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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 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 3, 5 and 7
* The ACT subject area tests of:
	+ 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 established 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.** The high school achievement indicator has been changed due to problems documented in Flicek (2013)[[4]](#footnote-4). Specifically, wide fluctuations in the percentage of students scoring at various scaled score point on the ACT were documented over three years. The fluctuation could not reasonably be explained by changes in school effectiveness. When the percentage of students varies across years from score point to score point in the manner they did, the establishment of a cut-point on the test for proficient performance becomes problematic. As such, the high school achievement indicator score will *not* be the percent of students who are proficient and above. Instead, the high school achievement indicator score will be based upon the scaled scores that students earn on the ACT subject area tests. The student scaled scores will be converted into standardized scores using procedures described below. The net effect will be that high schools with higher average scaled scores on the ACT subject area tests will have higher scores on the achievement indicator and high schools with lower average scaled scores on the ACT subject area tests will have lower scores on the achievement indicator.

The high school achievement scores will be computed as follows:

STEP 1. STUDENT SUBJECT AREA STANDARDIZED SCORES ARE COMPUTED

* The Wyoming, statewide mean scaled score and standard deviation for each ACT subject area test used for accountability was computed for a baseline year[[5]](#footnote-5) (i.e., 2012-13).
* The baseline year means and standard deviations from the 2012-13 school year were:
	+ Math
		- Baseline year mean = 19.6
		- Baseline year standard deviation = 4.5
	+ Reading
		- Baseline year mean = 20.1
		- Baseline year standard deviation = 6.0
	+ Science
		- Baseline year mean = 19.8
		- Baseline year standard deviation = 4.9
	+ English/Writing
		- Baseline year mean = 16.7
		- Baseline year standard deviation = 5.1
* For computing student standardized scores the baseline year mean and standard deviation will be rounded to one decimal place.
* A standardized score for each relevant ACT subject area test for each tested student will be computed by subtracting the statewide baseline year mean scaled score (i.e., *b*) from the student’s accountability year scaled score (i.e., *a*) and dividing the result by the statewide baseline standard deviation (i.e., *c*).

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

* The computation of a math standardized score for a student with an subject area math test scaled score of 21 is illustrated here:
	+ (21 – 19.6) = 1.4
	+ 1.4/4.5 = 0.31
	+ “This student scored 31% of a standard deviation above the baseline mean score”
	+ These scores will be negative when the student score is below the state baseline mean score.

STEP 2. THE OVERALL SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT SCORE IS COMPUTED

* The school achievement score for accountability will be the mean student standardized score for all four of the subject areas combined.
* The mean of standardized scores will then be multiplied by 100 to arrive at the school’s achievement score. These school scores express the “percent of a standard deviation” that the school’s mean score is above or below the baseline year statewide mean score. These percentage scores are rounded to the nearest whole number and the rounded score is the school’s score.
* These scores may be negative or positive and may be more than 100% of a standard deviation. For example, a score of +100 indicates the school’s achievement score was 100% of a standard deviation (i.e., 1 standard deviation) above the baseline year mean score.

STEP 3. SETTING TARGET SCORES

* Target scores for creating three categories of achievement will be set by the professional judgment panel during September 2014. The target scores will be used to place each school into one of three categories. The three categories are “*exceeding targets”, “meeting targets”,* and *“not meeting targets”.*

Students with significant cognitive disabilities who take the alternate assessment will be included the high school achievement indicator. The alternate assessment provides performance level scores for reading, math, science and writing. Students’ scores on the alternate assessments indicate if they are below basic, basic, proficient or advanced proficient on the extended standards for the particular content area. In order to include student performance for students who take the alternate assessment, the student performance levels will be converted to student standardized scores as follows:

* Below Basic Alternate Assessment Score = Student Standardized Score of -0.50
* Basic Alternate Assessment Score = Student Standardized Score of -0.20
* Proficient Alternate Assessment Score = Student Standardized Score of +0.20
* Advanced Proficient Alternate Assessment Score = Student Standardized Score of +0.50.

**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[[6]](#footnote-6) (SGPs) that indicate how an individual student’s growth compared with that of all Wyoming public school students[[7]](#footnote-7) 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[[8]](#footnote-8). 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[[9]](#footnote-9).

**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.

**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.

A *growth to standard* approach will be used for the measurement of equity at schools with grades 4 through 8. Specifically, adequate growth percentiles (AGPs[[10]](#footnote-10)) will be computed for all students (see Appendix A for specific information about the computation of AGPs). For students in the consolidated subgroup, an AGP represents the minimum SGP that the student needs for the current year in order to be considered *on track* to reach proficiency within three years or by the end of grade eight. The equity indicator, therefore, will be the percent of students in the consolidated subgroup who obtain SGP scores that are at or above their AGP score. The PJP will determine the percentages of students meeting this criterion that resulted in schools being considered as exceeding targets, meeting targets or not meeting targets.

No students in the consolidated subgroup will be proficient in both reading and math. Many students in the consolidated subgroup, however, will already be proficient in either reading or math. For students proficient in one or the other of the content areas, the AGP represents the SGP that predicts they will remain proficient for three years or until the end of grade eight. For these students having an AGP that equals or exceeds their SGP indicates that they are on track to remain proficient for three years or until the end of grade 8, whichever comes first.

**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 equity score at high schools will be the consolidated subgroup *mean* student *standardized score* for the ACT subject area tests for reading and mathematics combined.

The high school equity score will be computed as follows.

Step 1. State average scaled scores and standard deviations were computed for the ACT subject area tests for mathematics and reading for a baseline year (i.e., the baseline year was 2013). A baseline year is used because comparison against a current year state average would result in a moving target that schools could only know after the fact. This comparison against a baseline year provides a stable target that is known in advance.

Step 2. For each student in the consolidated subgroup, a *standardized* score will be computed that describes the extent that the student’s scaled score differs from the baseline year state mean scale score expressed as a standard deviation unit (i.e., based upon the baseline year standard deviation). Student standardized scores will be computed for both reading and math for all consolidated subgroup students. An illustration of computing a student standardized score for one student in one content area is illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3. Illustration of Student Standardized Score Computation for ACT Math Subject Area Test.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade 11 ACT Mathematics |  |  |
| Student A Current Scaled Score | Baseline Year State Mean Scaled Score | Baseline Year State Standard Deviation | Student Standardized Score Computation | Student StandardizedScore |
| 17 | 19.6 | 4.5 | (17 – 19.6) 4.5 | - .58 |

The student standardized score in Table 3 indicates the student performed 58% of a standard deviation below the baseline year state average.

Step 3. The mean student standardizedscore for both content areas (i.e., reading and math) combined for all students in the consolidated subgroup will be identified.

The mean standardized score for the consolidated subgroup at the school will be multiplied by 100 and rounded to the nearest whole number and this will be the high schools’ *equity score*. If a school’s mean score standardized student score was -.25, for example, the school’s equity score would be -25. The consolidated subgroup at this school would have an equity score that was 25% of a standard deviation below the baseline year state mean scaled score for all students.

**Relationship of the Grade 3-8 and High School Equity Scores.** Two equity scores were computed for all grade 4-8 schools using PAWS reading and math scores. One equity score was the grade 4-8 equity score which is the percent of students in the consolidated subgroup with SGPs that equal or exceed their AGPs. The other equity score was a *school equity score* computed using the high school equity score methodology. There was a strong positive relationship (*r* = .80) among school equity scores based upon *high school equity score* versus the *percent meeting AGP* scores. The magnitude of this relationship provides evidence for convergent validity for different methods measuring the same construct. Furthermore, both school equity scores were moderately related to the school measures for both school growth and school achievement. This further provides evidence of discriminant validity that the two equity scores are measuring something different than achievement or growth. As such the equity indicators are highly related to one another and just moderately related to the measures of different constructs. These findings support the use of the proposed high school equity indicator[[11]](#footnote-11).

**READINESS**

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.

* 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)
* A graduation index
* Grade nine credits earned
* Graduates’ eligibility level for the Hathaway Scholarship

These sub-indicator scores will be combined into one overall readiness indicator score. The weights and index values in this document were first suggested by the advisory committee to Wyoming legislature’s select committee on school accountability during July, 2013. They will be finalized by the PJP during September 2014. The recommended weights were 20% for tested readiness, 25% for the graduation index, 10% for grade nine credits earned and 45% for Hathaway Scholarship eligibility level.

Some schools will meet the minimum *n* requirement for one or more readiness sub-indicators but not all sub-indicators. When this happens, a score 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 readiness scores by assuring that the same proportion of schools are exceeding, meeting and not meeting targets on the partial readiness score that fell within these categories for the total readiness score when the PJP established cut-points were applied.

**ACT Suite of Readiness Tests.** Tested readiness will remain unchanged from the 2013 pilot. 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. An index developed 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 Wyoming accountability. The ACT composite cut point for the highest level of Hathaway Scholarship eligibility became the highest cut point for Wyoming accountability. Finally, an ACT composite cut point for a middle level of Hathaway Scholarship eligibility became the middle cut point for Wyoming accountability. Table 4 presents the Wyoming ACT readiness score ranges and associated 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.

Next, 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 percentage of students scoring at each level on each test in 2013 was 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. A school received one overall 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.

Tested readiness for students who take the alternate assessment will be based upon the number of subject area tests on which they were proficient or better. Specifically, a school will be assigned 100 index points for each student who earns a proficient or better score on all four subject area tests on the alternate assessment. A school will be assigned 80 index points for all students who earn a proficient or better score on three of the four subject area tests on the alternate assessment. A school will be assigned 50 index points for all students who are proficient on one or two of the four subject area tests on the alternate assessment. A school will be assigned 20 points for all students who are proficient on none of the four subject area tests on the alternate assessment.

**Graduation Index.** Table 6 illustrates the graduation index. The index point values in Table 6 were assigned by the PJP. The index points are assigned to the school for each student who meets the student result criteria in Table 6. The school’s graduation index score will be the mean of student index points. This indicator is lagged one year so that schools can be awarded points for students who graduated during the summer.

Table 6. Graduation Index.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Graduation Index Levels | Student Result | Points |
| Level 3 | Diploma Earned | 100 |
| Level 2 | Returning Student\*\* | 50 |
| Level 1 | Noncompleters | 0 |

\*Continued enrollment after the student’s grade nine cohort had been in school for four years.

Specific definitions of the criteria in Table 6 follow.

*Diploma Earned*. This criterion was met when a students’ record shows they graduated from a high school between September 15th of the lagged school year and September 14th of the following school year. Diploma earned points are always awarded to the school from which student earns the diploma.

*Returning Student.* The purpose of this category is to encourage schools to keep those students who do not graduate with their on-time cohort engaged in school so that graduation remains an option. Returning students status applies to students who first entered grade nine more than four years ago but remain enrolled in a school on October 1st of a following school year. Students earning the school points as a returning student are those who did not graduate with their four year on-time cohort but who remained in a school. Returning student points always apply to the school from which the student's four year on time cohort graduated, even if their return is to another school. When a school is awarded points for a student’s returning student status one year, and that student does not go on to graduate and is not enrolled in any school on October 1st of the following year, that student will be included as a noncompleters in that year. The noncompleter score will be assigned to the school from which the student's four year on time cohort graduated.

*Noncompleters.* When computing the school index score, schools will be assigned zero points for noncompleters and they will be included in the computation of the mean student index score for the school. Students will count as noncompleters when they were the grade nine drop-outs three years ago, the grade ten drop-outs two years ago, the grade eleven drop-outs one year ago and the current year grade 12 drop-outs. Once a student has been designated as a noncompleter, the student is not eligible to earn "returning student" points for any school. When a student has been considered a noncompleter in a given year, but then goes on to earn a diploma in a following year, the school that awarded the diploma will receive the diploma earned points.

**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)[[12]](#footnote-12). Table 7 presents the list of high schools without a grade nine and their designated paired schools.

Table 7. 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 8. Changes have been made in the transcript collection process that will permit the use of all three Hathaway eligibility comments in future years.

Table 8. 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 9.

Table 9. Hathaway Success Curriculum Requirements for 2014 Graduates and Beyond.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Hathaway Scholarship Level | Provisional Opportunity | Opportunity  | Performance | Honors |
| Math | 3 years of Hathaway Success Curriculumapproved math; Must include two of the three,Algebra I, Algebra II and/or Geometry | 4 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved mathMust 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 sequencedor 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 10. The school’s score will be the mean of student points for the graduating class at the school.

Table 10. 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 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.

**SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT**

A decision table will be used to identify the performance level for each school. 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[[13]](#footnote-13). 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 11. 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

Table 12. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels for High Schools that have Three Indicators.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Achievement Below | Achievement Meeting | Achievement Exceeding |
| Equity Below | Readiness Below | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Readiness Meeting | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Readiness Exceeding | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Equity Meeting | Readiness Below | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Readiness Meeting | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Readiness Exceeding | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Equity Exceeding | Readiness Below | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Readiness Meeting | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Readiness Exceeding | 2 | 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 13. 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

Table 14. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels when a High School has Only Two Indicators.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Achievement Below | Achievement Meeting | Achievement Exceeding |
| Readiness Below | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Readiness Meeting | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Readiness 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. 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 14 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. Flicek, M. (December 11, 2013). *Wyoming school accountability: The 2014 high school achievement indicator.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The use of a baseline year instead of the current year provides a stable target across years. Using the current year’s mean and standard deviation would make this indicator a zero-sum indicator. For every school that showed improvement another school would show decline. The use of a baseline year makes it possible for all schools to improve relative to the baseline year. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See Betebenner, D. W. (2008). *Norm- and criterion-referenced student growth.* Available at http://www.nciea.org. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)
8. Correlation coefficients for prior achievement with SGPs at the student level in Wyoming were all very near *r* = 0.00. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In analyzeSGP protocol the specifications indicate that 2011-12 SGPs will be computed from the 2011-12 dataset. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. For additional information related to AGP properties, utility and validity see:

Flicek, M. (2013). *Technical details of the grade 3-8 equity indicator.* (available at: <http://edu.wyoming.gov/Programs/accountability>).

Bonk, W. J. (Undated). *Using norm- and criterion-referenced growth calculations to ensure that all students are held to high academic standards.* (available from: www.schoolview.org). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. This study is posted on <http://edu.wyoming.gov/Programs/accountability>. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. 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-12)
13. Some adjustments to the performance levels associated with the cells in the decision tables may be made by the PJP in 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)