

**WYOMING SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY**  
**2018 WYOMING SCHOOL PERFORMANCE RATING MODELS**  
**IMPLEMENTATION HANDBOOK**

October 15, 2018

---

---

**Work in Progress**

There are many changes to school accountability for 2017-18. Whenever significant changes are made to the accountability system, there is considerable stakeholder involvement in the development of the school accountability models. The Wyoming legislature, the State Board of Education (SBE), and the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) each play a role. There is an *Advisory Committee to the Joint Interim Education Committee (AC)* of the Wyoming legislature that works with the WDE to make recommendations to the legislature on the *Wyoming Accountability in Education Act (WAEA)* and the *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* school accountability provisions. There is a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) that provides recommendations for alternative school accountability under WAEA. There is also a *Professional Judgment Panel (PJP)* assisting with standard setting for WAEA school accountability.

The work of these groups is ongoing, and the final models for 2017-18 school accountability will not be available until the PJP completes its work in fall 2018. This draft describes the models as they have been developed as of the date of this draft. Updates will be provided as new developments occur.

---

---

### **Every Students Succeeds Act**

The 2017-18 school year marks the first year that the school accountability provisions of the federal *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* will be implemented in Wyoming. A primary purpose of ESSA school accountability is to identify schools that need *comprehensive support and improvement (CSI)*. Title I schools that receive federal money under this act are eligible for CSI based upon their performance on all ESSA-prescribed school accountability indicators. In addition, any high school in Wyoming failing to graduate one-third or more of their four-year, on-time graduation cohort is identified for CSI. An additional purpose of ESSA is to identify schools with low-performing subgroups for *targeted support and improvement (TSI)*. Schools with particularly low subgroup performance are identified for *additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI)*. Schools that are not identified for CSI, TSI, or ATSI, are *unclassified*. Under ESSA school accountability, alternative schools are treated the same as traditional schools.

### **Wyoming Accountability in Education Act**

**For Traditional Schools.** The Wyoming School Accountability system was piloted following the 2012-13 school year. Operational implementation began following the 2013-14 school year.

The *Wyoming Accountability in Education Act* (WAEA) established a requirement to develop procedures for assigning all Wyoming public schools to one of four performance levels: *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 are prescribed by statute. The methodology for evaluating each school's performance on the indicators was established in accordance with the January 2012, *Education Accountability Report*<sup>1</sup>. This handbook describes the operational implementation of WAEA School Accountability for traditional schools based upon their performance during the 2017-18 school year.

**For Alternative Schools.** WAEA stipulates that alternative schools in Wyoming are rated upon a model that is specific to these schools. A primary purpose of the alternative school model is to meaningfully differentiate among alternative schools based upon their performance using indicators that are better aligned with their unique mission. A technical advisory group (TAG) continues to offer recommendations on the development and implementation of the alternative school model. An objective of the pilot is to identify different performance levels for the schools based upon their performance during the 2017-18 school year. With respect to the classifications required by ESSA, alternative schools are treated the same as all other schools.

**New Assessment and Indicators.** The 2017-18 school year was the first year of implementation of a new state academic achievement assessment, the Wyoming Test of Proficiency and Progress (WY-TOPP), in math and English language arts (ELA) in grades 3 through 10. Writing is included on the ELA test in grades 3, 5, 7, and 9. Science is measured in grades 4, 8, and 10. The previous state assessments are no longer administered to measure academic achievement.

## SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

### WAEA Traditional Schools

- Indicators for all schools:
  - Achievement
  - Growth
  - Equity
  - English learner progress learning English
- Additional indicators for high schools
  - Wyoming extended graduation rate
  - Post-secondary readiness
  - Grade nine credits

### WAEA Alternative Schools

- Academic Performance
  - Achievement
  - Growth

---

<sup>1</sup> Marion, S. & Domaleski, C. (2012). *The Wyoming Comprehensive Accountability Framework: Phase I*. Produced for the Wyoming Select Committee on Statewide Education Accountability.

- Student Support
  - School Climate
  - Engagement
- Additional indicators for alternative high schools
  - High school credential rate (Wyoming extended graduation rate plus four-year, on-time cohort non-completers passing a high school equivalency test)
  - Post-Secondary Preparation
    - Credit earning
    - College and career readiness

### ESSA All Schools

- Indicators for all schools:
  - Achievement
  - Growth
  - English learner progress learning English
- Additional indicator for grade 3 through 8 schools
  - Equity
- Additional indicators for high schools
  - Four-year, on-time cohort graduation rate
  - Post-secondary readiness

Some indicators are defined differently for each of the three school accountability models. These differences will be addressed as implementation details are provided below.

### Categories for Indicator Performance

**WAEA categories** for both traditional school and alternative school indicators are called “Target Levels” and there are three target levels for each indicator: *exceeds target*, *meets target*, and *below target*. Cut scores for the target levels are established by State Board of Education based upon the recommendations of the PJP. A standard-setting process was used by the PJP to arrive at their recommended cut scores.

**ESSA categories** for the indicator performance of all schools are called “average indicator categories.” For ESSA, there are average indicator categories for the school overall and, unlike WAEA, indicator categories are also identified for each of the required subgroups. There are three average indicator categories: *above average*, *average*, and *below average*. The 2017-18 school year will serve as a baseline year and cut scores established during the baseline year will be used in future years as well, provided that there are at least 20 schools that meet the minimum *n* for the particular subgroup and indicator.

When this baseline year has fewer than 20 schools that meet the minimum *n* for a subgroup and indicator combination, further analyses will be performed using combined data from the 2017-18 and the 2018-19 school years to establish the cut scores that will be used for that subgroup and indicator combination going forward. Because indicator scores for ESSA were rounded to one decimal place, it was possible to establish cut scores in a manner that resulted in about one-third

of the schools being placed into each of the three categories in this baseline year. The method involved finding the 33<sup>rd</sup> and 67<sup>th</sup> quantile scores for the distribution of schools for each subgroup by indicator. These quantile scores became the cut scores for the average and above average categories. Appendix A presents a table of these cut scores.

## ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### ACHIEVEMENT

**WAEA Traditional School Model.** There is one overall *achievement score* for each school that represents student performance on the state assessment in all tested grades and content areas.

- Wyoming Test of Proficiency and Progress (WY-TOPP)
  - Math in grades 3 through 10
  - ELA in grades 3 through 10
    - Including writing in grades 3, 5, 7, and 9.
  - Science in grades 4, 8, and 10

The WAEA achievement indicator score for schools is the percent of students who have proficient or above test scores in math, ELA, and science on the WY-TOPP, rounded to a *whole number*, for all full academic year (FAY) students. For the achievement indicator, students who were continuously enrolled in the school from the first school day in October through the midpoint of the testing window are FAY students.

An illustration of how school achievement scores are computed is presented in Table 1. Assume the hypothetical school represented in Table 1 was an elementary school with grades kindergarten through five with 20 students per grade level. Science was only tested in grade 4 at this school.

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

Content	Count of Tested Students	Count of Proficient Students	School Achievement Score
Math	60	39	
ELA	60	43	
Science	20	12	
Column Totals	140	94	94/140 = 67%

The school achievement score (i.e., the total percent proficient on all achievement tests) is used for assigning schools to one of three target levels (i.e., *below target*, *meets target*, & *exceeds target*) for achievement using the cut scores established by a *professional judgement panel* (PJP).

Cut scores for **traditional** school grade three through eight achievement:

- Meets Target = 51
- Exceeds Target = 68

Cut scores for traditional high school achievement:

- Meets Target = 48
- Exceeds Target = 60

**WAEA Alternative School Model.** An achievement index will be used for alternative schools. Each student’s performance level score (i.e., basic, below basic, proficient, and advanced) will be converted into the index represented in Table 2.

Table 2. The WAEA Alternative School Achievement Index.

Student Performance Level	Student Index Score
Below Basic	0
Basic	50
Proficient	100
Advanced	150

The school’s score will be the mean student index score for math, English language arts, and science for all students identified as full academic year students. Cut scores were established by the professional judgment panel.

Cut scores for **alternative** school achievement index:

- Meets Target = 30
- Exceeds Target = 50

**ESSA Model.** The achievement indicator score for the ESSA model is the percent of proficient test scores in math and ELA on the WY-TOPP at a school rounded to *one decimal place*. The same FAY rule is applied to the ESSA model. Science scores are not included in the ESSA achievement indicator.

The school’s achievement score is assigned to one of three categories (i.e., *below average, average, above average*). Cut scores for the indicator categories are based upon statewide performance during a baseline school year. The baseline school year is 2017-18. Schools in the bottom third of the distribution are placed into the below average category, schools in the middle third of the distribution are placed in the average category and schools in the top third of the distribution are placed in the above average category.

Overall school cut scores for grades three through ten achievement (cut scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A):

- Average Category = 47.7
- Above Average Category = 58.6

**Achievement Lookbacks.** Lookbacks were used for the achievement indicator when a school did not meet the minimum *n* of 10. Since the WY-TOPP was used for the first time in 2017-18, equipercentile linking was used to identify cut scores for performance levels on the 2016-17 tests that were that were comparable to the WY-TOPP cut scores in terms of impact (i.e., the proportion of students at each performance level). The cut scores that were identified for the 2016-17 tests were also applied to the test from 2015-16 when lookbacks required two prior

years in order to meet the minimum  $n$  of 10. For grades 3 through 8, the prior year test used for this purpose was the PAWS math and reading tests. For grades 9 and 10, the prior year test used for this purpose were the subject area tests for math, reading, and science on the Aspire test. The WY-TOPP has a test for English language arts (ELA) on which reading is a prominent part. Neither the PAWS test nor the Aspire test have an ELA test. The PAWS has a reading test and for grades 3-8, the equipercentile linking used for lookbacks was from the WY-TOPP ELA score to the PAWS reading score. The Aspire has a Reading subject area test and an English subject area test but there is no combined ELA test score. For consistency between grades 3-8 and grades 9 and 10, the equipercentile linking in grades 9 and 10 was from the WY-TOPP ELA test to the Aspire subject area reading test.

For science, the grade 8 WY-TOPP test was comprised of the legacy PAWS items and scale, and the performance level cut scores from the prior year were used on the current year WY-TOPP science test. In grade 10, equipercentile linking was used to identify cut scores on the prior year Aspire science test that were comparable to the current year WY-TOPP science test. For the ESSA model and the WAEA traditional school model the equipercentile links were established for the proficient cut score only. For the high school alternative school model, equipercentile links were established for basic, proficient, and advanced so that the alternative school achievement index could be computed for lookbacks. Table 3 presents the cut scores identified for the prior year tests that were comparable to the current year performance level cut scores.

Table 3. Scale Score Cut Scores for Student Performance Levels on the 2017-18 Achievement Tests that were Comparable to the 2017-18 WT-TOPP Test.

Grade	Prior Year Test	Performance Level Cut Score		
		Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Math				
3	PAWS		603	
4	PAWS		646	
5	PAWS		662	
6	PAWS		675	
7	PAWS		694	
8	PAWS		706	
9	Aspire	421	427	436
10	Aspire	423	430	437
Reading/ELA				
3	PAWS		603	
4	PAWS		622	
5	PAWS		626	
6	PAWS		632	
7	PAWS		649	
8	PAWS		652	
9	Aspire	421	424	433
10	Aspire	419	424	432
Science				
3	Aspire	422	430	438

## GROWTH

**Student Growth.** Growth is measured in schools serving grades 4 through 11. Growth refers to a change in the achievement for 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 math and reading on the Wyoming state test for students in grades four through ten.

The model implemented to measure growth produces student growth percentiles<sup>2</sup> (SGPs). SGPs indicate how an individual student's growth compared with that of all Wyoming public school students<sup>3</sup> from that particular year in the same grade who had similar math or reading scores in previous years. Students in the same grade with a similar test score history may be referred to as a student's "academic peers." SGPs range from 1 to 99 with lower scores indicating lower growth and higher scores indicating higher growth relative to the academic peers. An SGP of 50 would indicate the student scored as well as or better than 50 percent of their academic peers (i.e., average). Given the level of precision of growth scores for individual students, it makes sense to think of a student's growth as *low*, *typical*, or *high*. A student with a SGP below 35 could be thought of as having low growth, a student with SGPs of 65 or higher could be thought of as having high growth, and students with an SGP between 35 and 65 could be thought of as having typical growth. This measure of growth is independent of the prior achievement level performance of students<sup>4</sup>. 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 or low students scored in past years, they may still earn any SGP from 1 to 99 depending upon how the changes in their test scores compare to that of their academic peers. Because SGPs are used for the measurement of growth, it is possible to measure growth from the prior year's state test in grades 4 through 9 (i.e., PAWS or the ACT Aspire test) to new WY-TOPP test in the current year.

For ESSA accountability and WAEA traditional school and alternative school accountability, the WY-TOPP will be used to measure growth during grades 4 through 10. Growth will also be measured during grade 11 for WAEA traditional school and alternative school accountability. In grade 11, growth will be measured in mathematics and English language arts from the WY-TOPP subtests to the mathematics subject area test and the combined English language arts test on the ACT.

**Students Included in the Growth Modeling Data Set.** Only Wyoming public school students are included in the SGP norm cohort for a given year. The data set included the current year public school students that have a current year reading or math scale score on the state test and a score from the prior school year. All consecutive prior test scores are included.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Betebenner, D. W. (2008). *Norm- and criterion-referenced student growth*. Available at <http://www.nciea.org>.

<sup>3</sup> Some private school and home school students take the state 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.

<sup>4</sup> Correlation coefficients for prior achievement with SGPs at the student level in Wyoming were all very near  $r = 0.00$ .

**School Growth Score.** The school growth score is the mean SGP at a school (i.e., the school's MGP). To compute the MGP for the school, all reading and math SGPs for full academic year students at the school are averaged. The school scores were rounded to a whole number. When a school does not meet the minimum  $n$  of 10 on the growth indicator, lookbacks are used. For high schools, lookbacks only occurred in grades 10 and 11, since no growth scores were computed for grade 9 prior to the 2017-18 school year.

**WAEA.** The MGPs at each school are rounded to the nearest whole number and are placed into one of three target levels: (a) below target, (b) meets target, and (c) exceeds target. The PJP established the following cut-points for the MGPs in September 2013 that separated these three categories from one another. The cut scores established for 2018 for traditional schools and alternative schools are:

Cut scores for grades four through eight growth:

- Meets Target = 48
- Exceeding Target = 60

Cut scores for grades nine through eleven growth for traditional schools:

- Meets Target = 49
- Exceeding Target = 60

Cut scores for growth for alternative schools:

- Meets Target = 40
- Exceeding Target = 50

**ESSA.** Growth is measured in grades four through ten for ESSA. The school's growth MGP is rounded to one decimal point and are used to assign schools to one of three categories (i.e., *below average*, *average*, *above average*). Cut scores for the indicator categories are based upon statewide performance during a baseline school year. The baseline school year is 2017-18. Schools in the bottom third of the distribution are placed into the *below average* category, schools in the middle third of the distribution are placed in the *average* category, and schools in the top third of the distribution are placed in the *above average* category.

Overall school cut scores for grades four through tenth growth (cut scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A):

- Average Category = 47.1
- Above Average Category = 54.5

## **EQUITY**

**WAEA Traditional Schools.** An important goal of WAEA is to “minimize achievement gaps” [Wyoming Statute 21-2-204(b)(vi)]. This goal is addressed by the equity indicator. The equity indicator is designed to encourage schools to do as well as possible with the students who are most at risk. Students with low performance in either math or reading or both math and reading on the prior year state test are assigned to a consolidated subgroup. For 2018, low performance is defined as having scale scores in the bottom 25% of students during 2016-17 on the achievement



measures in use during 2016-17. With the WY-TOPP being implemented in 2017-18, the cut-points for consolidated subgroup membership for 2018-19 and beyond is based upon the WY-TOPP baseline year scale scores that are at the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile rank for each grade and content area from the baseline year (i.e., 2017-18).

Students are identified for the consolidated subgroup membership for only the subject areas where they met the score cut-point criterion. As such, some are in the consolidated subgroup for mathematics, some are in the consolidated subgroup for reading, and some are in the consolidated subgroup for both mathematics and reading.

The cut-points that are used for the 2018 consolidated subgroup determination are based upon the performance of Wyoming students on the 2016-17 state test (PAWS in grades 3 through 8 and ASPIRE in grade 9). The cut-points used for this purpose are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. 2016-17 State Test Cut-Points Used for 2018 Consolidated Subgroup Identification.

	Content Areas	
	Reading	Math
PAWS Grade 3	563	566
PAWS Grade 4	591	608
PAWS Grade 5	601	628
PAWS Grade 6	605	645
PAWS Grade 7	616	662
PAWS Grade 8	623	677
ASPIRE Grade 9	416	419

The equity indicator was changed in 2017-18 in order to align the WAEA indicator for grades three through eight with the required provisions of ESSA. The change involved using a weighted MGP that includes SGPs of all students attending a school. The MGP for the consolidated subgroup is weighted at 80% and the MGP for all students not in the consolidated subgroup is weighted at 20%.

*The WAEA alternative school accountability model does not have an equity indicator due to the subgroup of students traditionally served by alternative schools served in Wyoming.*

**WAEA School Equity Score.** A school’s equity score is based upon SGPs of students in grades 4 through 10. Step 1 involves computing separate MGPs for (a) the consolidated subgroup and (b) all students not in the consolidated subgroup. The MGP for the consolidated subgroup is then multiplied by 0.80 and the MGP for the students not in the consolidated subgroup is multiplied by 0.20. These weighted MGPs are then summed to produce the school score. For example, if the consolidated subgroup had a MGP of 41 and the MGP for the students not in the consolidated subgroup was 53, the equity score would be  $(41 * .8) + (53 * .2) = 43.4$ , which is rounded to a whole number for WAEA to 43 and which is rounded to one decimal place for ESSA to 43.4.

For WAEA, the school equity scores at each school are rounded to the nearest whole number and are placed into one of three target levels: (a) below target, (b) meets target, and (c) exceeds

target. The PJP established the following cut-points for the MGPs that separated these three categories from one another.

WAEA Cut scores for equity for grades four through eight:

- Meets Target = 48
- Exceeds Target = 60

WAEA Cut scores for equity for grades nine and ten:

- Meets Target = 49
- Exceeds Target = 60

**ESSA.** For ESSA school accountability, the equity indicator is used for grades four through eight and is not used for grades nine and ten. The school equity scores are rounded to one decimal place and used to assign each school to one of three categories (i.e., *below average*, *average*, *above average*). Cut scores for the indicator categories are based upon statewide performance during a baseline school year. The baseline school year is 2017-18. Schools in the bottom third of the distribution are placed into the *below average* category, schools in the middle third of the distribution are placed in the *average* category, and schools in the top third of the distribution are placed in the *above average* category.

Overall school cut scores for grades four through eight equity (cut scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A):

- Average Category = 47.5
- Above Average Category = 56.2

## **ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (ELP)**

**ESSA and WAEA Traditional Schools.** The ELP indicator measures whether or not English learners are making expected progress toward becoming English proficient within a time frame suggested by research to be reasonable. Research suggests that learning English should take about 6 years for a student who enters an English-speaking school with little or no English contingent on factors such as previous educational experience and first language. Having little or no English is operationally defined as having a performance level score between 1.0 and 1.9 on the ACCESS 2.0 test during the first year that they enter the English speaking school. The ACCESS 2.0 is an English language proficiency assessment (ELPA) focused upon academic language. Higher performance level scores on the ACCESS 2.0 reflect higher English proficiency scores. Therefore, the number of years within which an English learner was expected to become English proficient is related to the performance level score the EL student earned on the ACCESS 2.0 during the first year that they entered the English speaking school.

Given the number of years within which an EL student is expected to become English proficient, Table 5 indicates the method used to determine if a student is making acceptable progress learning English. Table 5 also shows the formula used to determine if an EL student is making expected progress acquiring English proficiency. One feature of the formula is that the annual progress target is reset each year based upon the student's most recent ACCESS 2.0 score. The ELPA indicator includes students in kindergarten through grade 12.

Table 5. Expected Annual Progress for English Learners Acquiring English Proficiency.

Baseline Year Performance Level	Growth Targets				
	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
4.6 or higher*					
4.0 – 4.5	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/2)+b$	End Year (4.6 or higher)			
3.0 – 3.9	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/3)+b$	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/2)+b$	End Year (4.6 or higher)		
2.0 – 2.9	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/4)+b$	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/3)+b$	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/2)+b$	End Year (4.6 or higher)	
1.0 – 1.9	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/5)+b$	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/4)+b$	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/3)+b$	$((a^\dagger - b^\ddagger)/2)+b$	End Year (4.6 or higher)

Note. Column 1 scores and the score in the “End year” cells are performance level scores and the scores in the formulas are scale scores.

\*Composite performance level score of 4.6 is exit criteria for EL services.

†The scale score needed during the “End Year” to be deemed English Proficient (i.e., to earn a performance level score of 4.6) is represented by “a”.

‡The prior year scale score is represented by “b”.

Example of Student ELP Progress Achieving English Language Proficiency Based Upon Table 5.

- Student A enters district in Grade 1
  - Initial ACCESS score is 284 (this is associated with performance level score of 3.2 for grade 1 students)
  - Utilizing the Student Interim Progress table above, the student needs to be proficient by Year 4 (i.e., grade 4)
    - 370 is the scale score associated with a performance level score of 4.6 in grade 4
    - The Year 2 (i.e., grade 2) ELPA *progress goal* for this student will be:
      - $((370-284)/3)+284$
      - $((86)/3)+284$
      - $29+284 = 313$
  - Student A actually earns a scale score of 315 in year 2 (i.e., grade 2)
    - Student A **met** their progress goal in year 2
    - Student A’s progress goal in year 3 (i.e., grade 3) will be:
      - $((370-315)/2)+315$
      - $((55/2)+315$
      - $28+315 = 343$
  - Student A actually earns a scale score of 338 in year 3

- Student A did **not meet** their progress goal in year 3
- Student A’s progress goal in Year 4 (i.e., grade 4) is 370, the scale score associated with a performance level score of 4.6 for students in grade 4
- In Year 4, if Student A earns a scale score of 370 or higher the student enters Year 1 of English Learner **Monitoring** in Year 5
- In Year 4, if Student A earns a scale score of less than 370, the student’s progress goal for Year 5 becomes 377, the scale score associated with a performance level score of 4.6 for students in Grade 5 (i.e., the student’s grade in year 5).

The school score is the percentage of English learners at the school that made expected progress learning English.

**WAEA.** For WAEA, the school ELP scores at each school are rounded to the nearest whole number and are placed into one of three target levels: (a) below target, (b) meets target, and (c) exceeds target. The PJP established the following cut-points for these scores that separated these three categories from one another.

WAEA cut scores for ELPA for grades kindergarten through eight:

- Meets Target = 49
- Exceeds Target = 65

WAEA cut scores for ELPA for grades nine through 12:

- Meets Target = 41
- Exceeds Target = 55

**ESSA.** For ESSA school accountability, the school ELP scores are rounded to one decimal place and used to assign each school to one of three categories (i.e., *below average*, *average*, *above average*). Cut scores for the indicator categories are based upon statewide performance during a baseline school year. The baseline school year is 2017-18. Schools in the bottom third of the distribution are placed into the *below average* category, schools in the middle third of the distribution are placed in the *average* category, and schools in the top third of the distribution are placed in the *above average* category.

Overall school cut scores for grades kindergarten through 12 (cut scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A):

- Average Category cut score for ELPA = 46.1
- Above Average Category cut score for ELPA = 62.5

## **ADDITIONAL INDICATORS FOR HIGH SCHOOLS**

### **HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION (CERTIFICATION)**

**WAEA Traditional Schools.** The cohort for the Wyoming extended graduation rate begins with the prior school year’s four-year, on-time graduation cohort with all 5-, 6-, and 7-year graduates from that same year added into that cohort. The school score is the Wyoming extended graduation rate which is the percentage of graduates in that cohort. The numerator is all 4-, 5-, 6-

, and 7-year graduates. The denominator is all 4-, 5-, 6-, and 7-year graduates plus all non-completers.

For WAEA, the school Wyoming extended graduation rates at each school are rounded to the nearest whole number and are placed into one of three target levels: (a) below target, (b) meets target and (c) exceeds target. The PJP established the following cut-points for these scores that separated these three categories from one another.

WAEA cut scores for extended graduation:

- Meets Target = 85
- Exceeds Target = 93

**WAEA Alternative Schools.** The cohort for the high school credential rate is the same cohort used for the WAEA traditional school model. The high school credential rate has a different numerator than the Wyoming extended graduation rate. The numerator for the high school credential rate is all 4-, 5-, 6-, and 7-year graduates plus all four-year, on-time non-completers who are reported to have passed a recognized graduate equivalency test by the Wyoming Community College Commission by February of the school year following the year that their cohort graduated<sup>5</sup>. The denominator is all 4-, 5-, 6-, and 7-year graduates plus all non-completers who passed the graduate equivalency exam and all non-completers who did not either take or pass the graduate equivalency exam.

The high school credential rates at each school are rounded to the nearest whole number and are placed into one of three target levels: (a) below target, (b) meets target and (c) exceeds target. The PJP established the following cut-points for these scores that separated these three categories from one another.

WAEA cut scores for graduate certification (Diploma or graduate equivalency):

- Meets Target = 67
- Exceeds Target = 83

**ESSA.** The four-year, on-time cohort graduation rate is the school score for the ESSA graduation indicator. The four-year, on-time graduation rate is rounded to one decimal place and used to assign each school to one of three categories (i.e., *below average*, *average*, *above average*). Cut scores for the indicator categories are based upon statewide performance during a baseline school year. The baseline school year is 2016-17. Schools in the bottom third of the distribution are placed into the *below average* category, schools in the middle third of the distribution are placed in the *average* category, and schools in the top third of the distribution are placed in the *above average* category.

Overall cut score for four-year, on-time cohort graduation (cut scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A):

- Average Category = 82.3
- Above Average Category = 90.3

---

<sup>5</sup> The Community College Commission provides the graduate equivalency file to the Wyoming Department of Education in February each year.

## POST-SECONDARY READINESS

**WAEA for Traditional Schools & ESSA for All Schools.** School year 2017-18 marks the first time school accountability scores include a post-secondary readiness indicator. When new indicators are introduced, data quality can be an issue. Some aspects of the post-secondary readiness indicator will need to be improved going forward.

As with the graduation indicator, the post-secondary readiness indicator is lagged. The cohort of students for whom this indicator is computed is all graduates from the school in the prior school year. This includes 3-, 4-, 5-, 6-, and 7-year graduates. Lookbacks are used for some schools in order for the schools to meet the minimum *n* of 10. A school's score on this indicator is the percentage of prior year graduates who are college, career, or military<sup>6</sup> ready. College, career, and military readiness are defined as follows:

- Option 1\* – Evidence of college readiness is based on completion of a college preparatory curriculum and one or more of the following: a college-ready score on a standardized college entrance exam or eligibility to earn college credits through Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or dual/concurrent courses.
- Option 2\*\* – Evidence of career readiness is based on completion of a career/technical education pathway (i.e., minimum of a three course sequence and one or more of the following: a passing score on a state-approved CTE exam or state-approved industry-recognized certification.
- Option 3\*\*\* – Evidence of military readiness is based upon completion of a college preparatory curriculum or a CTE pathway and a military-readiness score on the ASVAB.

\*For the 2017-18 school year, the *college preparatory curriculum* is equivalent to the [Opportunity success curriculum](#) for the Hathaway Scholarship Program and includes four years of math, four years of science, four years of English, three years of social studies, PLUS two years of foreign language or two years of fine/performing arts or two years of career/technical education. Success curriculum evidence will come from the WDE 950 transcript collection which has a field for the success curriculum level. Schools have been instructed to use this field to indicate the success curriculum level that their review of the student's transcript suggests is appropriate<sup>7</sup>. The curriculum level for accountability is based upon the success curriculum level that the school reports on each graduate's transcript.

---

<sup>6</sup> Wyoming has been unable to obtain ASVAB test scores from the military. Since the post-secondary readiness indicator is a lagged indicator, Wyoming does not have ASVAB scores for 2016-17 graduates who are included in the 2017-18 school accountability determinations. The Department is planning to have districts submit evidence of ASVAB scores for the 2017-18 graduating cohort.

<sup>7</sup> A student's Hathaway scholarship level is based upon a student's (a) success curriculum level, (b) composite ACT score, and (c) unweighted grade point average (GPA). The curriculum level field to be included on the transcript is designed to report a student's success curriculum level, and is not designed to collect information about the ACT or the GPA performance of a student.

In order to improve the reliability of the college preparatory curriculum evidence for future accountability determinations, the Department is working with the districts to improve the course identification on both the course information collection (i.e., WDE 638) and the student transcript collection (i.e., WDE 950). This work is intended to support the use of course-level transcript data to document whether graduates have completed a college-preparatory curriculum in future years.

Secondly, the requirement for *a college-ready score on standardized college entrance exam* is defined as an ACT composite score of 19 or higher. There are three sources of ACT composite scores that are considered. First, the grade 11 census ACT scores are considered. Second, the WDE 950 transcript collection includes a field for schools to report each graduate's best ACT score. Finally, ACT provides a file with ACT scores to the Department once each year. The highest ACT composite score from each of these three sources is the score used for the college-readiness component for school accountability.

Finally, eligibility to earn *college credits* through an Advanced Placement (AP) course is defined as obtaining a score of 3 or higher on an AP exam or a score of 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate (IB) exam. The scores for all Wyoming students are provided by the AP and IB testing contractors directly to the Department. Lastly, evidence of college readiness from a dual/concurrent course requires the evidence from the WDE 950 transcript collection that a graduate earned a grade of "C" or better in a 1000-level or higher dual/concurrent course.

\*\*The *career ready* option includes course-taking evidence (i.e., CTE pathway concentrator and CTE pathway completer), state-approved CTE exam results, and evidence of industry certification. Career-readiness evidence is available from the WDE 950 graduate transcript collection, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (hereafter referred to as Perkins), NOCTE (i.e., a CTE test provider), and other industry-testing organizations.

Nearly all Wyoming school districts participate in the Perkins grant and participate in CTE reporting requirements<sup>8</sup>. Students in Perkins districts may enroll in one or more CTE pathway. Pathways vary from three CTE courses within a pathway to more than three courses within the pathway. Students are reported by districts in the Perkins collection to be *career concentrators* when they have passed two courses within a pathway. Students are reported to be *career completers* in the Perkins collection when they have completed all courses within a pathway. Furthermore, Wyoming participates in NOCTE testing and industry testing for specific CTE pathways.

Not all CTE career concentrators become completers and not all completers pass the associated test for the CTE pathway. The CTE collection includes evidence of industry certification. In some cases this evidence is provided directly from the industry. In others, industry certification is reported by the districts without any verification by the Department.

---

<sup>8</sup>A few districts do not participate in the Perkins grant and reporting, so there are no career-ready students identified. These districts serve less than 3% of Wyoming graduates in the 2017-18 post-secondary readiness cohort and can work with Department CTE staff to get CTE pathways approved and to secure permission to take the state-approved CTE exams in order to establish evidence of career readiness for their high school graduates.

When it comes to CTE concentrator and CTE completer status within particular CTE pathways, an alternative source of evidence to the Perkins collection comes from the WDE 638 course collection, which includes CTE pathway designations, along with the WDE 950 transcript collection, with course information that can be associated with the WDE 638 course information to document concentrator and completer status. The Department will work with districts on improving the quality of these collections going forward.

The *WAEA traditional school model* and the *ESSA model for all schools* follows here. For 2017-18, evidence from both the Perkins collection and the transcript collection will be used in designating students as career ready. In order to be considered career ready, the student must have passed a state-approved CTE exam with evidence provided by NOCTE or an industry exam or have an industry-recognized certificate (i.e. with evidence from an industry or reported by the school to the Department) – and – the student must have passed three courses in the same pathway as the passed exam or certification – or – the student must have been reported as a completer in the same pathway as the passed exam in the Perkins collection. In many cases, there are discrepancies between the WDE 950 transcript collection and the Perkins collection related to CTE course completion evidence. The 2017-18 career ready designation will give schools the benefit of the doubt by accepting evidence of CTE course completer status from either of the sources<sup>9</sup>.

\*\*\*The *military readiness* option requires ASVAB scores. The Department has been unable to obtain a data files from the military that contains ASVAB scores for Wyoming students. As such, the Department does not have ASVAB scores for students who graduated during the 2016-17 school year. Because evidence of military readiness cannot be established for the 2016-17 cohort of graduates, **no** students were designated as military ready in 2017-18. For the 2017-18 cohort of graduates, the Department is making plans to collect this evidence for future school years.

WAEA post-secondary readiness cut scores:

- Meeting target cut score = 67
- Exceeding target cut score = 80

ESSA overall school post-secondary readiness cuts cores (cut scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A):

- Average category cut score = 41.8
- Exceeding category cut score = 65.4

**WAEA Alternative Schools.** The college- and career-readiness index is an outcome of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) work during the 2017 and the 2018 legislative interims<sup>10</sup>. The final 2018 TAG recommendations are presented in Table 6.

---

<sup>9</sup> In 2018-19 the department plans to use the 950 transcript collection for course completion evidence. Districts will be asked to improve the 938 and 950 collections for this purpose.

<sup>10</sup> Wyoming Alternative School Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Report. (9/5/2017). *Revisions to the Alternative Schools Accountability Framework: Recommendations from the Wyoming Technical Advisory Group for the Alternative School Model*



“Table 6. College and Career Readiness (CCR) Index Example

<b>Level 1 – 1 point</b>	<b>Level 2 – 2 points</b>	<b>Level 3 – 3 points</b>
Complete Hathaway provisional curriculum	Complete Hathaway opportunity curriculum	Complete Hathaway honors/performance curriculum
ACT 17-18	ACT 19-20	ACT 21 +
Pathway concentrator	Pathway completion (if this can be determined)	Attaining a qualifying score on a CTE pathway exam or earning an industry credential
Work Keys –NCRC Bronze (9-11) At least a Level 3 on each exam.	Work Keys –NCRC Silver (12-14). At least a Level 4 on each exam)	Work Keys –NCRC Gold (15 or up) at least a Level 5 on each exam
Starting 2018-19: Credit earned for internship or work study (verified by transcript)	ASVAB Military Readiness Score that qualifies for all four branches of service OR earn 1-3 non-remedial college course credits via dual enrollment or AP/IB	Earn 4 or more non-remedial college course credit (through dual enrollment or AP/IB exam)

Under this illustrative model a student’s CCR index score would be the points associated with the highest observed outcome level for that student. For example a CTE pathway concentrator (Level 1) who completed the Hathaway opportunity curriculum (Level 2) and earned a total score of 11 across levels on the Work Keys (Level 1) would receive a score of 2, because completion of the opportunity curriculum represented the highest leveled outcome for this student. The points associated with each level for the 2017-18 pilot implementation will be 10 points for Level 1, 20 points for Level 2 and 30 points for Level 3. An alternative school’s CCR index would be the average index across all graduates’ CCR scores rounded to a whole number.”

For the 2017-18 school year, the following rules will be applied for the alternative school college- and career-readiness indicator. There will be five sources of evidence: (1) Hathaway success curriculum level from the WDE 950 transcript collection, (2) best ACT score from the sources described above for traditional schools, (3) CTE course completer evidence and assessment evidence described above for traditional schools (and CTE course concentrator evidence) plus, (4) performance from the optional grade 11 ACT WorkKeys (provided by WDE), and (5) meeting the AP, IB, or dual/concurrent evidence requirement for college readiness described above in the traditional school model. There is no evidence of ASVAB performance available for the 2017-18 accountability determinations. As described above, the level of college- or career-readiness to which a student is assigned for accountability will be the highest level from all rows in Table 6 from the TAG report as reproduced above.

CCR Target Level Cut Scores:

- CCR meets target cut score = 15
- CCR exceeds target cut score = 20

## CREDIT EARNED INDICATOR

**WAEA Traditional School Model.** The *grade nine credit* indicator is a lagged indicator. The school's grade nine credit score is the percent of the prior year's first-time grade nine students who earned one-fourth of the credits required to graduate from the designated high school. Use of prior year grade nine credits permits the inclusion of grade nine credits earned during the summer session. The WDE 949 collection is a transcript collection from the schools for all first-time grade nine students. Grade nine credits are obtained from the student transcripts. This indicator applies to all students in attendance at the school from October 1<sup>st</sup> of the school year until within 10 days of the end of the school year.

Traditional schools grade nine credits earned cut scores:

- Meeting target cut score = 88
- Exceeding target cut score = 95

**WAEA Alternative School Model.** The alternative school credit earned indicator is a lagged indicator. For alternative schools, the credit-earned indicator looks at the credits earned during grades 9, 10, and 11 for all students attending the alternative school. The cohort of students for this indicator is all students who were in their first-year of grade 9, 10, and 11. The school score is the percent of these students who earned one-fourth of the credits required to graduate during that school year. This indicator applies to all students in attendance at the school from October 1<sup>st</sup> of the school year until within 10 days of the end of the school year.

Alternative schools grades nine, ten, and eleven credits earned cut scores:

- Meeting target cut scores = 67
- Exceeding target cut scores = 83

## STUDENT CLIMATE SURVEY FOR ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS.

For the Climate indicator, a 24-item student climate survey<sup>11</sup> is administered each fall and each spring at the alternative schools. The survey has three empirically defined domains.

- The *staff support and respect* domain has 12 items and measures the extent to which students perceive staff as supporting student learning and demonstrating respect for students and other staff members.
- The *student support and respect* domain has 7 items and measures the extent to which students perceive other students as supporting students learning and demonstrating respect for one another.
- The *high expectations* domain has 5 items and measures the extent to which students perceive they are appropriately challenged with meaningful academic work.

All survey items are positively stated and student responses on the survey are *strongly agree* (4), *agree* (3), *disagree* (2), and *strongly disagree* (1). Student scores on each domain are the mean of their responses to the items on the domain rounded to two decimal places. The student *total*

---

<sup>11</sup>The survey items are included in the APPENDIX B.

*score* on the survey is the mean of the domain scores. The school score on the climate survey is the mean *total score* for all surveys completed at the school during both the fall and the spring combined.

The following item is included on the student climate survey: “I provided honest responses on this survey to the best of my ability.” The response options for this item are “yes” and “no”. Survey results for students who responded “no” to this item are not included in the computation of school scores.

**Survey Participation Rate.** The survey participation rate expectation is 85%. A one additional nonparticipant rule will be applied (see the description of this in the *Participation Rate* section below).

**Survey Target Level Determination.** The procedures for establishing a school target level on the survey were determined by the professional judgment panel with guidance from the alternative school TAG. When a school’s participation rate was below 85%, the school was in the *below target* category on this indicator. When a school’s participation rate was at least 85%, the target level cut scores were:

- Meeting target = 2.8
- Exceeding target = 3.3

## **STUDENT SUCCESS PLAN.**

For the Engagement indicator, each alternative school is expected to utilize a *student success plan* for each student during each school each year. Broadly, schools are expected to formally work with students on the extent to which students attend school regularly and participate in a range of activities that promote holistic development of life skills associated with post-secondary success.

The alternative school TAG considered different types of evidence that may be included in a student success plan such as:

- Regular meetings (i.e., at least 2 per year) with a teacher, mentor, or counselor
- A focus on ensuring strong school attendance and goal setting for the future aspirations in school and beyond
- Membership in select school clubs or activities
- Work, volunteer service, internship, and/or leadership experience in a qualifying setting outside of school
- The completion of job or college application
- Participation in a job interview

In order to ensure the intent of the SSP is not jeopardized, the alternative school TAG recommends, and the Department requires, for purposes of accountability, principals to annually sign a document indicating a) compliance with the SSP process and b) the availability of artifacts

demonstrating participation. WDE indicated that the review of SSP artifacts will be included as part of the accreditation process scheduled to occur every five years.

## **STUDENT SUPPORT COMMENDATION.**

The TAG decided to use engagement as a gateway for achieving an overall school performance rating of Exceeds Expectations. In instances when a school does not comply with the SSP requirements, a rating of Exceeds Expectations cannot be met regardless of the school's performance on the other indicators.

## **AGGREGATION RULES FOR OVERALL SCHOOL SCORES**

### **WAEA SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVELS**

Under WAEA, each school is assigned to one of four school performance levels based upon the overall performance of the school on the indicators. Under WAEA, the equity indicator is used to measure the performance of a consolidated subgroup. Beyond the consolidated subgroup, there is no requirement for performance level scores for other subgroups. As a result, there is one school performance level at each school which represents the overall performance of the school on the indicators. In order to receive a school performance level, a school serving grades three through eight must meet the minimum  $n$  on both the achievement and growth indicators and high schools must meet the minimum  $n$  requirement on both the achievement and graduation indicators. Schools that do not meet these minimum  $n$  requirements undergo a small school review. The four performance levels are:

- *Exceeding expectations*
- *Meeting expectations*
- *Partially meeting expectations*
- *Not meeting expectations*

There are three target levels on each WAEA indicator: *exceeding target* = 3, *meeting target* = 2, and *below target* = 1. Cut-points on the school indicator scores for placing schools into target level categories are established using a standard-setting process with a PJP based upon baseline 2017-18 school performance. Once cut-points are established, they remain in effect in future years unless the indicator changes in some significant way or there is evidence that the cut-points are not functioning properly.

**Traditional Schools Weighting.** The overall school performance level is produced using a weighted average of the target level scores rounded to one decimal place. A stakeholder advisory committee determined the weights for the indicators. What follows is an illustration of weighted average target level calculations for schools serving grades 3 through 8. Table 7 presents the weighting scheme to be illustrated.

Table 7. The weighted index for grade 3 through 8 schools.

Indicator Category	Specific Indicator	Weight
Academic Performance		70%
	Achievement	35%
	Growth	35%
Overall Equity		30%
	Equity	25%
	EL Progress	5%

Example 1. Assume a school has an achievement target level of 1, a growth target level of 3, an equity target level of 2 and an EL progress target level of 1. This school's weighted average target level score would =  $(1*.35) + (3*.35) + (2*.25) + (1*.05) = 1.9$ .

Example 2. Assume now that the school did not meet the minimum  $n$  on equity or EL Progress. This school had an achievement target level of 1 and a growth target level of 3. This school's weighted average rounded to one decimal place would =  $(1*(1/.70)*.35) + (3*(1/.70)*.35) = 2.0$ . In this example,  $(1/.70)$  is a multiplier that is the total weight left among the indicators that remain.

Example 3. Assume the school did not meet the minimum  $n$  for EL progress. This school had had an achievement target level of 1, a growth target level of 3, and an equity target level of 2. In this example the weight for achievement would still be .70: .30 for achievement and .40 for growth. Overall equity would still retain a weight of .30. This means equity would have a weight of .30 since there was no EL progress indicator. This school's weighted average target level would =  $(1*.35) + (3*.35) + (2*.30) = 2.0$ .

Table 8 presents the weights for indicators for traditional high schools. In this weighting scheme, the categories of *academic performance*, *readiness*, and *overall equity* will retain their category weights so long as they have one indicator remaining in the category. When indicators are missing, the weights are adjusted using the appropriate multiplier like that illustrated in example 2 above.

Table 8. Weights for Weighted Average Index for Traditional High Schools.

Indicator Category	Specific Indicator	Weight
<b>Academic Performance</b>		<b>40%</b>
	Achievement	20%
	Growth	20%
<b>Readiness</b>		<b>40%</b>
	Extended Graduation	20%
	Postsecondary Readiness	15%
	Grade 9 Credit	5%
<b>Overall Equity</b>		<b>20%</b>
	Equity	15%
	EL Progress	5%

Each school will have a weighted average indicator score rounded to 1 decimal place that ranges from 1.0 to 3.0. This is a 20-point scale and many schools will have identical weighted average indicator scores. The standard-setting activity involving the PJP will identify 3 cut-points on this scale for placing schools into the school performance levels of exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, partially meeting expectations, and not meeting expectations.

School performance level cut scores for traditional grades three through eight schools:

- Partially Meets Expectations = 1.4
- Meets Expectations = 1.8
- Exceeds Expectations = 2.6

School performance level cut scores for traditional high schools:

- Partially Meets Expectations = 1.4
- Meets Expectations = 1.8
- Exceeds Expectations = 2.5

School performance level cut scores for alternative schools:

- Partially Meets Alternative School Expectations = 1.4
- Meets Alternative School Expectations = 1.7
- Exceeds Alternative School Expectations = 2.3

**Alternative School Weights.** The TAG recommended the following weights for the alternative school weighted average target level score.

Indicator	Weight
Achievement	20%
Growth	25%
Graduation Credential Rate	25%
Credit Earning	5%
College Career Readiness	15%
Climate	10%

When one or more indicators are missing, the weight(s) are redistributed proportionately among the remaining indicators at the school.

**Schools Serving High Schools and Grades below High School.** Traditional schools that serve students in high school grades and grades below high school will receive weighted average indicator scores for the high school grades and for the grades below high school. Because indicator weighting is different for high school grades and grades below high school providing two weighted average indicator scores for these schools ensures that indicator weighting is appropriate for the grades being served. These separate weighted average indicator scores are then combined into one overall weighted average indicator score for the school. This overall

weighted average indicator score is further weighted to reflect the count of students tested on the state test in high school grades versus grades below high school.

For alternative schools, when grades served are below high school grades, achievement, growth, and climate will be measured. When the alternative school serving grades below high is not part of a high school, the weighted average indicator target level score will be based upon those three indicators. When the alternative school serving grades below high school is part of a high school, the performance from the grades below high school will be combined with the performance from the high school grades and one overall weighted average indicator target level score will be produced for that school.

## ESSA MEANINGFUL DIFFERENTIATION

ESSA requires meaningful differentiation of schools based on accountability indicators and on overall school performance. This meaningful differentiation is used to identify schools for CSI. Furthermore, meaningful differentiation among schools on the performance of student subgroups on accountability indicators and overall school performance is needed for the identification of schools for TSI and ATSI. This section describes the methodology that is used for these purposes.

As described in the sections of this manual describing each indicator, each school will receive one of three normative category scores on each ESSA indicator: 1 = below average, 2 = average, and 3 = above average. The 2017-18 school performance data serves as a baseline. Because each indicator score is rounded to one decimal point, very nearly one-third of the schools belong to each normative indicator category in the baseline year. The cut-points for category membership identified during the baseline year will be applied in future years to assign schools to each normative category on each indicator. During the baseline year, about one-third of schools meeting the minimum  $n$  for each subgroup on an indicator belonged to each of the indicator categories for that subgroup during the baseline school year (i.e., 2017-18). When cut-points for a subgroup are higher than the cut-points for overall school performance, the overall school performance cut-points are applied to that subgroup. The cut-points identified during the baseline year are applied in future years in order to identify category membership on the indicators.

Once schools are assigned to a normative performance category on each indicator, the school's overall performance is the ***average indicator category score*** (AICS). There are AICS scores for overall school performance and for each subgroup. Schools serving grades three through eight must at least meet the minimum  $n$  on both the achievement and growth indicators in order to receive an AICS score and high schools must at least meet the minimum  $n$  on both the achievement and graduation rate indicators in order to receive an AICS score. Schools that do not meet these minimum indicator requirements will undergo a small school review. School AICS scores are the average of the indicator category scores rounded to one decimal point. For ESSA, the AICS is a simple average and each indicator has equal weight. AICS scores ranged from 1.0 and 3.0. As such, the AISC scale is a 20 point scale on which many schools have identical scores.

**ESSA Performance Level Categories.** The performance level categories for ESSA are:

- CSI
- TSI
- ATSI
- Unclassified

CSI determination at a school is based upon the overall school performance of Title I schools, the four-year, on-time graduation rate of high schools (not just Title I schools), and/or failure to improve the performance of a low performing subgroup within 4 years. For subgroup performance, schools with *consistently underperforming subgroups* are identified for TSI and schools with *chronically low-performing subgroups* are identified for ATSI. Schools may be TSI or ATSI for more than one subgroup. Schools that do not meet criteria for consistently underperforming subgroups or chronically low-performing subgroups were not identified for either TSI or ATSI for any subgroups. School that do not meet criteria for CSI, TSI, or ATSI, are identified as *unclassified*.

**CSI Evidence.** Schools are first identified for CSI in 2018-19 based upon their performance during the 2017-18 school year and every third year thereafter. After this initial identification, the analyses and identification of schools as CSI will only be repeated each third year after the 2018-19 school year. There are two ways that schools are identified for CSI in 2018-19 based on their 2017-18 performance. First, the Title I schools with performance in the bottom 5% of Title I schools are identified for CSI. Second, any high school graduating less than 67% of their four-year, on-time graduates are identified for CSI.

A two-step process is used to identify the lowest performing Title I schools on the indicators. First, schools with the lowest AICS score<sup>12</sup> become candidates for CSI identification. A secondary criteria is applied to CSI candidate schools in order to identify those schools performing in the bottom 5%. The secondary criteria is an average of the achievement score (i.e., percent proficient in reading and math combined) and growth scores (i.e., the MGP at the school) at each school. Schools with AICS scores of 1.0 are ranked from the highest to the lowest on this average achievement and growth score. The number of candidate schools identified as CSI due to low performance was a number that captured at least 5% of all Title I schools in the state. The candidate schools with the lowest average achievement and growth scores were identified for CSI. Once identified for CSI, a school may *exit* by improving their AICS score for 2 consecutive years. A high school identified for CSI because of a low graduation rate may exit CSI by graduating 67% or more students for 2 years in a row.

There is a third way for a school to be identified for CSI. Any Title I school that is identified for ATSI because of a chronically low-performing subgroup that did not meet the exit criteria within 4 years will be designated as CSI on the basis of having a chronically low-performing subgroup. Since 2018-19 is the first year that schools are identified as ATSI, there are no ATSI schools

---

<sup>12</sup> This will be 1.0, since many more than 5% of Title I schools are likely to have AICS scores of 1.0 in any given year.



identified for CSI based upon their 2017-18 performance. The identification and exit criteria for ATSI are described below.

**TSI Evidence.** Any school, not just Title I schools, may be identified for TSI. Schools are identified for TSI when they have a consistently underperforming subgroup. A consistently underperforming subgroup is defined as follows. First, a school must have an AICS score of 1.0 for a particular subgroup in order for the subgroup to be considered underperforming. Step 1 is to identify schools with AICS scores of 1.0 for specific subgroups. If fewer than 10% of schools that meet the minimum *n* for a subgroup, those schools become TSI eligible for that school year. If more than 10% of schools that meet the minimum *n* for a subgroup have an AICS score of 1.0, a secondary criteria is applied in order to identify those schools with performance in the bottom 10% for a given subgroup in a given year. The secondary criteria is the average achievement and growth score for students in the subgroup at the school. The number of schools that remain eligible for TSI identification in any given school year is the number that captures 10% of all schools with a given subgroup in the given school year. The lowest ranked schools on this average score that equals 10% of all schools with the subgroup become eligible for TSI. In order for a school to be identified for TSI a school must be TSI eligible for two consecutive school years.

Schools will be identified for TSI for the 2018-19 school year based upon their performance during both the 2016-17<sup>13</sup> and the 2017-18 school year. Schools may be identified as TSI for more than one subgroup. Identification for TSI will occur annually. The exit criteria for these schools will be increasing the subgroup AICS for 2 years in a row.

**ATSI Evidence.** Schools will be identified for ATSI during the 2018-19 school year based upon their performance during the 2017-18 school year, and every third year thereafter. Schools with ATSI have one or more low-performing subgroups, and are all among the schools with the lowest AICS scores for a given subgroup for a given school year. A low-performing subgroup is a subgroup that has an average achievement and growth score that is equal to or lower than the lowest average achievement and growth score for the *all student* group at CSI schools during that school year. The exit criteria for these schools will be increasing the subgroup AICS for two years in a row.

## **PARTICIPATION RATE**

Both WAEA and ESSA include a 95% participation rate requirement on the state achievement test. Participation rate is computed for all students enrolled in the school during the testing window including all full academic year (FAY) students. The denominator on the achievement indicator must be at least 95% of FAY students attending the school (expanded standards students are not excluded). Not tested students in excess of 5% of all FAY students are counted as not proficient on achievement indicator. For WAEA, the participation rate rule is applied to

---

<sup>13</sup> The scores for the 2016-17 school year were based upon application of the ESSA model to school performance from that school year. Equipercentile linking was used to identify cut-scores on the 2016-17 achievement test (i.e., PAWS) that were equivalent to those from the 2017-18 achievement test (WY-TOPP) definition of proficient. For grades 9 and 10 this was done for the 2016-17 Wyoming Scale Scores on the Aspire tests.

the all student group. For ESSA, the participation rate requirement is applied to the all student group and to each subgroup.

When fewer than 95% of all eligible students in attendance at the school participate on the state test, but at least 95% the FAY students participate on the assessment, the calculation of the achievement indicator is not affected. When this situation occurs, 0.1 points will be deducted from the school's AICS (i.e., for ESSA) and the *weighted average indicator score* (i.e., for WAEA) for each 5% increment below the 95% criterion.

A *simple participation rate* is the number of students who tested divided by the number of students who should have tested at the school. For example, if a school has 10 students who were expected to test and only 9 tested, the school's simple participation rate would be 90%. In this illustration the school's simple participation rate was below the 95% requirement. The school had one student that did not test. When the non-participation of one student yields a participation rate below 95%, as it did in this illustration, the school was really being held to a participation rate requirement of 100%. For the school in the illustration, the *actual participation rate requirement* to which they were held was 100%. This illustrates the need for an adjustment rule to be employed when determining a school's participation in testing.

Whenever the *actual participation rate* for a school is greater than the 95% requirement, the *one additional non-participant rule* will be applied. The school will be allowed to have one additional non-participating student and still be considered to have met the requirement. In the above example, the school was being held to an actual participation rate requirement above 95% (i.e., it was 100%), therefore the school is allowed one additional non-participant. Since the school had only one non-participant the school met the participation rate requirement. The school had a simple participation rate of 90% but the school met the requirement because it was allowed one additional non-participant. The one student who did not test is the one additional non-participant.

This adjustment to the participation rate rule ensures no school has an *actual required participation rate* requirement that is above the 95% requirement. Whenever the one additional non-participant rule is applied, the school is allowed to have a simple participation rate below the requirement.

Participation rates are computed at the test score level rather than the student level. The implementation of this rule is accomplished by setting a target for the number of tests that need to be administered and scored at the school for the requirement to be met. If there are 10 students at the school and each student is expected to take a math test and an English language arts (ELA) test. The one additional student rule applies at this school. Therefore, if the one additional student did not test, the school would have 18 test scores, 9 for math and 9 for ELA, so the participation rate requirement at this school is 18 test scores.

If this school had fewer than 18 test scores (e.g., just 16 test scores because 2 students did not test), the achievement calculation would still be based upon the 18 expected tests, assuming that all 10 student met the FAY threshold. If there were 10 proficient tests at this school the actual percent proficient would be  $10/16 = 62.5\%$ , but the percent proficient included for school accountability at this school would be  $10/18 = 55.6\%$ .

If there are fewer than 18 test scores (e.g., just 16 test scores because 2 students did not test), the achievement calculation would still be based upon the 18 expected tests, assuming that all 10 student met the FAY threshold. If there were 10 proficient tests at this school the actual percent proficient would be  $10/16 = 62.5\%$ , but the percent proficient included for school accountability at this school would be  $10/18 = 55.6\%$ .

The minimum  $n$  for participation is 10 students. When students from prior school years are included in order to meet the minimum  $n$  for the achievement indicator, the prior years that are used for that purpose are also included for the participation rate computations.

### **MINIMUM $n$**

For accountability decisions, the minimum number of students ( $n$ ) needed in order to produce a score on an indicator is 10. For schools with fewer than 10 students on an indicator, the performance of students from a prior school year is combined with the performance of students from the current year (i.e., a one-year lookback). If there are still fewer than 10 students on the indicator, the performance of students from two prior school years is combined with that of students from the current year (i.e., a two-year lookback). If there are still fewer than 10 students on the indicator, the school does not have a score on that indicator. A school must meet the minimum  $n$  on at least two indicators in order to receive a school performance level score. Schools without a school performance level score will be assigned to a small school review process.

Since the WY-TOPP replaced the PAWS as the test for achievement in 2017-18, special procedures are needed in order to apply the minimum  $n$  lookback procedure. The definition of proficient on the achievement tests was changed with the implementation of a new test. Lookbacks are based upon the PAWS, because there are no prior WY-TOPP test results. Equipercentile linking is used to identify a scale scores on the 2017 PAWS tests in each grade that identified a similar proportion of students as proficient to the proportion identified on the 2018 WY-TOPP. For English language arts, equipercentile linking is performed between the PAWS reading test and the WY-TOPP English language arts test. The PAWS cut-points identified on the 2017 PAWS are applied to the 2016 PAWS when a two-year lookback is needed.

For the equity indicator there must be 10 students in the consolidated subgroup (i.e., with achievement scores in the bottom 25% on the prior year's state test).

### **FULL ACADEMIC YEAR**

When computing school scores, only students who were present at the school for a full academic year (Marion & Domaleski, 2012) are included.

For computation of school performance levels, “full academic year” (FAY) status is defined as being continuously enrolled in the same school from the first weekday in October until a spring accountability date set by the Department each year, typically aligned with the midpoint of each

assessment's testing window. Students not identified as FAY students will be excluded from school performance level computations. However, a school's participation rate is based on *all* students who are not enrolled during the state assessment window, not just FAY students. For the grade nine credit sub-indicator, FAY status is defined as being continuously enrolled at the same school from the first weekday in October until ten days from the school's last day of the school year.

In either case, continuous enrollment ends with a gap of ten or more days in reported enrollment, or where enrollment is reported by a different school during a gap of less than ten days. Home schooled and concurrent enrollment students are not included in accountability calculations.

## ESSA LONG-TERM GOALS AND INTERIM TARGETS

Under ESSA, the state is required to establish long-term goals with interim targets for overall school performance and for subgroup performance. School performance on the long-term goals and interim targets are reported each year. Performance on long-term goals does not impact ESSA or WAEA accountability scores. Long-term goals and interim targets are required for four indicators:

- Reading achievement
- Math achievement
- Four-year, on-time graduation rate
- Progress of English learner's becoming English proficient (ELP)

The long-term goals and interim targets must be both ambitious and attainable. To this end, the goal setting process in Wyoming was accomplished consistent with the recommendations of the *Advisory Committee to the Select Committee on Statewide Education Accountability*<sup>14</sup>. In order to ensure that long-term goals and interim targets were both ambitious and attainable, three questions were considered: were the goals ambitious, was the annual rate of improvement required attainable for low-performing schools, and was the number of years required to attain the long-term goal adequate and reasonable? Once these questions were answered, setting the interim targets followed.

**Long-Term Goals.** The same process and parameters were used for each of the four indicators for which long-term goals were established. The parameters were recommended by the state based upon data analysis, and were vetted with the PJP and recommended to the State Board of Education. Wyoming implemented a new state test for math achievement and English language arts achievement during the 2017-18 school year. The proposed long-term goals submitted and approved by the U.S. Department of Education<sup>15</sup> as a part of the Wyoming state ESSA plan were no longer relevant since they were based upon an obsolete state test. Therefore, upon obtaining the results of the new 2017-18 state assessment (i.e., the WY-TOPP), long-term goals were

---

<sup>14</sup> Advisory Committee Chair, Judy Catchpole, report drafted by S. Marion, J. Martineau, & Thanos Patelis from the Center for Assessment (December 31, 2016).

<sup>15</sup> For ELP, the scale scores used for standard setting had not been finalized at the time that state plan goal setting was performed.

revised by applying the PJP approved parameters to the 2017-18 results for math achievement and English language arts achievement. There was considerable data quality improvement associated with Wyoming English learner data during 2017-18; therefore, 2017-18 will serve as the baseline year for ELPA long-term goals. As such, a new baseline year was established for these goal areas.

The parameters and business rules reported here, which were used to derive the long-term goals in the state plan, were also used with baseline 2017-18 WY-TOPP and ELPA data to produce the long-term goals. The following steps were used to produce the long-term goals for each of the four indicators.

1. Cumulative frequency distributions of the Wyoming school scores were produced for the indicators for each goal.
2. Parameters for long-term goals were established: The acceptable long-term goal for overall school performance was determined to be the performance of the school with a school score at the 65<sup>th</sup> percentile rank during the baseline year. The acceptable long-term goal for subgroups during the baseline year was determined to be the performance of the school at the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile for the school score on that indicator<sup>16</sup>. The subgroup parameter is higher than the overall school performance parameter because the long-term goals for subgroups are expected to result in a narrowing of the achievement gap.
3. Parameter for a *low-performing school* was determined for both overall school performance and for subgroups. A low-performing school was the school with overall school performance at the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile rank during the baseline year. The same parameter was used for each subgroup on each indicator. The amount of annual progress needed by the low-performing school to meet the long-term goal, given various terms for the long-term goal, were computed to inform the attainability of the long-term goals.
4. A distribution of school indicator score changes from one year to the next was produced on each long-term goal indicator for overall school performance and for each subgroup. The percentile ranks associated with each change score were computed. This was done for two consecutive improvement years with PAWS data since at least one other year of data will be needed before this can be completed for WY-TOPP test results.
5. The results of steps 3 and 4 were used to inform judgments about the term that was appropriate for the long-term goals. The parameter for the term of the long-term goal was 15 years. With a 15 year term the amount of change from one year to the next for the low performing school in any given year was considered attainable. Of course, that amount of change would, on average, be needed each year for the entire term and there is no data available to judge the likelihood of this type of sustained improvement.

To summarize, the parameters used for goal setting were:

- The goal for overall school performance was, all schools will perform as well as or better than the school with an indicator score at the 65<sup>th</sup> percentile rank during the baseline year.
- For subgroups, the long-term goals were established as follows:

---

<sup>16</sup> The frequency distributions were smoothed using regression and the percentile ranks utilized were those from the smoothed distribution.

- The long-term goal was a value higher than the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile rank from the baseline year when a higher goal was needed to ensure that the subgroup gap decreased by 30% by the end of the goal term – or –
        - When the baseline year gap between the subgroup and the all student group was less than or equal to 5% or positive (i.e., the subgroup performed above the all student group), and there were more than 10 schools that met the minimum  $n$ , the long-term goal was the 65<sup>th</sup> percentile rank for the subgroup from the baseline year – or –
        - When the baseline year gap between the subgroup and the all student group was less than or equal to 5% or positive, and there were less than 10 schools with the subgroup, the subgroup goal was the all student goal and minus the baseline year gap (this ensured the subgroup would not lose ground on the all student goal over time) – or –
        - If there were less than 10 schools but gap was greater than 5%, the long-term goal was based upon a 30% gap reduction (percentile ranks based upon frequency distributions with so few schools could be unreliable) – or –
  - When there were no schools that met the minimum  $n$  for a subgroup, the statewide student level gap was measured and the long-term goal was a 30% reduction from the baseline year gap.
- The term for the long-term goal is 15 years.
  - A school with an indicator score at the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile rank for overall school performance or for the performance of any subgroup is a low-performing school for overall school performance or for the performance of the subgroup for the purpose of estimating the extent that a long-term goal is attainable.

**Interim School Targets.** The method used to determine interim targets varies as a function of whether or not a school was at or above the long-term goal during the baseline year.

- For all schools, the baseline year is Year 1. For the four-year, on-time graduation indicator, the baseline year is the accountability year 2016-17. Since this is a lagged indicator, the four-year, on-time cohort is the 2015-16 graduating class for the 2016-17 accountability year. For math achievement, English/language arts achievement, and ELP, the baseline year is 2017-18.
- The end of the 15 year term is the 2030-31 accountability year for the graduation indicator and 2031-32 for the math, English/language arts, and ELP indicators

Interim Target Computation for *Schools below the Long-Term Goal during the Baseline Year* is illustrated in Table 9.

- The baseline score and long-term goal are whole numbers. The expected *annual progress* is computed as follows = (long-term goal - school baseline score)/14. The denominator is 14 since the baseline year is Year 1 and the goal must be reached by year 15. The expected annual progress is not rounded. See column 3 in Table 9.

- Through Year 12, *interim targets* remain unchanged for three years at a time. Interim targets increase in years 4, 7, 10, 13, 14, and 15. Therefore, interim targets increase for the first time in Year 4. This increase is the sum of the baseline plus the expected annual improvement through Year 4 rounded to the nearest whole number. Each increase is the baseline score plus expected annual improvement through the year of the increase rounded to a whole number.

Table 9. Illustration of Interim Target Computation for a Low Performing School on the Reading Achievement.

Year	School Year	Expected Annual Growth*	Baseline Plus Sum of Expected Annual Improvement	Interim Target**
1 - Baseline	2017-18		37.000	37
2	2018-19	1.857142857	38.857	37
3	2019-20	1.857142857	40.714	37
4	2020-21	1.857142857	42.571	43
5	2021-22	1.857142857	44.429	43
6	2022-23	1.857142857	46.286	43
7	2023-24	1.857142857	48.143	48
8	2024-25	1.857142857	50.000	48
9	2025-26	1.857142857	51.857	48
10	2026-27	1.857142857	53.714	54
11	2027-28	1.857142857	55.571	54
12	2028-29	1.857142857	57.429	54
13	2029-30	1.857142857	59.286	59
14	2030-31	1.857142857	61.143	61
15	2031-32	1.857142857	63.000	63

\*Required Annual Growth = (long-term goal - school baseline score)/14.

\*\*Baseline plus required annual growth for the row where increase is required rounded to a whole number.

Interim Target Computation for *Schools above the Long-Term Goal during the Baseline Year.*

- In order to meet the interim target, the school score must be at or above the long-term goal.
- A school meets the interim target if their score drops by up to 5% so long as the score remains at or above the long-term goal (this provides some relief from regression to the mean to the schools that have already met the long-term goal).

### 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 calculations and both schools are assigned the same performance level.

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 also applied to the K-2. In these situations, collaboration across buildings is important to the success of the students involved.

Table 10 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 10. 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-1	Douglas Upper Elementary School	4-5	0501010
0501013	Douglas Intermediate	2-3			
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
0725002	Ashgrove Elementary School	1-3	Rendezvous Elementary	4-5	0725007
0725009	Aspen Park Elementary School	P-K			
0725008	Jackson Elementary School	1-3			
0725010	Willow Creek Elementary	1-3			
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



1201004	Kemmerer Elementary	K-2	Canyon Elementary	3-6	1201051
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
2201004	East Side Elementary	K-1	2201006	4-5	West Side Elementary
2201005	South Side Elementary	2-3			
2301003	Newcastle Elementary	K-2	Gertrude Burns Intermediate	3-5	2301001

APPENDIX A

Cut Scores for Average Category and Above Average Categories for ESSA Indicators for All Students and for Each Subgroup.

	Count of Schools	Meets Target Cut Score	Exceeds Target Cut Score
All Students - Achievement	331	47.7	58.6
All Students - Growth	329	47.1	54.5
All Students - Equity	242	47.5	56.2
All Students - ELPA	61	46.1	62.5
All Students - Graduation Rate	85	82.3	90.3
All Students - Post-Secondary Readiness	83	41.8	65.4
Asian - Achievement	33	53.3	75.0
Asian - Growth	33	50.9	57.5
Asian - Equity	1	47.5	56.2
Asian - ELPA	0	46.1	62.5
Asian - Graduation Rate	6	87	91.3
Asian - Post-Secondary Readiness	3	54.9	62.6
Black - Achievement	36	32.9	45.7
Black - Growth	36	43.3	48.6
Black - Equity	11	38.9	44.8
Black - ELPA	0	46.1	62.5
Black - Graduation Rate	7	69.2	80
Black - Post-Secondary Readiness	3	31.1	41.7
ELL - Achievement	109	20.8	39.5
ELL - Growth	108	45.3	55.3
ELL - Equity	68	45.6	52.5
ELL - ELPA	58	42.9	63.4
ELL - Graduation Rate	18	68.4	80.6
ELL - Post-Secondary Readiness	11	7.3	20.0
Lunch Eligible - Achievement	300	36.0	47.6
Lunch Eligible - Growth	296	45.5	52.0
Lunch Eligible - Equity	218	45.3	52.3
Lunch Eligible - ELPA	48	45.1	60.8
Lunch Eligible - Graduation Rate	77	71.5	84.2
Lunch Eligible - Post-Secondary Readiness	68	28.8	54.5
Hispanic - Achievement	221	35.0	46.2
Hispanic - Growth	218	46.2	53.8
Hispanic - Equity	144	46.2	55.2
Hispanic - ELPA	50	43.4	63.5
Hispanic - Graduation Rate	41	73.6	88.7
Hispanic - Post-Secondary Readiness	30	31.5	55.8
IEP - Achievement	265	14.5	24.0
IEP - Growth	262	42.5	49.5
IEP - Equity	211	43.1	50.3
IEP - ELPA	4	45.5	
IEP - Graduation Rate	58	56.5	72.7

IEP - Post-Secondary Readiness	36	9.4	17.2
Native American - Achievement	49	22.2	35.0
Native American - Growth	46	44.2	51.2
Native American - Equity	21	43.4	49.2
Native American - ELPA	3	17.6	24.0
Native American - Graduation Rate	12	54.1	64.0
Native American - Post-Secondary Readiness	6	5.5	18.9
Pacific Islander - Achievement	0		
Pacific Islander - Growth	0		
Pacific Islander - Equity	0		
Pacific Islander - ELPA	0		
Pacific Islander - Graduation Rate	0		
Pacific Islander - Post-Secondary Readiness	0		
Two or More Races - Achievement	91	42.3	55.9
Two or More Races - Growth	88	47.9	52.5
Two or More Races - Equity	23	45.2	56.8
Two or More Races - ELPA	0	46.1	62.5
Two or More Races - Graduation Rate	14	67.4	84.4
Two or More Races - Post-Secondary Readiness	33	33	63
White - Achievement	318	50.0	61.4
White - Growth	317	47.7	54.4
White - Equity	235	48.2	55.8
White - ELPA	2	46.1	62.5
White - Graduation Rate	80	82.8	91.7
White - Post-Secondary Readiness	78	46.0	66.1

**APPENDIX B**  
**STUDENT SURVEY ITEMS**

1. Teachers at this school believe I can perform well on challenging academic work.
2. Teachers at this school set high standards for academic performance.
3. I trust the staff at this school.
4. I can find a classmate to help me with school work when I need it.
5. Students have to work hard to do well at this school.
6. Students at this school help each other even if they are not friends.
7. Students at this school treat property with respect.
8. I find the academic expectations challenging at this school.
9. Teachers at this school do not let students give up when the work gets hard.
10. There is at least one staff member at this school who knows me well and shows interest in my education and future.
11. Staff work hard to make sure that students stay in school.
12. I help other students when I see that they are struggling.
13. Students at this school treat staff with respect.
14. Students at this school treat each other with respect.
15. Students at this school are treated with respect by staff.
16. Teachers give me helpful suggestions about how I can improve my work in class.
17. Teachers at this school expect students to do their best all of the time.
18. Teachers at this school have high expectations for me.
19. Staff at this school treat me with respect.
20. Staff at this school help students when they need it.
21. There is at least one student at this school who knows me well and whom I consider to be a friend.
22. Staff at this school make sure that I am planning for life after high school.
23. Staff at this school treat each other with respect.
24. Teachers explain things in a different way if students don't understand something.