**WYOMING SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY**

**WYOMING LEGISLATURE’S ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION MODEL 2014**

**IMPLEMENTATION HANDBOOK**

(August 20, 2014b)

The Wyoming School Accountability pilot was implemented during the fall of 2013. This paragraph pertains to the pilot. The Wyoming Accountability in Education Act (WAEA) established a requirement to develop procedures for assigning all Wyoming public schools to one of four performance level categories: *Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, Partially Meeting Expectations* and *Not Meeting Expectations.* Each school’s performance level determination was based upon the school’s performance on various indicators that were prescribed by statute. The methodology for evaluating each schools performance on the indicators was established in accordance with the January, 2012, *Education Accountability Report[[1]](#footnote-1)*. A professional judgment panel (PJP) composed of Wyoming stakeholders as prescribed by statute engaged in a standard setting process to establish cut-scores and other parameters for a school performance rating model. The PJP met on September 16, 17, and 18, 2013 and this report reflects the decisions made by that panel. The school performance levels and school scores on the indicators were vetted with districts and publically released during October 2013.

The first operational implementation of Wyoming School Accountability under the Legislature’s Accountability in Education Model is scheduled to take place during the fall of 2014. Lessons learned during the pilot and the availability of additional data in 2013-14 resulted in some changes to the school performance rating model to be implemented in 2014. Those changes are documented where appropriate in this *Implementation Handbook.*

Some delay in implementation may occur due to the requirement that student performance levels on the *Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students* (PAWS) and the *Student Assessment of Writing Skills* (SAWS) for achievement (i.e., PAWS for grades 3-8) need to be aligned with the recently adopted Wyoming state standards (i.e., which are the common core state standards) for mathematics and English language arts. This will be accomplished by engaging in standard setting activities during the summer of 2014.

**ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT PANEL**

During the 2012-13 accountability pilot, as mentioned above, a PJP of stakeholders established cut-scores for indicators and other parameters of the school performance rating model. The PJP will be convened again for the 2013-14 full implementation of the model. Alignment of student performance levels on the PAWS and SAWS with the recently adopted state standards will result in some change to the impact data available for the PJP for use in establishing target levels on the indicators. In addition, all three high school indicators have been altered from those used during the pilot as described in this handbook. New standard setting is therefore necessary to make necessary adjustments to the indicator target levels.

**INDICATORS BY GRADE**

Indicators are a function of grade in school.

* Indicators for Schools that have Grades Three through Grade Eight
  + Achievement
  + Growth
  + Equity measured by growth
* Indicators for High School
  + Achievement
  + Readiness
  + Equity measured by change in the achievement gap

Some schools have grade configurations that include both grades nine through 12 and grades eight and lower (e.g., schools with grades K-12). These schools will have two school performance levels computed initially; one for grades eight and below and one for grades nine through 12. The school will receive two reports (i.e., a grade 3-8 report and a high school report). The school’s official performance level will be the lower of the two computed performance levels.

**INDICATORS AND INDICATOR SCORES**

**ACHIEVEMENT**

There will be one overall *school achievement score* for each school that represents student performance in all tested grades and content areas at each school. The Grade 3 through 8 and the high school achievement indicators will be different. The 2013-14 achievement tests used for state accountability will include:

* The Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students (PAWS)
  + Reading in grades 3 through 8
  + Math in grades 3 through 8
  + Science in grades 4 and 8
  + Writing in grades 5 and 7
* The ACT subject area tests
  + Reading in grade 11
  + Mathematics in grade 11
  + Science in grade 11
  + Combined English/Writing in grade 11

**Grades 3 through 8 Achievement.** The achievement indicator for schools serving grades 3 through 8 will be the percent of tested students who scored proficient or above on the Wyoming state achievement test. An illustration of how school achievement scores will be computed is presented in Table 1. Assume the hypothetical school represented in Table 1 was an elementary school with grades kindergarten through six with 20 students per grade level. Science will only be tested in grade 4 at this school. Because fewer students were tested in science, exceptionally high or low performance on the science test would have less impact on the school achievement score than would exceptionally high or low performance on either the reading tests or the math tests[[2]](#footnote-2).

Table 1. Illustration of Computation of a School Achievement Score.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Content | Count of Tested Students | Count of Proficient Students | School Achievement Score |
| Math | 80 | 65 |
| Reading | 80 | 60 |
| Writing | 40 | 25 |
| Science | 20 | 12 |
| Column Totals | 220 | 162 | 162/220 = 73.6% |

This school achievement score (i.e., the total percent proficient on all achievement tests) was used for assigning schools to one of three categories on the achievement indicator: (a) exceeding targets, (b) meeting targets, or (c) below targets. The PJP will establish the school achievement score cut points during a September 2014 standard setting session that will be used to assign schools to these three categories. The establishment of separate cut-points are planned for each of two grade level bands[[3]](#footnote-3). Schools below the low cut are not meeting targets, schools at or above the low cut and below the high cut are meeting targets and schools at or above the high cut are exceeding targets.

* Grade Band One = Grades 3 through 6
* Grade Band Two = Grades 7 and 8

Some schools will have students in both grade band one and grade band two. When this happens, cut points will be adjusted to accurately reflect the number of students in each of the grade bands at the school using the procedure illustrated in Table 2. The school represented in Table 2 is a hypothetical middle school with grades six, seven, and eight.

Table 2. Illustration of Method of Adjusting a Cut Point when a School Includes Two Grade Bands

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Band 1 | Band 2 | Steps 1 & 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 |
| Cut Points | 75 | 68 | 75 - 68 = 7 | 7\*0.333 = 2.33 | 68+2.33 = 70.33 |
| *n* of Students | 100 | 200 | 100/(100+200) = .333 |

Step 1 in Table 2 involves simple subtraction to determine the magnitude of the difference in the cut-points from each grade band. The difference between 75 and 68 is 7. Step 2 in Table 2 involves determining the percentage of total students in grade band 1. Grade band 1 included 33.3% of the total student count at the school. In step 3 the result of step 1 is multiplied by the result of step 2. The result, 2.3 is 33% of the 7 point difference in the cut-points for grade band one versus grade band two. In step 4, the final step, 2.3 is added to the lower of the two cut-points (i.e., the cut-point for grade band two). The adjusted cut-point for this hypothetical school would be 70.3.

**High School Achievement Indicator.** Following the 2013 Wyoming school accountability pilot, there were plans to change the high school achievement indicator due to problems with using student performance level determinations based on ACT scale cut points. Specifically, frequency distributions for Wyoming grade 11 students on the ACT scales for the ACT subject area tests showed wide fluctuations in the percentage of students scoring at particular ACT scaled score points from one year to the next. As a result of these fluctuations, the use of cut-scores for student performance levels based on the ACT scale for these subject area tests resulted in substantial shifts in the percentage of students within the various performance levels from year-to-year. Because it was not reasonable to conclude that these fluctuations were due to changes in school performance, the student performance levels established based upon ACT scale cut-scores were deemed unacceptable for use in school accountability.

A variety of options for using ACT subject area test as a school indicator for achievement were explored following the 2013 Wyoming school accountability pilot. Recently, during the summer of 2014, ACT staff facilitated an empirical standard setting process with Wyoming educators to identify student performance levels on the subject area tests in reading, mathematics, science and English/writing. In addition, ACT staff provided a *Wyoming ACT Scale* to the WDE for use in establishing student performance levels. This scale differs from the traditional ACT scale. ACT staff further provided the WDE with cut-scores on the Wyoming ACT Scale that reflected the outcome of the empirical standard setting process. Basing student performance levels on the Wyoming ACT Scale, instead of the traditional ACT scale, will result in student performance levels that are appropriate for use in school accountability[[4]](#footnote-4). This development makes it possible to use the percent of students proficient or above on the subject area tests of reading, mathematics, science and English/writing as the achievement score for high schools. As such, the achievement score for high schools will be similar to the achievement score used for schools serving students in grades 3 through 8. This score will be computed in the manner illustrated in Table 1.

**EQUITY**

An important goal of WAEA is to “minimize achievement gaps” [Wyoming Statute 21-2-204(b) (vi)]. Measures of student growth will be used to measure equity in schools with students in grades four through eight. Since high schools do not have a measure of growth, a measure of the achievement gap will be used to measure equity.

**Equity for Schools Serving Grades 4 through 8.** A consolidated subgroup will be established that consists of all students who were below proficient on the prior year state test in math and/or reading. Because the previous year’s test performance defines this group, educators will know who is in this group at the beginning of each new school year. This will permit educators to be strategic about planning to improve outcomes for students in this subgroup.

In order to align the 2014 test with the recently revised Wyoming Content Standards for English/language arts and mathematics, Wyoming aligned all items on the 2014 PAWS test with the new standards and developed a new scale to go along with those standards. When a test moves from one scale to another it is still possible, in most instances, to compute normative growth scores like student growth percentiles (SGPs). As such, Wyoming will include growth in the school performance ratings in 2014. When there is a break in scales, however, it is generally not possible to compute adequate growth percentile rank (AGP) scores which are based upon projections from the prior year's test to current and future tests. In 2013, AGPs were central to the measurement of the equity score for schools with grades four through eight. An alternative method for computing equity will be needed in 2014 to address this break in scale on the PAWS test. The alternative method will be based upon student standardized scores. The correlation coefficient for equity scores computed using the 2013 method and the equity scores computed using the proposed 2014 method was *r* = .80[[5]](#footnote-5).

PAWS scaled scores have different means and standard deviations for each grade within each content area. In order to measure equity in the absence of AGPs we need to be able to express how the consolidated subgroup scored as a group. When each student in the subgroup has a reading and math score with means and standard deviations that have a common meaning, a mean of those scores would serve this descriptive purpose. A student standardized score is a transformation of a PAWS scaled score that has a common mean and standard deviation[[6]](#footnote-6) for all content areas and grades. A mean student standardized score for a consolidated subgroup will express how much that group's reading and math performance differed from that of all students in the state of Wyoming. To assist with computing equity scores for 2014 school performance ratings, a standardized scale for the student scores in reading and math will be computed with the statewide Wyoming mean set to equal 100 and the statewide standard deviation set to be equal to 20. *Each school's equity score will be the consolidated subgroups mean student standardized score in reading and math combined.*

Student standardized scores will be used in order to have scores with a common mean and standard deviation for PAWS performance across grades in school and content areas. Student standardized scores in reading and math will be computed as follows:

* Step 1 will involve the Wyoming, statewide mean scaled scores and standard deviations for each grade will be computed for both reading and math.
* Step 2 will be the computing of standardized score for PAWS reading and math for each tested student by subtracting the statewide mean scaled score from step 1 (i.e., *b*) from the student’s scaled score (i.e., *a*) and dividing the result by the statewide standard deviation from step 1 (i.e., *c*).

Student ACT Subject Area Standardized Score = (*a* – *b*)/*c* (1)

* An example of step 2 of the transformation is presented here. This involves the computation of a hypothetical math standardized score for a student with a subject area math test scaled score of 580:
  + Assume the statewide mean score for math for this grade is 600 and the standard deviation is 50.
  + (580 – 600) = -20
  + -20/50 = -0.40
* This (i.e., step 2) of the transformation will result in scores that are expressed as decimals and they may be negative (e.g., -0.40).
* Step 3 of the transformation produces the scale with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 20. The step involves multiplying the score obtained in step 1 (i.e., -0.40) by the transformed standard deviation of 20 and adding the result to 100, e.g.,
  + -0.40 \* 20 = -8
  + -8 + 100 = 92
* The student with the hypothetical PAWS math scaled score of 580 would have a math standardized score of 92 (i.e., the math scaled score of 580 was 20% of a standard deviation below the Wyoming grade level mean for this hypothetical student and the standardized score of 92 was also 20% of a standard deviation below the Wyoming grade level mean of 100).

**Equity for High Schools.** Issue 30 of the *WDE Assessment Updates* informed schools in Wyoming that the high school equity indicator for 2013-14 would include a consolidated subgroup. Current year (i.e., 2013-14) grade 11 students were in grade 10 last year (i.e., 2012-13) when they were required to take the PLAN test. Membership in the consolidated subgroup for high school will be based upon 2012-13 PLAN test performance on the subject area tests of mathematics and reading. Students with scaled scores below 17 on the mathematics subject area test and/or below 16 on the reading subject area tests will be placed in the consolidated subgroup for their respective high schools.

The high school equity score will be a measure of the achievement level of the consolidated subgroup's combined reading and math achievement at the end of grade 11 (i.e., the current school year). Keep in mind that these students were identified as low performing students based upon their low performance in either reading or math or both reading and math at the end of grade 10 (i.e., the prior school year). The equity score for high schools will be a mean score of the consolidated subgroup in reading and math from the end of grade 11. The mean used will be the mean *Wyoming ACT scaled score*.

**GROWTH**

**Student Level Growth.** Growth is measured in schools serving grades 4 through 8 only. Growth refers to a change in the achievement within students as they progress from year to year. In order to compute growth scores, students must have at least two consecutive years of state test scores. Since the Wyoming state test is first administered in grade three, growth is first measured in grade four. Growth is computed separately for reading and for math on the Wyoming state test for students in grades four through eight.

The method used to measure growth will produce student growth percentiles[[7]](#footnote-7) (SGPs) that indicate how an individual student’s growth compared with that of all Wyoming public school students[[8]](#footnote-8) from that particular year in the same grade that had similar scores in previous years. SGPs range from 1 to 99 with lower scores indicating lower growth and higher scores indicating higher growth. This measure of growth is independent of the achievement level performance of students[[9]](#footnote-9). Students with low achievement may have low or high growth. Likewise, students with high achievement may have low or high growth. Regardless of how high a student’s test scores in past years were, they still may earn any of the SGPs from 1 to 99 depending upon the changes in their scaled scores.

**Students Included in the Growth Modeling Data Set.** Only public school students are included in the SGP norm cohort for a given year. Any available results from tests delivered at private institutions in prior years for students in the SGP norm cohort will be included.  This consideration results in the use of a slightly different long data set for each year's SGPs. In other words, the current year dataset is not the prior year dataset with another year's scores tacked on. It is a data set for the current year public school students with all of their prior scores including some that may have come from a private school test administration in a prior year. The only growth scores of interest that are computed from this data set are those for the given year. Prior year growth was computed with the prior year’s data set[[10]](#footnote-10).

**School Level Growth.** The median SGP at a school (i.e., the school’s MGP) is the SGP that half of the students at the school scored above and half scored below. MGPs have the same meaning for any group. As such, they can be computed separately for each grade and content area at a school. Separate MGPs for each grade and content area at a school will be computed and reported to assist schools with their improvement efforts. The most accurate median that represents total growth at a school across all grades and both content areas, however, is the median of SGPs (i.e., the MGP) at the school for all grades and both content areas. That *school MGP* was used as the school’s growth score.

MGPs at each school will further be placed into one of three categories: (a) exceeding target, (b) meeting target and (c) not meeting target. The PJP established cut points for the MGPs that separated these three categories from one another.

**READINESS**

**High School Readiness Indicator.** Readiness will be measured at all high schools (i.e., schools from which students may earn a high school diploma). There will be four sub-indicators for readiness in 2014. In 2013 only two of these sub-indicators were available.

* Graduation rate
* Tested readiness as measured on tests in the ACT suite of tests (i.e., ACT Explore in grade 9, ACT Plan in grade 10 and the ACT in grade 11)
* Grade nine credits earned
* Graduates’ eligibility level for the Hathaway Scholarship

**Graduation Rate.** Graduation rate will be featured more prominently than the other three readiness sub-indicators. A goal of WAEA is for Wyoming to become an education leader among states. Clearly, a state that is an education leader among states would be among the top states for high school graduation rate. The current evidence suggests that Wyoming is not presently among the top states for high school graduation.

Specifically, the most recent graduation rate information for states available from the US Department of Education (USED) is from the 2009-10 school year. During the past four years Wyoming and other states have been measuring four year on-time graduation rates. Wyoming's four year on-time graduation rate on that report was listed as 80%. 61% of the states at that time had four year on-time graduation rates above 80%. Wyoming has experienced a drop in four year on-time graduation each of the last three years. Wyoming's graduation rates for these years are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3.Wyoming Four Year On-Time Graduation Rates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| School Year | Four Year On-Time Graduation Rate |
| 2012-13 | 77.5 |
| 2011-12 | 78.9 |
| 2010-11 | 79.7 |
| 2009-10 | 80.4 |

In order to place more prominence on the graduation rate sub-indicator, the method used in 2014 will have school level targets identified by the PJP that are specific to graduation rate. A graduation rate cut score for *meeting* and a graduation rate cut score for *exceeding* will be identified by the PJP. These targets will guide school efforts to improve graduation rates going forward. Once targets are established, the graduation rate computation will be a multi step process.

Step 1. Establish graduation rate targets.

* Various sources of information can inform the target setting by the PJP. For example,
  + For example, to achieve the goal of being an education leader among states the goal could be informed by the graduation rate of the top 15% to 25% of states according to some baseline year.
  + Second, the performance of Wyoming schools from a given year could provide guidance. For example, 29% of Wyoming schools had graduation rates of 88% or higher during the 2012-13 school year.
* This information could be made readily available to the PJP when it establishes targets.

Step 2. Determine the degree to which the schools met the *graduation rate targets* with the four year on-time graduation rate and/or with the extended graduation rate.

* The school's four year on-time graduation rate is computed as follows:

Students Receiving a Regular Diploma in Year 4

Dropouts (Grade 9 Year 1 + Grade 10 Year 2 + Grade 11 Year 3 + Grade 12 Year 4) + Students Completing High School Year 4

* + This formula used by the Wyoming Department of Education for calculating graduation rates was an “exiter” rate. The denominator was the total of all “exiters” from a school over a 4 year period for a grade cohort. The exiters were the 9th grade drop-outs 3 years ago, the 10th grade drop-outs 2 years ago, 11th grade drop-outs last year, and this year’s 12th grade drop-outs plus completers. These were all the students that “exited” from education for that cohort. The numerator was the count of the cohort's current year regular diploma recipients. This four year on-time rate answers the question, “What percent of students exiting education do so within four years with a regular diploma?” Foreign exchange students are not included in either the numerator or the denominator. These students often stay in Wyoming schools for only a year and then return to their home country to complete their education, thus they are not expected to graduate from a Wyoming school.
  + Each school will fall within one of three categories (i.e., exceed, meet or *not meet* the target) based upon their four year on-time graduation rate.
* Next, the school's extended graduation rate is computed
  + The extended graduation rate is the four year on-time graduation rate with all 5, 6 and 7 year graduates from the school added to both the numerator and the denominator.
  + Each school will also *exceed, meet* or *not meet* the graduation rate target based upon the extended graduation rate.

Step 3. Determine the degree to which the schools *progress toward the target* met the *graduation rate targets*.

* *Schools are assigned one of three levels with respect to progress toward the targets for both meets and exceeds. Progress toward the target will be computed on the four year on-time graduation rate only.* The "meets" target is minimum graduation rate to obtain meets; the "exceeds" graduation rate target is minimum graduation rate needed to obtain exceeds. Progress is determined as follows:
  + Progress is defined as a school being considered to be on track for reaching the target within three years ... three years is the ‘time to target’ criterion.
  + For all high schools in the "not meet" category based upon the four year on-time graduation rate or the extended graduation rate, the gap between the prior year four year on-time graduation rate and the graduation rate target for the "meets" target will be computed
    - For example, assume a school has a graduation rate of 78% and the meets target rate is 85%
      * Calculate the amount of growth needed to be considered on track to meet the target within three years (round this to the nearest tenth)
      * If the target was 85% and the school's prior year four year on-time graduation rate was 78% then,
        + (85) - (78) = 7
        + (7) x (.333) = 2.3
        + (2.3) + (78) = 80.3
      * If the school's four year on-time graduation rate for the current year was at least 80.3 in the current year the school would have made satisfactory progress and would be placed in the "meets" category on the progress indicator.
      * If the school's four year on-time graduation rate for the current year was below 80.3 in the current year, the school will remain in the "not meet" target category.
    - Similarly, for schools that were in the "meets" target category with their four year on-time or extended graduation rate, progress will be measured toward the "exceeds" target category using the same methodology described above
      * If progress is sufficient to obtain the "exceed" category, the school is classified as "exceeds" on the progress indicator
      * If progress is not sufficient, the school will remain in the "meets" target category on the progress indicator

Step 4.The school is given the HIGHER rating of either status (i.e., attainment of target with either the four year on-time graduation rate or the extended graduation rate) or progress (i.e., improvement to target.)

**Additional Readiness.** The remaining three readiness sub-indicators (i.e., tested readiness, grade nine credits and Hathaway eligibility level) will be grouped together and one combined score will be computed to reflect performance on these three sub-indicators. This combined score will be referred to as the *additional readiness* score. When computing the additional readiness score, the PJP may recommend differential weighting for the three sub-indicators scores that are combined into the other readiness score. The PJP will identify cut scores for *meeting* and *exceeding* targets on the *additional readiness* score.

Some schools will meet the minimum *n* requirement for one or more additional readiness sub-indicators but not all additional readiness sub-indicators. When this happens, the additional readinessscore will be computed using just those indicators on which the school meets the minimum *n* requirement. This score will be computed for all schools in the sample with the needed scores that meet the minimum *n* on those indicators. Cut-scores will be established on these partial additional readiness scores by assuring that the proportion of schools exceeding, meeting and not meeting targets on the partial readiness score were as close as possible to the proportion of schools within each category for all three additional readiness sub-indicators when the PJP established cut-points were applied to those schools. The partial additional readiness scores will be weighted the same as they would be if all three sub-indicators were present. For example, if a school met the minimum *n* the tested readiness and grade nine credits but not on Hathaway eligibility and tested readiness was weighted at .15 and grade nine credits was weighted at .35, these same weightings would be applied to the partial additional readiness scores.

**ACT Suite of Readiness Tests.** Tested readiness will remain unchanged from the 2013 pilot. Composite scores on the ACT Explore in the spring of grade nine, the ACT Plan in the spring of grade ten and the ACT in the spring of grade 11 will provide test evidence of readiness. The index developed and used during the pilot for each of the three tests will be used in computing the measure of tested readiness. ACT composite test scores are presently used in Wyoming as one source of information that determines a student’s level of eligibility for Hathaway Scholarships. The ACT composite score cut points used for Hathaway Scholarship eligibility informed the development of the Wyoming accountability tested readiness index. Specifically the ACT composite cut point for the lowest level of Hathaway Scholarship eligibility became the lowest cut point for the readiness index. The ACT composite cut point for the highest level of Hathaway Scholarship eligibility became the highest cut point for the readiness index. Finally, an ACT composite cut point for a middle level of Hathaway Scholarship eligibility became the middle cut point for the readiness index. Table 4 presents the Wyoming ACT composite score ranges and associated accountability index values that resulted from this process.

Table 4. ACT College Readiness Index Score Ranges.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Composite Score Ranges | | |  |
| Wyoming Tested Readiness Levels | ACT Explore Grade 9 | ACT Plan Grade 10 | ACT Test Grade 11 | Index Points\* |
| Level 4 | 21-25 | 22-32 | 25-36 | 100 |
| Level 3 | 18-20 | 19-21 | 21-24 | 80 |
| Level 2 | 15-17 | 16-18 | 17-20 | 50 |
| Level 1 | 1-14 | 1-15 | 1-16 | 20 |

\*The index points associated with each level were established by the PJP in September, 2013.

Table 4.9 in the *Technical Manual Plan* provided observed ACT scores from fall of grade 12 for students who also had Plan scores from spring of grade ten. The frequency distributions from this matrix of scores were used to identify the score point on the Plan that was a mid point in the score range associated with the ACT cut points represented in Table 4 above. The Plan score ranges in Table 4 were constructed using those corresponding Plan composite scores as cut points.

Finally, Table 4.19 of the *Technical Manual Explore* provides observed Plan composite scores from fall of grade 10 for students who also had Explore scores from the spring of grade nine. The frequency distributions from this matrix of scores were used to identify the score point on the Explore that were a mid point in the score range associated with the Plan cut points represented in Table 4 above. The Explore score ranges in Table 4 above were constructed using those corresponding Explore cut points.

In order to better understand the extent of coherence across the tested readiness index score ranges on the three tests, the percentages of students scoring at each level on each test in Wyoming in 2013 were computed. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Percent of Wyoming Students with Scores at Each Tested Readiness Level in 2013.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Wyoming Tested Readiness Levels | ACT Explore  (Grade 9) | ACT Plan  (Grade 10) | ACT  (Grade 11) |
| Level 4 | 17% | 21% | 18% |
| Level 3 | 26% | 25% | 24% |
| Level 2 | 33% | 33% | 30% |
| Level 1 | 23% | 21% | 28% |

The findings presented in Table 5 provide evidence for the coherence of the score ranges across the three tests.

In order to compute a schools’ tested readiness score, the school was assigned 20 points for each student at a school who performed at level 1, 50 points for each student who performs at level 2, 80 points for each student who performs at level 3 and 100 points for each student who performs at level 4. These index point values were assigned by the PJP in September 2013. A school received one overall tested readiness score for student performance on all tests from the ACT suite that were administered at the school. The school’s tested readiness score was the mean index score for all students across all tests from this suite that were administered at the school.

Students who take the alternate assessment will be included on the tested readiness subindicator. Alternate assessment students are included in the participation rate calculation. Tested readiness index scores for students who take the alternate assessment will be based upon the percentage of subject area tests on which they were proficient or better. The number of alternate tests taken may vary for a variety of reasons. Students eligible for the alternate assessments may take anywhere from zero to four alternate assessments. Specifically, a school will be assigned the index points associated with Level 4 (i.e., from Table 5) for each student who earns a proficient or better score on all subject area tests that they take. A school will earn index points associated with Level 3 for all students who earn a proficient or better score on between 66 percent to 75 percent of subject area tests they take on the alternate assessment. Some students may earn scores of proficient or better on 50% of subject area tests administered. When this happens the school will be assigned the number of index points that is the average of the index points, rounded to the nearest whole number, associated with Level 2 and Level 3. This is equivalent to a Wyoming Tested Readiness Level of 2.5. Level 2.5 is only possible for students who take the alternate assessment. A school will be assigned the index point associated with Level 2 for all students who are proficient or better on between 25% and 33% of the alternate assessment subject area tests taken. Finally, a school will be assigned the number of index points associated with Level 1 performance for all students who take the alternate assessment and are proficient or better none of subject area tests that they take.

**Grade Nine Credits Earned.** Grade nine may or may not be part of the grade configuration for all Wyoming schools from which students may receive a diploma. Some high schools serve students in grades ten through 12 while most presently serve students in grades nine through 12. Grade nine credits earned will be an indicator for all schools from which students may receive a diploma, regardless of the grade configuration of the school. The number of credits a student has when entering grade ten is a leading indicator for success in high school regardless of where the student attended school for grade nine. Therefore, high schools have an interest in and can choose to have some role in how well students are performing in grade nine even when grade nine is housed in a feeder school rather than in the high school itself.

Some students earn grade nine credits during a summer session. In order to be able to credit schools for ninth grade credits earned in the summer, the grade nine credits earned indicator will lag one year. In this respect it will be similar to the long standing practice in Wyoming of lagging the reporting of graduation rate for accountability purposes by one year so that students who graduate following the successful completion of required courses during the summer session may be included in a school’s graduation rate.

When grade nine is housed at the high school, grade nine credits earned will be computed for all full academic year students enrolled at the school at the end of grade nine. When grade nine is housed in feeder schools, grade nine credits will be computed for all students who were full academic year students in a grade 9 paired school (i.e., a feeder school)[[11]](#footnote-11). Table 6 presents the list of high schools without a grade nine and their designated paired schools.

Table 6. School Pairs for Grade 9 Credits during the 2012-13 School Year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Accountability School | |  | Grade 9 Credits Earned School |
| District | School # | School | School # | School |
| Albany #1 | 0101055 | Laramie High School | 0101050 | Laramie Junior High School |
|  |  |  | 0101030 | UW Laboratory School |
|  |  |  | 0101001 | Snowy Range Academy |
| Fremont #21 | 0721055 | Ft. Washakie Charter High School | 0721056 | Ft. Washakie High School |
| Fremont #21 | 0721056 | Ft. Washakie High School | 0721055 | Ft. Washakie Charter High School |
| Campbell #1 | 0301055 | Campbell County High School | 0301050 | Twin Spruce Junior High School |
|  |  |  | 0301051 | Sage Valley Junior High School |

A school’s score for grade nine credits will be the percentage of full academic year students that earned one fourth of the credits required to earn a diploma at their designated high school.

**Hathaway Scholarship Level.** There are four Hathaway scholarship levels in Wyoming. Eligibility for each level is based upon three criteria: (a) unweighted high school grade point average (GPA), (b) a minimum ACT or Work Keys score and (c) completion of the success curriculum at a particular level. For 2014 accountability, the scholarship levels used for school accountability will be based upon just two of the three eligibility criteria: the unweighted high school GPA and the minimum ACT score. These eligibility criteria are presented in Table 7. Changes have been made in the transcript collection process that will permit the use of all three Hathaway eligibility criteria in future years. For 2014 the student's Hathaway eligibility level for school accountability will be based upon a conjunctive model. Specifically, the level assigned to the student for the purpose of school accountability will be the level associated with lower of the two indicators (i.e., unweighted GPA or minimum ACT score).

Table 7. Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility Levels and Criteria for Unweighted GPA and Best ACT Composite Score.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Scholarship Level | | | |
| Provisional | Opportunity | Performance | Honors |
| High School Minimum Unweighted GPA | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 |
| Minimum ACT\* | 17\*\* | 19 | 21 | 25 |

\*ACT can be the student’s best ACT score which may not be from the census administration in grade 11.

\*\*Or a WorkKeys score of at least 12.

The Hathaway success curriculum requirements for 2014 and beyond are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Hathaway Success Curriculum Requirements for 2014 Graduates and Beyond.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Hathaway Scholarship Level | Provisional Opportunity | Opportunity | Performance | Honors |
| Math | 3 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum  approved math; Must include two of the three,  Algebra I, Algebra II and/or Geometry | 4 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved math  Must include Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry and an approved additional math | | |
| English/language arts | High school graduation requirements | 4 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved English courses grades 9-12 | | |
| Science | High school graduation requirements | 4 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved science courses grades 9-12 | | |
| Social Studies | High school graduation requirements | 3 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved social studies courses grades 9-12 | | |
| Foreign Language | Meet foreign language proficiency as determined by your district  (Excludes 2016 graduates and beyond) | | 2 sequenced years of approved foreign language courses; One year may be taken prior to grade nine | |
| Additional Success Curriculum Requirements for 2016 Graduates and Beyond | | | | |
| Fine Arts | Fine Arts 2 years of fine and performing arts course grades 9-12 | | | |
| OR | | | | |
| Career and Technical Education | 2 years of career and technical education courses grades 9-12 | | | |
| OR | | | | |
| Foreign Language | 2 sequenced years of approved foreign language courses; One year may be taken prior to grade nine | | 2 additional years of foreign language courses may be sequenced  or non-sequenced different language | |

Hathaway Scholarship eligibility will be measured using an index for the purpose of computing school performance levels under WAEA. The index is presented in Table 9. The school’s score will be the mean of student points for the graduating class at the school.

Table 9. Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility Index.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student Eligibility Level | Points\* |
| Level 5: Honors | 100 |
| Level 4: Performance | 90 |
| Level 3: Opportunity | 80 |
| Level 2: Provisional | 70 |
| Level 1: Not Eligible | 0 |

\*\*Initial index point values were derived from advisory committee to the Wyoming select committee on school accountability standard setting activity.

The Hathaway eligibility used for accountability will not necessarily match Hathaway eligibility for awards. For awards, a students’ best ACT score can be used. The WDE Hathaway data collection may or may not include a student’s best ACT score. In addition, a students’ success curriculum performance may be monitored for verification by WDE using transcript information on a random basis or to address specific concerns. Actual success curriculum performance used for Hathaway awards and other eligibility criteria are judged by a human inspection of the student’s transcript.

The final readiness score for high schools in 2014 will be computed by multiplying each sub-indicator score at the school by the weight of that sub-indicator and then summing the weighted scores. Sub-indicator weights will be established by the PJP. The PJP will then establish cut scores for the three categories of not meeting target, meeting target and exceeding target.

**HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT**

Each school's performance on the achievement, equity and readiness indicators will be used to determine a school's performance level. Three decision tables will be used for this purpose. Table 10 presents the first decision table that will be used to establish whether the school did not meet, met or exceeded targets on tested achievement and equity.

Table 10. Achievement and Equity Target Level Decision Table.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Achievement Below Target | Achievement Meets Target | Achievement Exceeds Target |
| Equity Below Target |  |  |  |
| Equity Meets Target |  |  |  |
| Equity Exceeds Target |  |  |  |

Note. Each cell will be designated as not meet, meets or exceeds.

Table 11 presents the second decision table that will be used to establish whether the school did not meet, met or exceeded targets on the readiness sub-indicators.

Table 11. Overall Readiness Decision Table.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Grad Rate Below Target | Grad Rate Meets Target | Grad Rate Exceeds Target |
| Additional Readiness Below Target |  |  |  |
| Additional Readiness Meets Target |  |  |  |
| Additional Readiness Exceeds Target |  |  |  |

Note. Each cell will be designated as not meet, meets or exceeds.

Finally, Table 12 present that decision table for the determining the overall performance level of the schools. Each school's target levels from the achievement and equity decision table and from the readiness decision table will be entered into the school performance level decision table. The PJP will determine which of the four school performance levels will be applied to each cell in this decision table.

Table 12. School Performance Level Decision Table.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Achievement & Equity Not Meet | Achievement & Equity Meets | Achievement & Equity Exceeds |
| Readiness Not Meets |  |  |  |
| Readiness Meets |  |  |  |
| Readiness Exceeds |  |  |  |

Note. Each cell will be designated as *not meeting expectations, partially meeting expectations, meeting expectations* and *exceeding expectations.*

Schools that meet the minimum *n* on at least two of the three high school indicators (i.e., achievement, equity or readiness) will receive a performance level based upon the available indicators. Schools that meet the minimum *n* indicator on zero or one indicator only will be considered small schools and will undergo a small school review.

**GRADE 3-8 SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT**

A decision table will be used to identify the performance level for each school serving students in grades 3-8. The decision table has a cell that represents all possible combinations of target levels on the indicators. Each school’s pattern of indicator target levels will be represented by a cell in the decision table. Each cell in the table is associated with a specific performance level. The performance level associated with each cell in the decision tables were established during the September 2013 standard setting meeting by the PJP[[12]](#footnote-12). The median of PJP member judgments for each cell on a second round of making judgments were used to identify the performance level associated with each cell. The decision tables are presented below.

Table 13. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels for Schools with Grades Three through Eight that have Three Indicators.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Achievement Below | Achievement Meeting | Achievement Exceeding |
| Equity Below | Growth Below | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Growth Meeting | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Growth Exceeding | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Equity Meeting | Growth Below | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Growth Meeting | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Growth Exceeding | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Equity Exceeding | Growth Below | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Growth Meeting | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Growth Exceeding | 3 | 3 | 4 |

Note. “1” = Not Meeting Expectations, “2” = Partially Meeting Expectations, “3” = Meeting Expectations, and “4” = Exceeding Expectations.

There will be some schools that have only two indicators. For example, many schools will not have a consolidated subgroup that meets the minimum *n* requirement. These schools will not have an equity indicator. When schools have only two indicators the decision tables below will be used for determining the school performance level.

Table 14. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels when a School with Grades Three through Eight has Only Two Indicators.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Achievement Below | Achievement Meeting | Achievement Exceeding |
| Growth Below | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Growth Meeting | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Growth Exceeding | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Note. “1” = Not Meeting Expectations, “2” = Partially Meeting Expectations, “3” = Meeting Expectations, and “4” = Exceeding Expectations

**STUDENTS INCLUDED IN STATE ACCOUNTABILITY**

Students included in state accountability at a particular school are those who districts have reported with an active primary enrollment on the accountability date for a particular test under consideration (e.g., PAWS, ACT). Primary enrollment means a student was reported by the district (on the WDE684) as “no” in both the home school and concurrent enrollment fields. When a student is reported as “yes” in either of these fields it means the student is primarily home schooled or primarily enrolled at another school. Students can only have one “primary” enrollment.

**PARTICIPATION RATE**

Rules for minimum participation rate are important to assure that test results used as accountability indicators are representative of the performance of students receiving instruction at a school. Nonparticipation in testing is unlikely to be randomly distributed among students attending a school. Nonparticipation is more likely to be systematic. When a sample of non participants in testing at a school is systematic (e.g., when the students who are nonparticipants are those likely to have low test scores), selection bias occurs and the validity associated with using those scores in school performance computations is called into question (Marion & Domaleski, 2012). The accountability conclusions about school performance will not match actual school performance.

Participation rate is computed for (a) all enrolled students and (b) all enrolled students in the current year consolidated subgroup. As a group these are students with high needs and it is important that they not be systematically excluded from testing. In the case of small schools where look backs to previous years are used to increase the school's *n* count, participation rate will be based upon current year students only.

All schools are expected to meet the minimum annual participation rate of 95 percent for both student groups. When a school fails to meet the minimum participation rate on all tests involved in computing school performance levels the school will be assigned to the school performance level that is one level below the computed performance level.

Any school that fails to meet an annual participation rate of at least 90 percent on any test that is used in the assignment of Wyoming school performance levels will be declared “unscoreable”. Schools that are unscoreable will be assigned the school performance level of not meeting expectations.

**Exemptions**

In rare instances, districts may petition the Wyoming Department of Education for an exemption from testing for students with the most significant cognitive disability who are assessed on the alternate assessment when they move into the school from another school district after the beginning of the alternate assessment window. Students moving between schools within a district are not eligible for an exemption. Eligibility for an exemption should not be based on the disability category, the amount of time for which the students receives service, the location or delivery of service or the level of functioning of the student.

The Wyoming Department of Education will consider the amount of time left in the testing window to prepare for and administer the assessment. There must be evidence that the amount of time left in the testing window is not adequate to allow for a valid administration. The Wyoming Department of Education may consider evidence about the individual student’s response time when demonstrating academic knowledge if such evidence is provided. For approved exemptions the performance of the student is not considered in participation rate computations or in school performance level computations.

**Testing Status**

* Testing status values (by subject):
  + X = Exempt: The student has an approved exemption from this subject (or a pending exemption where ELL is the exemption type), as discussed in the “Exemption Type” section below.
  + T = Tested: The student has been reported by ETS to have taken the test free of any conditions expected to invalidate the test. That is, a valid scale score and proficiency level will be reported later this summer for this student and subject.
  + N = Not Tested: The student does not have a valid test result. In most cases, this will simply mean the student was not tested. One particular case, discussed in the “Grade Enrolled (WDE684 collection) vs. Grade Tested (ETS)” section below, is that where a student has been tested in a different grade than reported as enrolled.

**Exemption Types**

* **Exemption Type**
  + If you have requested an exemption from testing for a student and the exemption has been approved, the exemption type will be reported (e.g. ELL, Medical, etc.).
  + ELL exemptions require ACCESS testing of the student.
  + ELL exemptions only apply to the reading portion of the assessment.

**Grade Tested**

* **Grade Enrolled (WDE684 collection) vs. Grade Tested (Test Contractor)**
  + Grade Enrolled, Grade Tested, and a comparison field will be reported.
  + Where a student has tested, but was reported as enrolled in a different grade than tested, the comparison field will indicate a grade mismatch AND the testing status value will be N (Not Tested).
    - If the district determines that the student was tested at the proper grade level and that the reported WDE684 grade was incorrect the district may correct this discrepancy during the WDE684 vetting period

**ONE PERCENT ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT CAP**

Wyoming is imposing a 1% district-level cap on the percent of enrolled students in tested grades whose proficient and advanced scores on an alternate assessment count in school accountability calculations. This cap does not serve to limit the percent of students who participate in an alternate assessment or the percent of students who can earn a score of proficient/advanced; rather, the cap is placed on the proficient/advanced scores that “count” in calculating the school performance levels under WAEA.

For example, in a district with 500 students enrolled in tested grades, staff could test, say, 10 students with significant cognitive disabilities using the ALT, assuming the test is appropriate for the students. If 7 of the 10 earned scores of proficient and advanced, the 1% rule dictates that only the scores of 5 ALT-takers (5/500 = 1%) can be used in calculating AYP on the reading and math indicators. The remaining two scores are randomly reassigned as "basic" only for purposes of calculating WAEA school performance levels, and they are displayed in the field called ACCOUNTABILITY\_PERFORMANCE\_LEVEL in the confidential student level data file available to districts on Fusion.

It's important to note that the actual scores the students earn, regardless of the 1% cap, are printed on the Individual Score Report and returned to the district in their Fusion assessment files (and should be uploaded to district Student Information Systems). Students are not in any way penalized with the cap.

Districts that exceed the 1% cap can request an exemption by submitting the WDE 659 form and appropriate documentation. When a district submits evidence that the students were assigned the ALT per an IEP team decision based on participation in alternate curricula, then an exemption from the cap is granted. Evidence is required for all ALT participants in the district, not just for the number of students who bumped the percent over the cap.

This year, since the test scores will be delivered to districts in the early fall because of PAWS standard-setting, the WDE 659 will not be due until mid-September.

**TRANSCRIPT COLLECTIONS**

Two transcript collections are used for the high school readiness sub-indicators. One sub-indicator requiring transcripts is *ninth grade credits* and the other is *Hathaway scholarship eligibility*. It is expected that transcripts will be available for all students on the Wyoming Department of Education developed roster of students to be included on these indicators.

* Students included on the WDE developed rosters will be:
  + Transcripts for Grade 9 Credits – Full academic year students at the designated school who were continuously enrolled from October 1st through the end of the school year. This will include any student with an exit date within 10 days of the final day of the school year.
  + Transcripts for Hathaway Eligibility Level – This will include all students who were counted as graduates for the year in question when computing graduation rates. This includes all students who graduated between September 15th one year and September 14th the following year.

The absence of transcripts for included students can alter a school’s score on an indicator. For example, a pattern of systematic exclusion of transcripts at some schools but not at others would raise the issue of fairness, particularly if some exclusion were systematic for students that would have a negative impact on a particular school’s score. For this reason, the following transcript inclusion rule will be applied to both transcript collections.

* For the grade nine credit indicator, students for whom a transcript is missing will be considered to have not earned 1/4th of the credits required for high school graduation in grade nine.
* For the Hathaway eligibility indicator, students for whom a transcript is missing will be considered to not have been eligible for any level of Hathaway eligibility award.

Both of these sub-indicators are lagged, meaning that data from the prior year are applied to the current year’s indicator. This is done to permit the summer progress that students make to be counted. For example, the school performance level for the 2013-14 school year will use grade nine credits and Hathaway eligibility from the 2012-13 school year.

**FULL ACADEMIC YEAR**

Student mobility varies across schools. Students sometimes move into a school just prior to testing. When computing school performance levels, it is reasonable to include only students who were present at the school for a full academic year (Marion & Domaleski, 2012). “Full academic year” will be defined for Wyoming accountability as being enrolled in the same school on October 1 and on the day that is the midpoint of the testing window for each test used in the computation of school performance levels. Students who were not at the school for the full academic year will be excluded from school performance level computations.

For the grade nine credit sub-indicator, full academic year status is defined as being continuously enrolled from October 1st of the given school year until ten days from the last day of the school year in the school they are attending.

Most small (< 10 day) gaps in enrollments reported out of student information systems have been identified as being due to reporting requirements and system related administrative reasons. Thus, in automated processes, these small breaks do not constitute an immediate break-in-enrollment unless an enrollment record exists in a different school during the short break. Identification of students as mobile or full academic year also has significant funding implications, which were addressed with WDE Finance and the School Finance Data Advisory Committee in the development of status determination processes. As such, there may be cases where challenge of an automated status determination will make sense. Challenges will be evaluated individually based on enrollment details to be provided as a part of the challenge.

Home schooled and concurrent enrollment students are not included in accountability calculations.

**MINIMUM *n* FOR ACCOUNTABILITY**

Beginning with the 2013-14 school year, the minimum *n* will be 10 students for all indicators. A look back will occur independently for each indicator at a school that does not meet the minimum *n.* For high schools it will not be possible to look back on the equity indicator in 2013-14. On the high school achievement indicator and tested readiness sub-indicator it will only be possible to look back one year in 2013-14. The minimum *n* look back procedure is to first look back one year and see if the minimum *n* is reached. If the minimum *n* is not reached with a one year look back, the look back will go back a second year. If the minimum *n* is still not reached for more than one indicator, the school will undergo the *small school review* process.

Any student tested in reading, math, or reading and math will be counted to determine the schools *n.* No student will be counted more than once.

**SMALL SCHOOL DEFINITION AND PROCEDURES**

A school will be considered a small school when the school does not have at least ten students on at least two of the WAEA indicators. To put it another way, in order for a school to be assigned a school performance level without using small school procedures, the school must meet the minimum *n* of ten students on at least two indicators. Procedures for a small school review are included as Appendix C.

**SCHOOLS WITH ONE OR NO TESTED GRADES**

There are schools in Wyoming with grade three as their only tested grade. When schools have grade three as their only tested grade, they have an achievement indicator, but they do not have data for the growth indicator or the equity indicator. For the purpose of accountability these schools are “paired” with the school their students feed into after grade three that includes a grade four. This ensures school performance levels are based upon more than just one indicator. The grade three achievement scores from these schools are combined with the achievement scores from their paired school when determining school performance levels. In other words, the combined school is treated as a single school for accountability.

In Wyoming there are schools with grade configurations that do not include any tested grade.

For example, several LEAs have organized their elementary schools so that students attend grade K-2 in one building and then move to a different building for grades 3-5. In this case, the school performance level for the 3-5 school is used to hold the K-2 school accountable as well. The rationale for this is that the teachers in the two different schools need to be communicating across buildings to plan their curricular and instructional sequences for the successful transition of students between schools. Holding both schools equally accountable for the 3-5 school results should help foster this communication.

Table 15 is a list of Wyoming schools that do not contain any of the currently assessed grades and the school with which they are paired for accountability purposes. This table will be updated each year.

Table 15. Accountability School Pairings for Schools without Tested Grades.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School ID | School Name | Grades Served | Accountability Related School | Grades Served | School ID |
| 0501002 | Douglas Primary School | K-2 | Douglas Intermediate School | 3-5 | 0501010 |
| 0701007 | North Elementary & | K-1 | Baldwin Creek Elementary | 4-5 | 0701009 |
| 0701008 | Gannett Peak Elementary | 2-3 |
| 0706001 | Crowheart Elementary | K-3 | Wind River Elementary | K-5 | 0706002 |
| 0725001 | Ashgrove Elementary School | K-2 | Rendezvous Elementary | 3-5 | 0725007 |
| 0725005 | Aspen Park Elementary School | K-2 |
| 0725003 | Jackson Elementary School | K-2 |
| 0801007 | Lincoln Elementary | K-2 | Trail Elementary | 3-5 | 0801006 |
| 1001006 | Meadowlark Elementary | K-3 | Clear Creek Elementary | 4-5 | 1001002 |
| 1101021 | Lebhart Elementary | K-2 | Fairview Elementary | 3-6 | 1101013 |
| 1101010 | Deming Elementary | K-3 | Miller Elementary | 4-6 | 1101022 |
| 1202001 | Afton Elementary | K-3 | Osmond Elementary | 4-6 | 1202005 |
| 1202003 | Thayne Elementary | K-3 | Etna Elementary | 4-6 | 1202004 |
| 1601003 | Libbey Elementary | K-2 | West Elementary | 3-5 | 1601005 |
| 2001010 | Jackson Elementary | K-2 | Colter Elementary | 3-5 | 2001009 |
| 2104001 | Mountain View Elementary | K-2 | Fort Bridger Elementary | 3-5 | 2104002 |
| 2301003 | Newcastle Elementary | K-2 | Gertrude Burns Intermediate | 3-5 | 2301001 |

APPENDIX A

COMPUTING “AGP” – Technical Documentation

* From SGP Package in R
  + Obtain “Lagged” Projections
    - Projections are the SGPs needed to remain within or get to a particular performance level on a future test
    - Lagged indicates that projections were based upon the prior year’s test
      * As such the YEAR\_1 projection is a projection of the SGP needed this year to assure a particular performance level
      * YEAR\_2 projection is a projection of the SGP needed to assure a particular performance level in the year after the current year and so on
  + A student’s prior year performance level is not considered in the computation of the lagged projections
  + There are 3 levels of projections
    - LEVEL\_1 projections give the SGP needed to remain/become Basic
    - LEVEL\_2 projections give the SGP needed to remain/become Proficient
    - LEVEL\_3 projections five the SGP needed to remain/become Advanced
* SGP\_TARGETS were obtained from SGP Package. (The SGP target for a given year is the SGP needed in the current year to become/remain proficient in the current year or a given future year)
  + Lagged projections from SGP Package
    - LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1
      * SGP needed in the current year to become/remain proficient
    - LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2
      * SGP needed in the next year to become/remain proficient
    - LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_3
      * SGP needed in 2 years to become/remain proficient
    - LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_4
      * SGP needed in 3 years to become/remain proficient
  + Lagged projections from SGP Package were used to compute SGP\_TARGETS for the CURRENT\_YEAR, YEAR\_1, YEAR\_2 and YEAR\_3

Work below here is completed in the Wyoming Department of Education Oracle data base.

* CUKU\_TARGETS (Catch Up Keep Up) take into consideration the proficiency status of the student on the prior year’s test were as lagged projection do not take this into consideration
  + CUKU\_TARGET\_CURRRENT\_YEAR
    - This equals the LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1 for all students
  + CUKU\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1
    - For below proficient students is the *lowest* of:
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2
    - For proficient and above students is the *highest* of:
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2
  + CUKU\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2
    - For below proficient students is the lowest of:
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_3
    - For proficient and above students is the highest of:
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_3
  + CUKU\_TARGET\_YEAR\_3
    - For below proficient students is the lowest of:
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_3
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_4
    - For proficient and above students is the highest of:
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_3
      * LEVEL\_2\_SGP\_TARGET\_YEAR\_4
* AGP (Adequate Growth Percentile) by grade
  + Is the CUKU\_TARGET\_CURRENT\_YEAR for grade 8 students
  + Is the CUKU\_TARGET\_YEAR\_1 for grade 7 students
  + Is the CUKU\_TARGET\_YEAR\_2 for grade 6 students
  + Is the CUKU\_TARGET\_YEAR\_3 for grade 4 & grade 5 students
* MET\_AGP
  + True if SGP – AGP ≥ 0
  + False if SGP – AGP < 0

APPENDIX B

*Performance Level Descriptors Coming out of the 2013 Pilot Professional Judgment Panel*

***For Schools Serving Grades 3 through 8:***

***Exceeding Expectations:***This category is reserved for schools considered models of performance. These schools demonstrated high achievement and exceeded target on at least one other performance indicator – equity or growth – while meeting target on the other indicator.

***Meeting Expectations:*** Schools in this category demonstrated performance that met or exceeded target on multiple performance indicators. These schools typically had acceptable or better levels of achievement, student growth, and/or in promoting equity for students with below-proficient achievement.

***Partially Meeting Expectations:*** Schools in this category performed below target on multiple performance indicators *or* were below target in achievement while failing to exceed target in the other indicator(s). Many schools in this category showed acceptable performance in promoting equity based on growth for students with below-proficient achievement *and/or* met target for student growth from year to year.

***Not Meeting Expectations:*** Schools in this category had unacceptable performance on all indicators. For schools in this category, improvement is an urgent priority. These schools have low levels of achievement, demonstrate below-target growth, and fall short of producing academic improvement for below-proficient students that will move them toward proficiency.

***For Schools that Award Diplomas:***

***Exceeding Expectations:***This category is reserved for schools considered models of performance. These schools demonstrated high achievement and exceeded target on at least one other performance indicator – equity or readiness – while meeting target on the other indicator.

***Meeting Expectations:*** Schools in this category demonstrated performance that met or exceeded target on multiple performance indicators. These schools typically had acceptable or better levels of achievement, student readiness, and/or in promoting equity for students with below-proficient achievement.

***Partially Meeting Expectations:*** Schools in this category demonstrated either unacceptable levels of achievement *or* were below target on improving the achievement of below-proficient students *and* on graduation rate and tested readiness. Many schools in this category showed acceptable performance in promoting equity based on growth for low achieving students *and/or* met target for student readiness.

***Not Meeting Expectations:*** Schools in this category had unacceptable performance on all indicators. For schools in this category, improvement is an urgent priority. These schools have low levels of achievement, fall short of targets on graduation and tested readiness, and have large achievement gaps that show little or no improvement.

APPENDIX C

WYOMING SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY

SMALL SCHOOL REVIEW PROCESS

(Draft – 12/09/13)

SMALL SCHOOL DEFINITION

Wyoming has many very small schools. At times there are schools in Wyoming that have just one student. For the purpose of this small school review process a school will be considered a small school when the school is unable to meet the minimum *n* requirement on more than one indicator. If a school is able to meet the minimum *n* indicator on two or three indicators by implementing look back procedures, the school will not be considered a small school. Look back procedures involve aggregating data for multiple years as a way to increase the *n* count at a school.

Beginning with the 2013-14 minimum *n* look back will occur independently for each indicator at a school that does not meet the minimum *n.* The minimum *n* will be 10 students for all indicators. For high schools it will not be possible to look back on the equity indicator in 2013-14. On the high school achievement indicator and tested readiness sub-indicator it will only be possible to look back one year in 2013-14. The minimum *n* look back procedure is to first look back one year and see if the minimum *n* is reached. If the minimum *n* is not reached with a one year looked back, the look back will go back a second year. If the minimum *n* is still not reached, the school will undergo the *small school review* process.

In addition, some schools with no indicators or just one indicator can logically be paired with a school to which their students eventually attend. The example here is a school serving students in grades kindergarten through grade two. This school would not have any indicators for accountability. Nearly all students from this school may, however, feed into another school that serves grades three through five. In this example the kindergarten through grade two school is paired with the grades three through five school and both schools share the performance level established based upon the three through five school indicator performance. It’s conceivable that a kindergarten through grade two school might feed students into many schools, however. In this case the school would be appropriate for a small school review. Details about which schools are paired for school accountability can be found in the *Implementation Handbook* for the *Wyoming School Performance Rating Model.*

PURPOSE OF SMALL SCHOOL REVIEWS

By definition, small schools lack standardized and stable data to inform a comparable school performance level determination. Therefore, the objective of a small school review is to review any applicable information and evidence that the school can produce to inform judgments about the extent of support and improvement the school may require.

OPERATIONAL DETAILS

* An accountability review team at the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) will complete the review. WDE has had a review team in place for several years to review federal school accountability decisions. This same team will complete the small school reviews.
* Upon completing the review, the review team will forward recommendations to the State Board of Education.
* Timeline for submission and review will be as follows:
  + Schools will be notified by October 1st if the school is deemed a “small school.”
  + By November 1st, schools must submit a school improvement plan via the ASSIST platform.
  + The WDE review team will read the school improvement plan.
    - If no additional information is required, the WDE review team will determine the outcome of the review and notify the school.
    - If additional information pertaining to the accountability indicators is needed, the WDE will make a request to the school by November 15th.
      * The school shall submit additional information pertaining to indicators by December 1st.
      * The WDE review team will review additional evidence provided by the school, determine the outcome of the review, and notify the school of the outcome by December 15th.

EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL

School improvement plans are presently due on November 1st each year. The department of education has access to these school improvement plans. These plans will be reviewed as part of the small school review. The attached school improvement plan review rubric will be used for reviewing the school improvement plans. This rubric provides guidance to the schools about the criteria that will be used in judging the improvement plans.

Schools serving students in grades three through eight may submit additional evidence relevant to the following indicators (e.g., evidence from Measures of Academic Progress [MAP]):

* Achievement
* Growth
* Equity
* Other relevant evidence

Schools serving students in high school grades may submit additional evidence relevant to the following indicators (e.g., evidence from ACT testing outside of the grade 11 census administration):

* Achievement
* Readiness (College and Career)
* Equity
* Other relevant evidence

The Department team conducting the review may consider the achievement evidence for small numbers of students or individual student if requested to do so by the school. Any public report prepared by the Department review team must not reveal any personally identifiable student performance information.

OUTCOMES OF A REVIEW

* Approved – The process is complete once a school gets this outcome
* Approved with Recommendations – The process is complete once a school gets this outcome
* Revise and Resubmit – additional support to the school may be required or made available when a school gets this outcome

In order for a school to be granted “approved” status it should receive a minimum rating of acceptable on all reviewed elements.

1. Marion, S. & Domaleski, C. (2012). *The Wyoming Comprehensive Accountability Framework: Phase I.* Produced for the Wyoming Select Committee on Statewide Education Accountability. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Weighting for different tested content areas will be a function of the number of students taking a test in each content area. This weighting reflects the policy maker decisions about which grade-by-content areas to test. For example, when federal and state policy makers required testing in reading and math in seven grades but they required testing in science in just three grades they suggested the weights reflected in this rating model. As a result, more students take reading and math tests than science test and reading and math will carry more weight on the achievement indicator than science. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The standard setting for student performance levels that will occur prior to computing school performance ratings may change the percentage of student proficient in each content area for each grade band. If this change is sufficient it may be possible to have just one grade band for achievement in grade 3 through 8 schools. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Wyoming ACT Scale is intended for use in school accountability only and IS NOT INTENDED for use in student level reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Flicek (2013). Wyoming school accountability: Proposed 2013-14 high school equity indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This is accomplished by producing a norm-referenced score. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See Betebenner, D. W. (2008). *Norm- and criterion-referenced student growth.* Available at http://www.nciea.org. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Some private school and home school students take the PAWS test. If these students are not enrolled in a public school at the time of the testing, their score will not be included in the norm sample. If they enroll in a public school the following year and take the PAWS test, their previous PAWS test scores will be used to compute growth. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Correlation coefficients for prior achievement with SGPs at the student level in Wyoming were all very near *r* = 0.00. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. In analyzeSGP protocol the specifications indicate that 2011-12 SGPs will be computed from the 2011-12 dataset. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. A potential negative unintended consequence could be associated with this particular business rule. Specifically, a district may choose to retain students in grade nine in a junior high if they do not have all credits needed to be considered “on-track” for high school completion. An additional unintended consequence would be a practice of becoming more lenient about awarding credits in grade nine. A choice by the professional judgment panel to place less weight on this readiness indicator compared to the other readiness indicators could mitigate the likelihood of the potentially negative changes in practice. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Some adjustments to the performance levels associated with the cells in the decision tables may be made by the PJP in 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)