

AFRICAN-AMERICAN= xxx.x

SUBSIDIZED MEALS= xxx.x

As you can see, the growth scores between 2011 and 2012 were all negative, so we could not assign a partial credit for those groups.

Another category which affected [NAME REDACTED] Middle's composite score was MALES for ELA (mean test score for 2012= xxx.x) and Science (mean test score for 2012=xxx.x). Although the mean ELA score for males did not increase between 2011 and 2012, it did for Science which is why [NAME REDACTED]received partial credit in that field.

Request\_Date

Request Details

Resolution

Hope this helps clarify where the performance issues lay.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

We included the subgroups with N size of 30 or more in the calculation, for example, this school has total students in HASP are xx , Male students=x, Female students=xx, so they are considered insufficient data for calculation.

7/31/2012

<http://ed.sc.gov/data/embargoed/esea/emesea12mg5/>

It may be correct, but [NAME REDACTED]data doesn't look correct. It is a large enough school to have subgroup

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

8/5/2012 performance for males and females, but the males performance isn't showing up.  
Dr. Butler-Nalin: completed and put dta on ADT 8-20. Sent email to [NAME REDACTED]@ [NAME REDACTED].org  
I trust you had a great weekend. Please send the following 2012 ESEA data files (with individual student data) for [NAME REDACTED] School ? Completed  
HSAP ELA  
HSAP Math  
Biology I EOC  
U.S. History EOC  
2011 School Graduation rate  
Thank you in advance.  
[NAME REDACTED]

| Request_Date | Request Details                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Resolution                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8/7/2012     | FOLLOWUP EMAIL AUG 9TH<br>Please send a status for my request.<br><br>Dr. Butler-Nalin:<br><br>I trust you had a great weekend. Please send the following 2012 ESEA data files (with individual student data) for [NAME REDACTED]School ?<br><br>HSAP ELA<br>HSAP Math<br>Biology I EOC<br>U.S. History EOC<br>2011 School Graduation rate | Extracted ELA, MATH , Biology and History student level data that were used in ESEA12 calculation and put the file on ADT. The name of the file is [NAME REDACTED.schxxxxxxx.HSAP12.Science11.History11<br><br>Sending out an email to [NAME REDACTED]@ [NAME, REDACTED].org Aug. 20012.<br><br>Completed. |

Thank you in advance.

[NAME REDACTED]

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

| Request_Date | Request Details                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8/7/2012     | <p>Do you all have the Mean PASS scores for my Full Pay, Non-LEP, Non-Disabled for all of [NAME REDACTED]PASS schools?</p> <p>I have a PASS file and could calculate but would like the exact MEAN that was used to calculate the GAPS so I can be accurate. If it is posted somewhere that I can get it, please direct me.</p> <p>Thank you and have a great day.</p> <p>[NAME REDACTED]</p> |

|          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8/2/2012 | <p>Roy,</p> <p>Left you a voice message just now.<br/>Please call me to discuss formula for how gaps were computed, and the figures used for [NAME REDACTED] Elementary.<br/>I am concerned that the subsidized meals vs full pay gap computation might be incorrect.</p> <p>Also, I will try to contact Paul Butler-Nalin of Data Management Analysis.</p> <p>[NAME REDACTED]</p> |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. I have created an EXCEL table for you containing the data used in the GAP analysis for Focus Schools and placed it on the ADT (titled "[NAME REDACTED] GAP"). Tab 1 of the file contains the data for your schools including the GAP overall and per subgroup as well as the MEANS for each subgroup across each test subject. Tab 2 contains a KEY to explain what each column heading means. Note that fields are blank when there are fewer than 30 students in a subgroup so no mean (nor GAP) can be calculated.

Let me know if you need additional information.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers  
BOBBY CALLED [NAME REDACTED] TO DISCUSS THIS WITH THEM.

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request\_Date Request Details

8/3/2012 Hello Paul,

Resolution

Called.

In reading the Methodology for Identifying Focus Schools on page 119 of the approved ESEA Waiver, some of the language is not clear to me.

In Step 4b., it says to subtract mean scores to produce achievement gap score by subject. Question – are we to do this for each subgroup with an N of 30? If so, can you tell me all of the subgroups that are to be included? Do we include Male/Female, LEP/Non-LEP, Subsidized Meals/Non-Subsidized, Disabled/Non-Disabled? When looking at the “White” sub-group, do we compare to all non-White? The example matrix on pg. 121 is confusing on this point. In the “White” row under ELA, it shows an average scale score of 670 in the Primary Group column and a 600 in the Comparison Group column. Where does the “600” come from (the African-American subgroup has a mean scale score of 625, Hispanic shows a 580)? By the same token, the African-American sub-group shows a 625 in the PG column, and a 660 in the CG column. Where does the 660 come from?

In order to calculate Step 4c. correctly (“add the achievement gap scores for each subject and divide by the number of subgroups to obtain the average gap score by subject”), we need to know exactly which sub-groups must be included (M/F, etc.) and which groups are being defined as the Comparison Group in regards to the race subgroup.

If I am reading steps 4c. and 4d. correctly, once we calculate an “average gap score by subject”, and then add these gap scores together and divide, we should have an “gap index score” for lack of a better term?

Thank you,

[NAME REDACTED]

Request\_Date

Request Details

Resolution

8/8/2012

I appreciate your response. Allow me to ask for a few additional points of clarification.

I'll call him and work with him.

Robert Rykard

1. The example on pg. 121 of the Approved ESEA Waiver shows Matrix – Example of Achievement Gap Calculations.

Your explanation, and the directions in the waiver, say to subtract “African-American” subject mean from “White” subject mean. However, the example matrix shows in the Primary Group column a mean ELA scale score for the “White” group of 670 and a mean ELA scale score for the “African-American” group as 625. Yet, the calculation in the matrix shows in the Comparison Group column subtracting “600” (not “625”) from the “White” group; How can that be if the “African-American” group shows a “625” as its mean ELA score? By the same token, when subtracting the “White” group from the “African-American” group, it shows a mean ELA score of “660”; How is this the case if the “White” group has a mean ELA scale score of 670 in the Primary Group column? Are these typographical errors?

2. One of our schools was designated a Focus school. We were told that Male/Female is not used in the Overall Gap Score. Which is it?

3. What happens when you have 30 Hispanic students? Is this compared to the White group? Again, the matrix example does not show a Comparison Group mean scale score that is either the African-American score (625) or the Hispanic group (580)? It is subtracting 600 from the White group. Please explain.

Thank you,

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request\_Date

Request Details

Resolution

7/31/2012

This letter is an appeal per [NAME REDACTED], Superintendent [NAME REDACTED] School District X, of the ESEA Accountability data. We request review of the Social Studies calculations for All Students, Female, Male, White, African American and Subsided Meals. The data fields are not populated in relation with the known subgroups. The appropriate calculations and a copy of the state report are attached.

If this is related with History, We are using 2011 end of course file not 2012.

Please confirm receipt of e-mail and refer all correspondence in this matter to [NAME REDACTED]at [NAME REDACTED]@ [NAME REDACTED].org. Cell phone # xxx-xxx-xxxx. Call if necessary.

Attachments can be found at:

O:\Accountability\DataManagement\_Analysis\RES\REQUE  
STS\ESEA Inquiries

7/31/2012

Request that this not to be treated as a high school for ESEA. See letter located under program location in this database.

Nancy sent letter as reply - SEE FOR POLICY

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

| Request_Date | Request Details |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 8/6/2012     | Cynthia,        |

We appreciate all help, hints, and interpretations. At the request of my bosses, I sent the attached letter to Paul with some other questions. I don't guess any of them would mind if I share those with you. [NAME REDACTED]

[NAME REDACTED], Ph.D.  
Director of Testing, Accountability, and Research  
[NAME REDACTED] District X

Resolution  
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. According to our records Cynthia Hearn already answered some of your questions, so I am just addressing question 3:

3. In the area of percent tested, there are several data points that do not make sense, since we thought the students had either been tested or documentation supplied:
- White subgroup at [NAME REDACTED]School
  - Disabled subgroup for the District report
  - Disabled subgroup for [NAME REDACTED] School

ANSWERS:

- [NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL: According to our records, [NAME REDACTED] had xx white students that were supposed to take the ELA and MATH PASS test but only xx of them did so, leaving a percent tested of xx%. The untested students had the following stateids:  
7332750287  
7672738216  
8470264834

- DISABLED AT DISTRICT LEVEL:  
There were three disabled students for ELA and four for Math at the district level who did not test but who should have tested (and were not excused). They have the following stateids:

XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX

Math also has the following:

XXXXXXXXXX

- DISABLED for [NAME REDACTED]:  
There were three disabled students at [NAME REDACTED] High who did not test but who should have tested (and

Resolution

were not excused). They have the following stateids:

XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

Hope this helps.

Thank you.

Best,

Sylvia Sievers

FROM CYNTHIA:

I can answer two of your questions here.

Graduation rates for subgroups are not subject to the 30 N size that is used for performance measures.

We do set an N size of 10 for the graduation rate subgroups due to FERPA concerns.

A 0 in a graduation rate cell on the matrix means that the subgroup did not meet the AMO and there was no improvement from the previous year.

We will need to look at the data file to answer question 3.

A formal response will be forthcoming.

Cynthia Hearn

Education Associate

Office of Data Management & Analysis

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

| Request_Date | Request Details                                                                                                                           |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8/7/2012     | Letter in Mail, located on O: drive<br>O:\Accountability\DataManagement_Analysis\RES\REQUE<br>STS\ESEA Inquiries\[NAME REDACTED] ESEA.PDF |

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. According to our records Cynthia Hearn already answered some of your questions, so I am just addressing question 3:

3. In the area of percent tested, there are several data points that do not make sense, since we thought the students had either been tested or documentation supplied:

- White subgroup at [NAME REDACTED] School
- Disabled subgroup for the District report
- Disabled subgroup for [NAME REDACTED] School

ANSWERS:

- [NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL: According to our records, [NAME REDACTED] had xx white students that were supposed to take the ELA and MATH PASS test but only xx of them did so, leaving a percent tested of xx%. The untested students had the following stateids:

XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX

- DISABLED AT DISTRICT LEVEL:

There were three disabled students for ELA and four for Math at the district level who did not test but who should have tested (and were not excused). They have the following stateids:

XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX

Math also has the following:

XXXXXXXXXX

- DISABLED for [NAME REDACTED]:

There were x disabled students at [NAME REDACTED] High who did not test but who should have tested (and

Request\_Date Request Details

8/22/2012 FOLLOW UP

Thank you but we have had this file. I would like to have the data file of day 45 match to first day of testing so I can recreate your MEANS. If that is not possible, then ok. It is what it is.

The big problem I have with this is averaging the gaps together. This seems to hide true gap schools. If you are lucky enough to have more gaps then your average is lower. I know you are not the ones to complain to.

Thanks and have a great day.

8/1/2012 [NAME REDACTED]  
[NAME REDACTED]School District x  
I don't see any documents on the right-hand column. There is a link called "Research" that takes me to a "404 - Page Not Found". Is the document no longer available?

Thank you,

Resolution

were not excused). They have the following stateids:

XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

Hope this helps.

Thank you.

Best,

Sylvia Sievers

Last week every district received a PASS REVIEW2 file that shows all the test scores for all the students used in the calculations. You can calculate the means using those data.

Best,

Sylvia

Dear [NAME REDACTED],

I have not been able to see any link that reads "Research." Please provide a link, and I will make certain that the file for which you are looking can be found.

Sincerely,

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request\_Date

Request Details

Resolution

8/2/2012

Thank you for speaking with me.

Please send me the formula for how achievement gaps are computed for Title I Focus School Designation, and the data used to compute for [NAME REDACTED] Elementary, [NAME REDACTED] District x.

[NAME REDACTED] has been designated a Focus School and I need to see the computations before mailing public notification for School Choice.

Thank you.

P.S. Title I dates are such that we are supposed to mail letters Monday, so I need to see the computations today or tomorrow.

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

|              |                                                                                                                              |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Request_Date | Request Details                                                                                                              |
| 8/1/2012     | Subsidized Meals Science received a .x since they did not meet the AMO but grew x points over 2011. Thank you for your help. |

We have two schools on the focus list that we are surprised about. Can you help explain or guide me to someone who can.

[NAME REDACTED] under the new ESSEA has xx.x points A They have All Students, Male, Female, White subgroups only. This is a very small rural school. They met all AMOs. Under the NCLB system I predict they are somewhere around x.xx Excellent Absolute.

[NAME REDACTED] Absolute History is 2009 x.xxxxx Average with growth xx.xx, 2010 x.xx G xx.xx growth and 2011 x.xx with growth xx.xx

Please help me know where to look to understand that we are in the bottom of the state. Thank you.

Resolution

This questions is about FOCUS school information. I already answered her questions in other inquiry threads. --SS

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. I have created an EXCEL table for you containing the data used in the GAP analysis for Focus Schools and placed it on the ADT (titled "[NAME REDACTED] GAP"). Tab 1 of the file contains the data for your schools including the GAP overall and per subgroup as well as the MEANS for each subgroup across each test subject. Tab 2 contains a KEY to explain what each column heading means. Note that fields are blank when there are fewer than 30 students in a subgroup so no mean (nor GAP) can be calculated.

Let me know if you need additional information.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Request\_Date

8/13/2012

Request Details

This came by phone call directly to me. I emailed my response so that we have documentation.

The initial inquiry over the phone was the she didn't think [NAME REDACTED]Elementary School in [NAME REDACTED] had more than 30 students in their disabled category, especially in their xth grade (they are a x-x school).

--Sylvia

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding ESEA calculations. The number of disabled students used for ESEA calculations was extracted from PowerSchool on May 8, 2012 (first day of testing for PASS) in the EFA Primary Code field.

As of May 8th, [NAME REDACTED]Elementary had xx students who had a disability code in their EFA Primary field. xx of these students were continuously enrolled in the school between the 45th day and the first day of testing, so their data is used in the performance section of the matrix. Although [NAME REDACTED]Elementary has a xth grade and thus a middle school matrix, the minimum count of 30 is placed on the total enrollment in the school, not per grade or per matrix.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

FOLLOWUP RESPONSE TO A FOLLOWUP PHONE CALL:  
[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your telephone inquiry regarding ESEA calculations. To ensure proper documentation I will repeat your question in this email before answering. You mentioned that despite the fact that the performance criteria in ESEA are divided by grade level across two matrixes (for [NAME REDACTED]), the percent tested data are based on the entire school and therefore it appears in [NAME REDACTED]that the school is being penalized twice for not meeting percent tested in ELA.

This is one of the policy decisions that was made

Request\_Date      Request Details

Resolution

regarding the best way to evaluate a school with unusual grade spans such as [NAME REDACTED]. We used information for the entire school as a whole to limit numbers of students in subgroups as well as for evaluating the percent of students properly tested, but separated the performance by grade level so that the middle school grades could be evaluated against their own separate performance targets (AMOs). Although in this case, as you mentioned, [NAME REDACTED] appears to be dinged twice for failing to meet the percent tested in ELA, along those same lines it also is given twice as much credit for the percent tested in Math.

Hope this helps clarify this issue.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

| Request_Date | Request Details                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8/1/2012     | <p>please review appeals for the schools listed in the [NAME REDACTED] School District.</p> <p>[NAME REDACTED]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•In Science for 2012, for the female subgroup, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx. In 2011 for the female subgroup in Science, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx which amounts to a difference of at least x.xx. This change would give us at least x.x total points for Science, xx% for the Objectives Met, and at least x.x for the weighted points subtotal.</li><li>•In Social Studies for 2012, for the female subgroup, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.x. In 2011 for the female subgroup in Social Studies, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx which amounts to a difference of at least x.xx. This change would give us at leastx.xx total points for Social Studies, xx.x% of Objectives Met and at least x.xx weighted points subtotal. These changes should increase our total points substantially.</li></ul> <p>[NAME REDACTED]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Under the disabled subgroup for English Language Arts and Mathematics there are 10 students in each area. According to the Accountability System there should be 30 students.</li><li>• This year's accountability report has given the school x.x% in the disabled subgroup which changes our objectives from x to x. We believe that this is an error, and we are requesting that this objective be removed.</li><li>•This year's accountability report for Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) also shows that our 7th Grade Mathematics scores for all students increased from last year by at least x total points. We are requesting a review.</li></ul> |

Resolution

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 calculations for elementary and middle schools in your district.

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

1. QUESTION: In Science for 2012, for the female subgroup, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx. In 2011 for the female subgroup in Science, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx which amounts to a difference of at least x.xx. This change would give us at least x.x total points for Science, xx% for the Objectives Met, and at least x.x for the weighted points subtotal.

ANSWER: In Science in 2012 for the female subgroup, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED ] School was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this subgroup was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -x.x$ , which is not an improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

2. In Social Studies for 2012, for the female subgroup, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.x. In 2011 for the female subgroup in Social Studies, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx which amounts to a difference of at least x.xx. This change would give us at least x.xx total points for Social Studies, xx.x% of Objectives Met and at least x.xx weighted points subtotal. These changes should increase our total points substantially.

ANSWER: In Social Studies in 2012 for the female subgroup, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED]School was

Request\_Date Request Details

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

- There is a x recorded in the Male/ELA Category. Our records indicate that this is incorrect. The correct calculation should be recorded as at least x.x.
- There is a blank space recorded in the Female/Math Category. Our records indicate that this is incorrect. The correct calculation should be recorded as at least x.x.
- There is a x recorded in the Subsidized Meals Category. However, this should be recorded as at least .x.
- There is a discrepancy in the number of Objectives in each area. recorded. The total number of Objectives recorded should be x in ELA Proficiency,x5 in Math Proficiency,x5 in Science Proficiency, and x in Social Studies Proficiency.

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

- Under “Title”, the column that notes All Students: Math Proficiency Met/Improved, the difference in the scale score mean from 2011 to 2012 should have been recorded as at least .x, instead of zero due to the difference in improvement between the two years.
- The column under “Title”, that notes female test takers was recorded as .x and should have been recorded as at least .x as due to the difference in improvement from 2011 to 2012.
- The column noted as “white” test takers should have a blank instead of a zero rating
- Subsidized meals should have been recorded as at least .x instead of .x.
- We disagree with the graduation rate list as xx.x%.

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

- We agree with the Math and Social Studies scores, but we do not agree with the ELA and Science scores. We increased our ELA score from xxx.x to xxx.x, giving us a difference of xx.x which should give us a .x instead of a .x.

Resolution

xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this subgroup was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -x.x$ , which is not an improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

[NAME REDACTED]

3. QUESTION: Under the disabled subgroup for English Language Arts and Mathematics there are xx students According to the Accountability System there should be 30 students.

ANSWER: The only column in the ESEA matrix where Students With Disabilities was counted was graduation rate. The graduation rate column only limits subgroup information if there are fewer than 10 students. [NAME REDACTED] had more than 10 students in this subgroup so they were counted in the graduation rate column.

4. QUESTION: This year’s accountability report has given the school x.x% in the disabled subgroup which changes our objectives from x to x. We believe that this is an error, and we are requesting that this objective be removed.

ANSWER: As mentioned above, the only column in the ESEA matrix where Students With Disabilities was counted was graduation rate. The Students With Disabilities subgroup improved in their graduation rate by x percentage points from last year so they received a x.x in the matrix. The graduation rate column only limits subgroup information if there are fewer than 10 students. [NAME REDACTED] had more than 10 students in this subgroup so they were counted in the graduation rate column, and have shown growth over the previous year.

Request\_Date

Request Details

- We increased our Science score from xxx.x to xxx.x, giving us a difference of xx.x which should give us a .x instead of a .x.

We appreciate your prompt attention to our appeal, and look forward to receiving feedback from you. Thank you for your continued support.

Copies to: [NAME REDACTED], Superintendent  
[NAME REDACTED], Assistant Superintendent of Instruction

Resolution

5. QUESTION: This year's accountability report for Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) also shows that our xth Grade Mathematics scores for all students increased from last year by at least x total points. We are requesting a review.

ANSWER: In Math in 2012 for the ALL STUDENTS group, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this subgroup was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -xx.x$ , which is not an improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

6. QUESTION: We agree with the Math and Social Studies scores, but we do not agree with the ELA and Science scores. We increased our ELA score from xxx.x Toxxx.x, giving us a difference of xx.x which should give us a .x instead of a .x.

ANSWER: In ELA in 2012 for the ALL STUDENTS group, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this group was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = x$ , which is an improvement over the previous year of x points so there were 0.x growth points assigned.

7. QUESTION: We increased our Science score from xxx.x to xxx.x, giving us a difference of xx.x which should give us a .x instead of a .x.

ANSWER: In Science in 2012 for the ALL STUDENTS group, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] was xxx.x; for the

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

Request\_Date

8/1/2012

Request Details

The [NAME REDACTED] School District has reviewed its district and schools' data. We have observed several areas of concern regarding our data that are incorrect, and we are requesting to have our data reviewed in light of the many errors found that are not attributed to the district's submissions/corrections. A few of the ones documented to date are:

[NAME REDACTED] High School's graduation rate of xx.x

[NAME REDACTED] High School's female subgroup for ELA and Math were omitted

Pass Test results sent are under the name [NAME REDACTED] Elementary School instead of [NAME REDACTED] Elementary School; and [NAME REDACTED] School should be [NAME REDACTED] School

The name [NAME REDACTED] was omitted on the PASS scores by grade level & demographic category

There are additional concerns that will be forwarded to your attention today, 8/1/12.

Thank you for your attention to this request. We are a district working diligently to improve the performance of its students and to promote the gains being made. A review with appropriate corrections prior to release is urged.

Mr. Ragley,  
email - 8/1/12 9:07 a.m

Thank you for your response and forwarding action. I know you understand the level of impact a grade can have on a school district; especially one that is striving diligently to improve. We are simply requesting that the information submitted for public consumption be given full attention prior to release. The effects of what is being done is similar to that of words being spoken in haste that cannot be retrieved. No matter how much one apologizes, it's still

Resolution

#1. [NAME REDACTED] High School's graduation rate is NOT xx.x but xx.x

#2 [NAME REDACTED] High School's female subgroup for ELA and Math N=xx

# Calculation not  
[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

1. QUESTION: In Science for 2012, for the female subgroup, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx. In 2011 for the female subgroup in Science, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx which amounts to a difference of at least x.xx. This change would give us at least x.x total points for Science, xx% for the Objectives Met, and at least x.x for the weighted points subtotal.

ANSWER: In Science in 2012 for the female subgroup, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] School was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this subgroup was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -x.x$ , which is not an improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

2. In Social Studies for 2012, for the female subgroup, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.x. In 2011 for the female subgroup in Social Studies, we had an average PASS score of at least xxx.xx which amounts to a difference of at least x.xx. This change would give us at least x.xx total points for Social Studies, xx.x% of Objectives Met and at least x.xx weighted points subtotal. These changes should increase our total points substantially.

ANSWER: In Social Studies in 2012 for the female subgroup, the average PASS score for continuously

Request\_Date

Request Details

out there.

Thank you so much for allowing me to share with you

Resolution

enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED]School was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this subgroup was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -x.x$ , which is not an improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

2. QUESTION: Under the disabled subgroup for English Language Arts and Mathematics there are xx students in each area. According to the Accountability System there should be 30 students.

ANSWER: The only column in the ESEA matrix where Students With Disabilities was counted was graduation rate. The graduation rate column only limits subgroup information if there are fewer than 10 students. [NAME REDACTED] had more than 10 students in this subgroup so they were counted in the graduation rate column.

4. This year's accountability report has given the school x.x% in the disabled subgroup which changes our objectives from x to x. We believe that this is an error, and we are requesting that this objective be removed.

ANSWER: As mentioned above, the only column in the ESEA matrix where Students With Disabilities was counted was graduation rate. The Students With Disabilities subgroup improved in their graduation rate by x percentage points from last year so they received a x.x in the matrix. The graduation rate column only limits subgroup information if there are fewer than 10 students. [NAME REDACTED] had more than 10 students in this subgroup so they were counted in the graduation rate column, and have shown growth over the previous year.

Request\_Date      Request Details

Resolution

5. This year's accountability report for Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) also shows that our xth Grade Mathematics scores for all students increased from last year by at least x total points. We are requesting a review.

ANSWER: In Math in 2012 for the ALL STUDENTS group, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this subgroup was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -xx.x$ , which is not an improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

6. We agree with the Math and Social Studies scores, but we do not agree with the ELA and Science scores. We increased our ELA score from xxx.x to xxx.x, giving us a difference of xx.x which should give us a .x instead of a .x.

ANSWER: In ELA in 2012 for the ALL STUDENTS group, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this group was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = x$ , which is an improvement over the previous year of x points so there were x.x growth points assigned.

7. We increased our Science score from xxx.x to xxx.x, giving us a difference of xx.x which should give us a x instead of a .x.

ANSWER: In Science in 2012 for the ALL STUDENTS group, the average PASS score for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this

Request\_Date      Request Details  
8/15/2012      FROM [NAME REDACTED]:

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

- There is a 0 recorded in the Male/ELA Category. Our records indicate that this is incorrect. The correct calculation should be recorded as at least x.x.
- There is a blank space recorded in the Female/Math Category. Our records indicate that this is incorrect. The correct calculation should be recorded as at least x.x.
- There is a 0 recorded in the Subsidized Meals Category. However, this should be recorded as at least .x.
- There is a discrepancy in the number of Objectives recorded. The total number of Objectives recorded should be x in ELA Proficiency, x in Math Proficiency, x in Science Proficiency, and x in Social Studies Proficiency.

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

- Under "Title", the column that notes All Students: Math Proficiency Met/Improved, the difference in the scale score mean from 2011 to 2012 should have been recorded as at least .x, instead of zero due to the difference in improvement between the two years.
- The column under "Title", that notes female test takers was recorded as .x and should have been recorded as at least .x as due to the difference in improvement from 2011 to 2012.
- The column noted as "white" test takers should have a blank instead of a zero rating
- Subsidized meals should have been recorded as at least .x instead of .x.

Resolution  
[NAME REDACTED],

Your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 calculations for high schools in your district was forwarded to me by Dr. Sievers. Please see the followings for responses:

[NAME REDACTED] SCHOOL

Question 1. There is a 0 recorded in the Male/ELA Category. Our records indicate that this is incorrect. The correct calculation should be recorded as at least x.x.

Answer 1: The 2012 average score of Males on HSAP ELA for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] school was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this subgroup was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -x.x$ , which is not an improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

Question 2. There is a blank space recorded in the Female/Math Category. Our records indicate that this is incorrect. The correct calculation should be recorded as at least x.x.

Answer 2: The Number of continuously enrolled students for Females on 2012 HSAP was xx in both ELA and Math. Any subgroup that had N size of less than 30 students was considered insufficient data that was not included in calculation. In other words, it was not counted against the school as an objective to be accountable. That's why this school had objectives of x instead of x under ELA and Math performance.

Question 3: There is a x recorded in the Subsidized Meals Category. However, this should be recorded as at least .x.

Request\_Date      Request Details

- We disagree with the graduation rate list as xx.x%.

Resolution

Answer 3: The 2012 average score of Subsidized Meals Category on HSAP ELA for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED]school was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this subgroup was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -x.x$ , which is not an improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

Question 4. There is a discrepancy in the number of Objectives recorded. The total number of Objectives recorded should be x in ELA Proficiency, x5 in Math Proficiency, x in Science Proficiency, and x in Social Studies Proficiency.

Answer 4. The objectives were reported as x in Science Proficiency, and x in History Proficiency in the matrix on web for the school, but x under ELA and x4 under Math because this school had xx females who were continuously enrolled students. Female students in these two subjects with less than 30 did not count for objectives for school to be accountable.

[NAME REDACTED]SCHOOL

Question 1: Under "Title", the column that notes All Students: Math Proficiency Met/Improved, the difference in the scale score mean from 2011 to 2012 should have been recorded as at least .x, instead of zero due to the difference in improvement between the two years.

Answer 1: The 2012 average score of All students on HSAP Math for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] School was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for the all student was xxx.x. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = -x.x$ , which is not an

Request\_Date      Request Details

Resolution

improvement over the previous year so there were no growth points assigned.

Question 2: The column under "Title", that notes female test takers was recorded as .x and should have been recorded as at least .x as due to the difference in improvement from 2011 to 2012.

Answer 2: The 2012 average score of Female students on HSAP Math for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] School was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for this the all student xxx.x The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = x.x$ , which is an improvement over the previous year, so there were .x (after rounding) growth points assigned.

Question 3: The column noted as "white" test takers should have a blank instead of a zero rating.

Answer 3: Cells of White students' performance and participation had blank in the matrix across all subjects already. Please see details at <http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2012/>

Question 4: Subsidized meals should have been recorded as at least .x instead of .x.

Answer 4: The 2012 average score of students on Subsidized meals on HSAP Math for continuously enrolled students at [NAME REDACTED] School was xxx.x; for the previous year (2010-11) the average score for the same subgroup was xxx. The difference between the two years is  $xxx.x - xxx.x = x.x$ , so there were .x growth points assigned after rounding.

Question 5: We disagree with the graduation rate list as xx.x%.

Answer 5: [NAME REDACTED]School's graduation

Request\_Date

Request Details

Resolution

9/6/2012

I am emailing in response to your telephone inquiry about the ESEA calculations for [NAME REDACTED] School. I am responding via email in order for this inquiry to be properly documented.

[NAME REDACTED],

I am emailing in response to your telephone inquiry about the ESEA calculations for [NAME REDACTED] School. I am responding via email in order for this inquiry to be properly documented.

[NAME REDACTED] received a composite score of xx.x for its elementary grades (x-x), which included xxx students who were continuously enrolled. It also received a composite score of xx.x for its middle grade (x), which consisted of xx students who were continuously enrolled.

To create the final weighted composite score the calculation is as follows:

$((xx.x \times xxx) + (xx.x \times xx)) / (xxx + xx)$  which equals a final overall score of xx.x

If you need additional clarification, we request that you email us your questions so we can continue to properly document all inquiries.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sievers

Questions Asked by School Districts Following Release of ESEA Grades on August 2, 2012

| Request_Date | Request Details                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Resolution                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8/13/2012    | <p>This letter is an appeal per [NAME REDACTED], Superintendent [NAME REDACTED], of the ESEA Accountability data. We request review of the Social Studies calculations for All Students, Female, Male, White, African American and Subsidized Meals. The data fields are not populated in relation with the known subgroups. The appropriate calculations and a copy of the state report are attached.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt of e-mail and refer all correspondence in this matter to [NAME REDACTED]at [NAME REDACTED]@ [NAME REDACTED].</p> |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 8/15/2012    | <p>See location in "Program Location."</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | <p>September 06, 2012</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 7/31/2012    | <p>[NAME REDACTED], Coordinator of ESOL and Gifted/Talented Initiatives</p> <p>I have a question concerning [NAME REDACTED] School in [NAME REDACTED]—why did the school receive zeros in all subgroups for Science and Social Studies?</p> <p>Any help in letting me know the explanation will be valuable. Thank you</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | <p>"[NAME REDACTED], I am emailing in response to your inquiry regarding the ESEA 2012 data. [NAME REDACTED] School in [NAME REDACTED]received zeros in all subgroups for science and social studies because their mean (average) scale score in these subjects was lower than the state Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for Elementary schools of 630. To see the mean scale scores for this school and its subgroups, please refer to the data file entitled "Elementary School" located on the main ESEA webpage, in the right hand column, under DATA FILES&gt; MEANS. Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sylvia Sievers"</p> |