target) for achievement using the cut-scores established by the State Board of Education on the recommendation of the PJP. For the three target levels, two cut-scores are needed.

WAEA cut-scores for traditional school **grade 3 through 8 achievement** are:
- Meets Target = 51
- Exceeds Target = 68

WAEA cut-scores for traditional **high school achievement** are:
- 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*, or *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 is 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 PJP.

WAEA cut-scores for **alternative school achievement index** are:
- 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 for all FAY students, rounded to *one decimal place*. Science scores are not included in the ESSA achievement indicator.

Each school is assigned to one of three categories (i.e., *below average, average, above average*) based upon their achievement score. Cut-scores for the indicator categories are based upon statewide performance during a baseline school year (2017-18). During the baseline year, 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. The cut-scores for subgroups are presented in Appendix A.

Overall school cut-scores for grades **three through ten achievement** are:
- Average Category = 47.7
- Above Average Category = 58.6

Growth Indicator

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 from a Wyoming school district. Since the 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 state test for students in grades four through ten.

The model implemented to measure growth produces student growth percentiles[3] (SGPs). SGPs indicate how an individual student's growth compared with that of all Wyoming public school students[4] 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. 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 an SGP below 35 could be thought of as having low growth, a student with SGPs above 65 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[5]. 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 change in their test score from prior years compares 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 grade 10 (i.e., WY-TOPP) to the ACT test in grade 11.

For ESSA accountability and for WAEA traditional school and alternative school accountability, the WY-TOPP was used to measure growth during grades 4 through 10. Growth was also be measured during grade 11 for WAEA traditional school and alternative school accountability. In grade 11, growth was 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 includes the current year public school students who 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.

---

[3] See Betebenner, D. W. (2008). *Norm- and criterion-referenced student growth.* Available at http://www.nciea.org.
[4] 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.
[5] 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 score is rounded to a whole number.

WAEA. The MGPs at each school are rounded to the nearest whole number and placed into one of three target levels: *below target*, *meets target*, and *exceeds target*. The State Board of Education accepted the PJP recommendations and established the following cut-points for the MGPs for each of the three categories.

WAEA cut-scores for **grades 4 through 8 growth** are:
- Meets Target = 48
- Exceeding Target = 60

WAEA cut-scores for **grades 9 through 11 growth for traditional schools** are:
- Meets Target = 49
- Exceeding Target = 60

WAEA cut-scores for growth for **alternative schools** are:
- Meets Target = 40
- Exceeding Target = 50

ESSA. Growth is measured in grades 4 through 10 for ESSA. The school's growth MGP is rounded to one decimal point and 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 (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[6] cut-scores for **grades 4 through 10 growth** are:
- Average Category = 47.1
- Above Average Category = 54.5

Equity

An important goal of WAEA is to "minimize achievement gaps" [Wyoming Statute 21-2-204(b)(vi)]. This goal is addressed with 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 on the prior year's state test are assigned to a consolidated subgroup. Low performance is based upon scoring below the cut-scores reported in Table 3[7].

---

[6] ESSA growth indicator cut-scores appear in APPENDIX A.

[7] The cut-scores in Table 3 were based upon the performance of all Wyoming students on the 2018 WY-TOPP test. The 2018 test served as the baseline test for the identification of WY-TOPP consolidated subgroup cut-scores. The identified cut-scores were the scores at the 25th percentile rank for all Wyoming students on the 2018 WY-TOPP.

Students were identified for the consolidated subgroup membership for only the subject areas where they scored below the cut-scores in Table 3. As such, some were in the consolidated subgroup for mathematics, some were in the consolidated subgroup for reading, and some were in the consolidated subgroup for both mathematics and reading.

Table 3. WY-TOPP Cut-Scores* for Consolidated Subgroup Identification.

	Content Areas	
	Reading	Math
WY-TOPP Grade 3	566	418
WY-TOPP Grade 4	582	443
WY-TOPP Grade 5	605	468
WY-TOPP Grade 6	616	491
WY-TOPP Grade 7	615	514
WY-TOPP Grade 8	628	542
WY-TOPP Grade 9	607	562

*Students are included in the consolidated subgroup for the content area or areas in which they scored below these cut-scores on their prior year WY-TOPP.

The school score for equity is a weighted MGP. The weighting of the MGP for the equity indicator includes 80% weighting for the consolidated subgroup MGP and 20% weighting for the MGP for all students not in the consolidated subgroup.

WAEA Alternative School Model. The WAEA alternative school accountability model does not have an equity indicator.

WAEA Traditional School Model.. 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 (i.e., 43) and rounded to one decimal place for ESSA (i.e., 43.4).

For WAEA, the school equity scores at each school are rounded to the nearest whole number and placed into one of three target levels: *below target*, *meets target*, or *exceeds target*. The State Board of Education accepted the PJP recommended cut-scores for the equity MGPs.

WAEA cut-scores for **equity for grades 4 through 8** are:
- Meets Target = 48
- Exceeds Target = 60

WAEA cut-scores for **equity for grades 9 and 10** are:
- Meets Target = 49
- Exceeds Target = 60

ESSA. For ESSA school accountability, the equity indicator is used for grades 4 through 8 and is not used for grades 9 and 10. 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 (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[8] cut-scores for **grades 4 through 8 equity** are:
- Average Category = 47.5
- Above Average Category = 56.2

English Learner Progress (ELP)[9]

Definition of English Proficient. All active English learner (EL) students are expected to take the ACCESS 2.0 each year. The ACCESS 2.0 is a measure of English language proficiency focused on academic language. The ACCESS 2.0 has both scale scores and performance levels. Performance levels are intended to represent relatively equivalent English proficiency levels across grades. For example, a composite performance level (CPL) of 4.6 is intended to represent a relatively equivalent level of English proficiency in grade 3 and grade 4 even though the composite scale scores (CSS) associated with a CPL of 4.6 in grade 4 is higher than the CSS associated with a CPL of 4.6 in grade 3.

In 2017, multiple linear regression was used to identify the ACCESS 2.0 CSS that were best predicted by the PAWS reading scale scores that served as cut-scores for proficient reading for each grade. The identified CSS on the ACCESS 2.0 for each grade that were best predicted by the PAWS reading proficient cut-scores were associated CPLs that ranged from 4.3 to 4.6 for each of the grades 3 through 8. Based on this and other analyses, Wyoming established that the definition of English proficient performance in 2018 on the ACCESS 2.0 would be a CPL of 4.6.

In 2018, the PAWS was no longer administered. Instead, the WY-TOPP was used to measure English language arts (ELA) performance. Multiple linear regression was implemented again to identify the ACCESS 2.0 CSS that were best predicted by the WY-TOPP ELA scale score cut-score for proficient ELA performance for each grade. The ACCESS 2.0 CSS that were best predicted WY-TOPP ELA proficient cut-scores for grade 3 through 10 were associated with CPLs that ranged from 4.2 to 4.5. In the interest of erroring on the side of avoiding false positives, Wyoming chose to continue defining English proficient performance on the ACCESS 2.0 as earning a CPL of at least 4.6. In addition, Wyoming added the criterion that EL students must have a *literacy performance level* (LPL) of at least 4.3 in order to be considered English proficient. This further minimize the likelihood of false positives. Table 4 shows the CSSs that are associated with CPLs of 4.6 in each grade.

---

[8] ESSA Equity indicator cut-scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A.
[9] ALT ACCESS students are not included in the ELP indicator for Accountability Year 2018-19.

Table 4. Lowest and Highest Scale Scores Associated with a Composite Performance Level Score of 4.6 for Each Grade.

Grade	Composite Performance Level of 4.6	
	Lowest Scale Score	Highest Scale Score
Kindergarten	313	315
1	333	335
2	347	349
3	359	361
4	370	372
5	378	380
6	393	395
7	393	395
8	399	401
9	405	408
10	411	414
11	417	419
12	422	424

Target Year (for Demonstrating English Proficiency). 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 students who enter school with little or no English take about 6 years to become English proficient. Having little or no English is operationally defined as having a CPL between 1.0 and 1.9 on the ACCESS 2.0 test during the year that the EL student first enters an English-speaking school. The year of the first ACCESS test for a student is referred to as *year one*[10]. Higher performance level scores on the ACCESS 2.0 reflect higher levels of English proficiency. Therefore, the number of years to an EL student's *target year* (i.e., the year within which an EL student is expected to become English proficient) is related to the CPL earned by the EL student on the ACCESS 2.0 during *year one*. Table 5 presents the target year for English proficiency based upon an EL student's CPL in *year one*.

Table 5. Year One Composite Performance Level and the Corresponding Target Year for English Proficiency.

Year One Composite Performance Level Score	Target Year (for English Proficiency)
At Least 4.6	Year One
4.0 to 4.5	Year Three
3.0 to 3.9	Year Four
2.0 to 2.9	Year Five
1.0 to 1.9	Year Six

Note. Students exit EL status at the beginning of the school year after they test as English proficient.

Computing Student Progress Targets. The school score for the English learner progress indicator is the percentage of EL students at a school who meet their annual English proficiency progress target. While both CPLs and LPLs are used for defining English proficiency, annual English proficiency targets prior to a student's target year are expressed as the CSS that the EL

---

[10] When there is a one-year break in ACCESS testing (i.e., the student tests one year, does not test the next year, but then tests again the following year), the EL students are returned to year one in the first year after the break.

student is expected to reach or exceed on the ACCESS 2.0 test. The first step in establishing an annual English proficiency progress target for an EL student is to subtract the student's current CSS from the ACCESS 2.0 CSS associated with a CPL of 4.6 for the grade the student will be in when they reach their target year, and dividing the obtained difference by the number of year's left to the student's target year. The resulting value is then added to the current CSS to establish a new CSS target.

Once the EL student reaches the target year, and every year thereafter until the EL student demonstrates English proficiency, the EL student's annual progress target is English proficiency. This means the student must have a CPL of at least 4.6 and an LPL of at least 4.3.

A specific example of the computation of a student's annual English language progress target is presented here. Assume an EL student tests on the ACCESS 2.0 for the first time in grade one. The EL student has a CSS of 284. The CPL associated with a CSS of 284 in grade 1, is 3.2. Table 6 indicates this student is expected to become English proficient by year four. The student will reach year four when she is in grade 4. The student will be in grade 4 in 3 years. The lowest CSS associated with a CPL of 4.6 in grade 4 is 370. The annual progress target for this student is, $(((370 - 284)/3) + 284) = 313$[11]. Each year the English language progress target is (((end year CSS – current year CSS)/years to target year) + current year CSS).

WAEA. For WAEA, the school ELP scores at each school are rounded to the nearest whole number and placed into one of three target levels: *below target*, *meets target*, or *exceeds target*. The ELP indicator evolved from 2017-18 to 2018-19 because, for the first time, there were two prior years of data for lookbacks at schools not meeting the minimum *n.* In addition, the definition of English proficient performance on the ACCESS 2.0 was adjusted by the addition of a Literacy composite performance level requirement. When the ELP indicator evolved, the distribution of school scores on the indicator changed considerably. When the original cut-scores were applied to the 2018-19 distribution of school scores the percentage of schools designated as below target was much larger and the percentage of school designated as exceeding target was much smaller. Because of this, the WAEA cut-scores were adjusted using the 2018-19 data in a manner intended to honor and reflect the work of the PJP. This was accomplished by identifying cut-scores that resulted in a percentage of schools at each target level that was as close as possible to the percentages of schools placed into each target level by the PJP.

WAEA cut-scores for **ELP for grades kindergarten through 8** are:
- Meets Target
  - 2017-18 cut-score = 49 (34.1% of schools below cut-score)
  - 2018-19 cut-score = 36 (33.3% of schools below cut-score)
- Exceeds Target
  - 2017-18 cut-score = 65 (70.7% of schools below cut-score)
  - 2018-19 cut-score = 60 (71.1% of schools below cut-score)

---

[11] After rounding.

WAEA cut-scores for **ELP for grades 9 through 12** are:
- Meets Target
  - 2017-18 cut-score = 41 (33.3% of schools below cut-score)
  - 2018-19 cut-score = 19 (31.8% of schools below cut-score)
- Exceeds Target
  - 2017-18 cut-score = 55 (77.7% of schools below cut-score)
  - 2018-19 cut-score = 40 (72.7% of schools below cut-score)

The WAEA alternative school model does not include an ELP indicator.

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 (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[12] **ELP cut-scores for grades kindergarten through 12** are:
- Average Category
  - 2017-18 cut-score = 46.1 (34.0% of schools below cut-score)
  - 2018-19 cut-score = 27.7 (33.6% of schools below cut-scores)
- Above Average Category
  - 2017-18 cut-score = 62.5 (67.0% of schools below cut-score)
  - 2018-19 cut-score = 50.0 (65.5% of schools below cut-score)

ADDITIONAL INDICATORS FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

High School Graduation

Lagged School Year. For all three school accountability models (i.e., WAEA traditional high schools, WAEA alternative high schools, and ESSA), the accountability school year is the school year just completed, but the graduation cohort is a lagged cohort. A lagged cohort comes from the school year prior to the accountability school year. Using a lagged school year allows high schools to include summer graduates in the denominator when graduation rates are computed.

Four-Year, On-Time Graduation Cohort. Students in the four-year, on-time cohort are included in the high school graduation cohorts for all three accountability models. The four-year, on-time cohort includes the number of first-time grade nine students in the school year 4 years prior to the graduation year (i.e., the starting year) plus students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die prior to the graduation year. The former description is the numerator of the four-year, on-time graduation rate.

---

[12] ELP cut-scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A

Extended Graduation Rate for Traditional High Schools. An extended graduation rate is used in WAEA for traditional high schools. The cohort for the Wyoming extended graduation rate begins with the prior school year's four-year, on-time graduation cohort. All graduates from prior graduate cohorts, (i.e., 5, 6, and 7-year graduation cohorts) who graduated during the lagged school year, are added to that year's four-year, on-time cohort for the purpose of computing the Wyoming extended graduation rate. The school score is the Wyoming extended graduation rate. The numerator for the Wyoming extended graduation rate is all 4, 5, 6, and 7-year graduates during the lagged school year. The denominator is all 4, 5, 6, and 7-year graduates during the lagged year plus all non-completers in the lagged four-year, on-time cohort.

For WAEA, the school Wyoming extended graduation rates are rounded to the nearest whole number and are placed into one of three target levels: *below target*, *meets target*, or *exceeds target*. The State Board of Education accepted the PJP recommended cut-scores for the target levels.

WAEA cut-scores for the **extended graduation rate** are:
- Meets Target = 85
- Exceeds Target = 93

Extended Graduation or Credential Rate for Alternative High Schools. The cohort for the high school credential rate includes all students in the Wyoming extended graduation rate cohort. In addition, any non-completer from the 5, 6, and 7-year graduation cohorts who were reported to have passed a graduate equivalency exam any time during the lagged school year up through February of the accountability year were added to the cohort in order to form the Wyoming alternative high school credential rate cohort. The numerator for the credential rate includes all graduates from the Wyoming extended graduation rate cohort plus all 4, 5, 6, and 7-year cohorts who were reported to have passed a graduate equivalency exam anytime during the lagged year up to February of the accountability year. The denominator includes all students from the numerator plus all remaining non-completers in the four-year, on-time cohort who were not reported to have passed a graduate equivalency exam.

The alternative high school credential rates at each school were rounded to the nearest whole number and were placed into one of three target levels: *below target*, *meets target*, or *exceeds target*. The State Board of Education accepted the PJP recommended cut-scores for the target levels.

WAEA cut-scores for the **alternative high school certification rate** are:
- Meets Target = 67
- Exceeds Target = 83

ESSA. The cohort for the ESSA graduation rate is the four-year, on-time cohort from the lagged year. The numerator is all graduates in the cohort and the denominator is all graduates from the cohort plus all non-completers in the cohort. 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 (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.

The all school[13] cut-scores for **four-year, on-time cohort graduation** are:
- Average Category = 82.3
- Above Average Category = 90.3

Post-Secondary Readiness

Post-Secondary Readiness Cohort. The post-secondary readiness (PSR) cohort for high schools includes all graduates at a school during a lagged school year. The most recent school year is the accountability year and the lagged school year is the school year prior to the accountability year. All graduates include those from the four-year, on-time cohort, and the 5, 6, and 7-year cohorts. In addition, 3-year graduates, who will be in the next year's four-year, on-time cohort are included in the PSR cohort.

WAEA for Traditional Schools & ESSA for All Schools. A school's score on the PSR indicator is the percentage of the lagged year graduates who were college, career, *or* military ready. College, career, and military readiness are defined as follows:

- **College readiness** evidence 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.
  - *College preparatory curriculum* is equivalent to the Opportunity success curriculum for the Hathaway Scholarship Program which 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 comes 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[14]. The curriculum level for accountability is based upon the success curriculum level that the school reports on each graduate's transcript.
  - 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

---

[13] The ESSA cut-scores for graduation for subgroups are presented in APPENDIX A.

[14] 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 only, and is **not** designed to collect information about the ACT or the GPA performance of a student.

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.

- Students may demonstrate eligibility to earn *college credits* by obtaining a score of 3 or higher on an AP exam or by obtaining 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 student earned a grade of "C" or better in a1000-level or higher dual/concurrent course.

- **Career readiness** evidence is based on completion of a career/technical education pathway (i.e., minimum of a three-course sequence) <u>and</u> one or more of the following: a passing score on a state-approved CTE exam or a state-approved industry-recognized certification.
  - 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 with evidence provided by the industry or have an industry-recognized certificate. Some industry exams or industry-recognized certificates are provided directly to WDE. When industry-recognized certificates are <u>not</u> provided directly to WDE by the industry, the district may submit them to WDE for department approval.
    – and –
  - The student's 950 transcript must have evidence the student 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 or certification in the Perkins data collection. When there are discrepancies between the WDE 950 transcript collection and the Perkins collection of CTE course completer status, WDE will allow evidence from either the 950 transcript or the Perkins collection to serve as evidence of CTE course completion.

- **Military readiness** evidence is based upon completion of either a college preparatory curriculum <u>or</u> a CTE pathway <u>and</u> a military-readiness score on the ASVAB. The curriculum requirement for military readiness can be met by either the college preparatory curriculum requirement for college readiness – or – the career completer evidence for career readiness.
  - The *college preparatory curriculum* requirement is equivalent to the Opportunity success curriculum for the Hathaway Scholarship Program which 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.
  - The *career completer evidence* for military readiness requires the student's 950 transcript to have evidence the student 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 or certification in the Perkins collection. When there are discrepancies between the WDE 950 transcript collection and the Perkins collection of CTE course completer status, WDE will allow evidence from either the 950 transcript or the Perkins collection to serve as evidence of CTE course completion

o The test evidence used for military readiness is a score on the ASVAB that is high enough for a student to be eligible for any of the four branches of the military during the first year that military readiness is included for school accountability (i.e., 2018-19). The required AFQT score for military readiness is 45.

The State Board of Education accepted the PJP recommended cut-scores for WAEA post-secondary readiness.

WAEA **post-secondary readiness** cut-scores:
- Meeting target = 67
- Exceeding target = 80

The ESSA post-secondary readiness category cut-scores were the scores that separated schools into the bottom third, the middle third, and the top third of schools during the baseline year (i.e., 2017-18).

ESSA overall school[15] **post-secondary readiness** cut-scores:
- Average category = 41.8
- Exceeding category = 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[16]. The final 2018 TAG recommendations are presented in Table 6. The cohort for the college- and career-readiness index is the same as the cohort for the post-secondary readiness in the traditional school model described above.

Under this model, a student's CCR index score for a student is the points associated with the highest observed outcome level for that student in any of the five rows in Table 6. 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 WorkKeys (Level 1) would receive a score of 20, because completion of the Opportunity curriculum represented the highest leveled outcome for this student. The points associated with each level are 10 points for Level 1, 20 points for Level 2, and 30 points for Level 3. An alternative school's CCR index score is the average index across all graduates' CCR scores rounded to a whole number.

---

[15] ESSA post-secondary cut-scores for subgroups appear in APPENDIX A.

[16] 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.

Level 0 – 0 points	Level 1 – 10 point	Level 2 – 20 points	Level 3 – 30 points
No evidence	Complete Hathaway provisional curriculum	Complete Hathaway opportunity curriculum	Complete Hathaway honors/ performance curriculum
No evidence	ACT 17-18	ACT 19-20	ACT 21 +
No evidence	Pathway concentrator	Pathway completer	Attaining a qualifying score on a CTE pathway exam or earning an industry credential
No evidence	ACT WorkKeys – NCRC Bronze (9-11). At least a Level 3 on each exam.	ACT WorkKeys –NCRC Silver (12-14). At least a Level 4 on each exam	ACT WorkKeys –NCRC Gold (15 or up). At least a Level 5 on each exam
No evidence	Credit earned for internship or work study (verified by the 950-collection transcript)	ASVAB Military Readiness Score which is an AFQT score of at least 45	Eligible to receive college course credit (through dual/concurrent enrollment or AP/IB exam)

There are five sources of evidence for the CCR index each of which is represented within one row in Table 6:

- First, the Hathaway success curriculum level comes from the WDE 950 transcript collection source as described above for traditional schools.
- Second, the best ACT score comes from the same sources described above for traditional schools.
- Third, the CTE completer evidence and assessment evidence are the same as those described above for traditional schools. The CTE *concentrator* status is achieved by the successful completion of 2 courses within a WDE recognized CTE pathway. Evidence of CTE concentrator status may come from the 950-course transcript collection or the Perkins reporting system.
- Fourth, WDE has evidence of grade 11 ACT WorkKeys performance for those students who choose to take this optional test.
- Fifth, there are three types of student performances that allow for credit. First, earning credit reflected on the 950-collected transcript for an internship or work study. Second, evidence provided by the district of an ASVAB, AFQT score of at least 45. Finally, college credit eligibility documented in the same manner as the described for the post-secondary readiness indicator.

WAEA alternative school **CCR target level cut-scores** were adopted by the State Board of Education on the recommendation of the PJP.

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

Credits 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 within four years. 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 1st of the school year until within 10 days of the end of the school year.

WAEA traditional school **grade nine credits earned** cut-scores:
- Meeting target = 88
- Exceeding target = 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, or 11. The school score was 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 1st of the school year until within 10 days of the end of the school year.

WAEA alternative school **grades nine, ten, and eleven credits earned** cut-scores:
- Meeting target = 67
- Exceeding target = 83

Student Climate Survey for Alternative Schools

For the climate indicator, a 24-item student climate survey[17] is administered at the alternative schools each fall and each spring. The survey has three empirically defined domains.
- The *staff support and respect* domain has 12 item 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 score* on the survey is the mean of the domain scores. The school score on the climate survey is

---

[17]The survey items are included in the APPENDIX B.

the mean *total score* for all surveys completed at the school during both the fall and the spring combined.

The following item is included at the end of 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 is 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 (Engagement)

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 the 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.

Overall School Score for Engagement

In order to communicate the importance of Engagement as a valuable indicator to help support student achievement, any school that does not meet standards for SSP will have its final overall school performance rating reduced by one level.

AGGREGATION RULES FOR SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVELS

WAEA School Performance Ratings

Under WAEA, each school is assigned to one of four performance levels based upon the overall performance on the indicators. Under WAEA, a consolidated subgroup's performance at a school accounts for 80% or the school's equity indicator score. Beyond the contribution of the consolidated subgroup to a school's equity score, there is no requirement for target level or performance level scores for individual subgroups. As a result, each school receives a single school performance rating which represents the overall performance on all of the indicators. In order to receive a school performance level, a school serving grades 3 through 8 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 WAEA school performance ratings 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-scores on the school indicator scores for placing schools into target level categories were recommended to the State Board of Education by a PJP using a standard-setting process, which was based on 2017-18 school performance (i.e., baseline year). Once cut-scores are established, they are expected to remain in effect in future years unless and until the indicator changes in some significant way or there is evidence that the cut-scores are no longer meaningfully differentiating schools.

Traditional Schools Weighting. The overall school performance rating 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: .35 for achievement and .35 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 as illustrated in example 2 above.

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

Indicator Category	Specific Indicator	Weight
Academic Performance		**40%**
	Achievement	20%
	Growth	20%
Readiness		**40%**
	Extended Graduation	20%
	Postsecondary Readiness	15%
	Grade 9 Credit	5%
Overall Equity		**20%**
	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 identified 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*.

Alternative School Weights. The TAG recommended weights for computing a school weighted average indicator score for alternative schools are presented in Table 9. The alternative school model does not include category weights. When a school is missing some indicators, the missing weight(s) are redistributed proportionately among the remaining indicators.

Table 9. Indicator Weights for Computing Alternative School Weighted Average Indicator Scores.

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

The State Board of Education adopted the PJP recommended cut-scores for the weighted indicator scores.

WAEA school performance level cut-scores for **traditional grades three through eight schools** are:
- Partially Meets Expectations = 1.4
- Meets Expectations = 1.8
- Exceeds Expectations = 2.6

WAEA school performance level cut-scores for **traditional high schools** are:
- Partially Meets Expectations = 1.4
- Meets Expectations = 1.8
- Exceeds Expectations = 2.5

WAEA school performance level cut-scores for **alternative schools** are:
- Partially Meets Alternative School Expectations = 1.4
- Meets Alternative School Expectations = 1.7
- Exceeds Alternative School Expectations = 2.3

Schools Serving High Schools and Grades below High School. Traditional schools that serve students in high school grades and grades below high school 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, computing 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.

Alternative Schools Serving Grades Below High School. For alternative schools, when grades served are below high school grades, achievement, growth, and climate are measured in all grades. When the alternative school serving grades below high is not part of a high school, the weighted average indicator target level score is based upon these 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 are combined with the performance from the high school grades and one overall weighted average indicator target level score is produced for that school.

ESSA MEANINGFUL DIFFERENTIATION

ESSA requires meaningful differentiation of schools based on all accountability indicators as well as 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 is needed for the identification of schools for TSI and ATSI.

As described in previous sections of this manual, each school will receive one of three normative category scores on each ESSA indicator: 1 = *below average*, 2 = *average*, and 3 = *above average*. Because each indicator score was rounded to one decimal point, it was possible to assign very nearly one-third of the schools to each normative indicator category during the baseline year (2017-18). The cut-scores for category membership identified during the baseline year will be used in future years to assign schools to each normative category on each indicator[18]. Each school received indicator scores and an overall average category score for all students at the school and for each subgroup at the school that met the minimum *n.*

For subgroups 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. When cut-scores for a subgroup were higher than the cut-scores for overall school performance, the overall school performance cut-scores were applied to that subgroup instead of subgroup specific cut-scores. The cut-scores identified during the baseline year for subgroups will be applied in future years for each subgroup in order to identify average 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 meeting the minimum *n* at the school. Schools serving grades 3 through 8 must at least meet the minimum *n* on both the achievement and growth indicators in order to receive an AICS score for the school overall or for any subgroup 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 for the school overall or for any subgroup. Schools that do not meet these minimum indicator requirements for the school overall 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

---

[18] When there are changes to an indicator, or should cut-scores no longer function in a useful manner for meaningful differentiation on an indicator, it may be necessary to utilize a new baseline year to establish new indicator cut-scores.

equal weight. AICS scores ranged from 1.0 and 3.0. As such, the AICS 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
- Not Identified

There are three ways for a school to be identified for CSI. Two of the three ways apply to Title I schools only. First, for Title I schools only, CSI determination at a school is based upon the overall school performance of the school being in the bottom 5% of all Title I schools. Second, for all Wyoming high schools, not just Title I high schools, schools that graduate fewer than two-thirds of students in the four-year, on-time graduation rate cohort are identified as CSI. A final path to CSI identification, for Title I schools only, involves failure to improve the performance of a *low-performing subgroup* at a school identified as ATSI within four school years. When a low-performing subgroup at a school does not improve within four school years, that subgroup is considered to be a *chronically low performing subgroup.* Schools with a chronically low-performing subgroup(s) are identified as CSI.

For subgroup performance, schools with *consistently underperforming subgroups* are identified for TSI, and schools with *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 low-performing subgroups are not identified for either TSI or ATSI for any subgroups. School that do not meet criteria for CSI, TSI, or ATSI, are identified classified as *Not Identified*.

Timeline for CSI, ATSI, and TSI Identification. Initial CSI and ATSI identification occurred in 2018-19 and was based upon school performance during the prior, 2017-18, school year. The next CSI and ATSI identification will occur during the 2021-22 school year and will be based upon performance during the 2020-21 school year. This pattern repeats every third year.

Schools were first identified as **ATSI** in 2018-19 based upon their prior year performance. The exit criteria for ATSI schools is to have an average indicator category score above 1.0 for two consecutive years for the identified low-performing subgroup(s). Any low-performing subgroup at an ATSI school identified in 2018-19, that does not meet the exit criteria by the end of the 2021-22 school year, will have the low-performing subgroup designated as a chronically low-performing subgroup and the school will be identified as CSI during the 2022-23 school year on the basis of having a chronically low-performing subgroup.

Schools were first identified as **TSI** in 2018-19 on the basis of having a subgroup or subgroups designated as consistently underperforming based upon their performance during the 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years. Schools may be identified as TSI each school year based upon the performance of a having a consistently underperforming subgroup. A consistently underperforming subgroup is a subgroup that has been designated as underperforming during the two prior school years.

CSI Identification Procedure. Schools will next be identified as **CSI** in 2021-22 based upon performance during the 2020-21 school year.

- Title I schools with the lowest performance on the ESSA school accountability indicators are identified as follows.
    - Schools with AICS scores of 1.0 are eligible for CSI identification. These schools are below average on all indicators.
    - The indicator scores at these schools on the achievement and growth are averaged. The schools with the lowest average achievement and growth scores from this group of schools are identified for CSI.
    - The number of schools identified for CSI is determined by computing how many schools constitute 5% of the total number of Title I schools.
- In addition, any Wyoming high school graduating less than two-thirds of their four-year, on-time cohort during the 2020-21 school year will be identified as CSI during the 2021-22 school year.
- Schools identified as ATSI in 2018-19 due to one or more low-performing subgroups may be identified for CSI on the basis of having a chronically low-performing subgroup during the 2022-23 school year if they do not meet the exit criteria for their low-performing subgroup by the end of the 2021-22 school year.

CSI Exit Criteria.

- Title I Schools identified for CSI due to low performance on the ESSA school accountability indicators may *exit* CSI 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 of the students in the four-year, on-time graduation cohort for 2 years in a row.
- A school identified as ATSI because of a low-performing subgroup may exit ATSI by having an AICS score greater than 1.0 for two consecutive school years. When low-performing subgroups do not meet the exit criterion within four years, the subgroup becomes a chronically low-performing subgroup. When a school has a chronically low-performing subgroup, the school is identified for CSI. This school may exit CSI when the chronically low-performing subgroup has an AICS above 1.0 for two consecutive school years.

Each year after a school's identification into one of these categories, the school will receive either a "Yes" or "No" in a field labeled MET_CSI_EXIT_TARGET_YR1. A year after a school has met the exit target in year one, the school will receive either a "Yes" or "No" in a field labeled MET_CSI_EXIT_TARGET_YR2. CSI schools that have not received a "Yes" in the MET_CSI_EXIT_TARGET_YR1 in the prior year will receive an "N/A" in the MET_CSI_EXIT_TARGET_YR2. When a school receives a "Yes" in MET_CSI_EXIT_TARGET_YR2, the school also received a "Yes" in a third field labeled MET_CSI_EXIT_CRITERION.

This same approach can be used for ATSI and TSI.

For CSI, some schools are identified for (1) being among the lowest-performing Title I schools, (2) having a graduation rate lower than 67%, or (3) both.

For schools in the third category to receive a "Yes" in the MET_CSI_EXIT_TARGET_YR1 or the MET_CSI_EXIT_TARGET_YR2 fields, the school must meet the exit targets for *both* the lowest-performing Title I schools and having graduation rates lower than 67% in order to receive a "Yes" in either of the MET TARGET fields.

Schools that are identified for CSI, ATSI, or TSI will receive a "Yes" in the meets exit target fields for years in which they do not meet the minimum *n*.

ATSI Identification and Exit Criteria. Schools were first identified for ATSI during the 2018-19 school year based upon subgroup performance during the 2017-18 school year. Schools are identified for ATSI every third year. As a result, schools will next be identified for ATSI in 2021-22 based upon having a low-performing subgroup during the 2020-21 school year.

In order for a subgroup at a school to be designated as a low-performing subgroup, two conditions must be present.

- First, the subgroup at the school must have an average indicator category score of 1.0.
- Second, the subgroup must have an average achievement and growth score that is below that of the All Student group at the lowest-performing Title I school.

Schools identified for ATSI may *exit* this designation by improving the subgroup AICS for two years in a row.

TSI Identification and Exit Criteria. 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 one that has been identified as underperforming for two consecutive school years. Underperforming subgroups are defined as follows:

- Subgroups at a school may be identified as underperforming each school year. Only subgroups with AICS scores of 1.0 are eligible to be considered underperforming.
- Up to 10% of the subgroups with ESSA scores (i.e., subgroups where the minimum *n* was met) may be identified as underperforming.
    - When fewer than 10% of schools with a particular subgroup have AICS scores of 1.0 for that subgroup, the subgroups at all of the schools with AICS scores of 1.0 are designated as underperforming.
    - For other subgroups, more than 10% of schools with the subgroup may have AICS scores for the subgroup of 1.0. For these subgroups, 10% of schools with the subgroup will have the subgroup designated as underperforming. The underperforming subgroups will be those with the lowest average growth and achievement scores for that subgroup.

- In order for the subgroup to be designated as *consistently* underperforming, the subgroup must qualify as underperforming for two consecutive school years. A school with a consistently underperforming subgroup is identified as TSI.
  - Identification of a subgroup as underperforming is an annual determination.
  - Identification of a subgroup as consistently underperforming is based upon being designated as underperforming for two consecutive school years.
  - A school where a subgroup is consistently underperforming is identified as TSI for that subgroup.

Schools were identified for TSI for the 2018-19 school year based upon subgroup performance during both the 2016-17[19] and the 2017-18 school years. Schools may be identified as TSI for more than one subgroup.

Once identified for TSI, the school may exit TSI status when the subgroup has an AICS above 1.0 for two consecutive school years.

Breaks due to not Meeting Minimum *n*. Schools identified as CSI, ATSI, and/or TSI may not meet the minimum *n* during a subsequent school year prior to having met the exit criteria. Whenever a school is CSI, ATSI, or TSI, and the school does not meet the minimum *n* in a year prior to meeting the exit criteria, there is an absence of evidence that they did not meet the exit criteria and, therefore, the school will be treated as if they had an AICS above 1.0 during that year.

PARTICIPATION RATE

Participation Rate on State Achievement Test. Both WAEA and ESSA include a 95% participation rate requirement on the state achievement test. Two participation calculations are applied to each school. First, participation calculations are computed for *all* students enrolled in the school during the testing window, including all full academic year (FAY) students. Second, participation calculations are computed for all FAY students at a school (i.e., with non-FAY students excluded).

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 who did not test. When the non-participation of one student yields a participation rate below 95%, as it did in this illustration, using a simple participation rate would result in the school being held to a participation rate requirement of 100%. This example illustrates a problem with the use of a simple participation rate. This problem will be addressed using the *one additional non-participant rule*.

---

[19] 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 the proficient cut-scores on the 2017-18 achievement test (WY-TOPP). For grades 9 and 10 this was done using the 2016-17 Wyoming Scale Scores on the Aspire tests.

In order to ensure that no school is held to a simple participation rate greater than the 95%, the one additional non-participant rule will be applied. A table is presented in APPENDIX C that shows the number of students permitted to not test for every *n* size between 10 and 100. Even though the table in APPENDIX C only shows *n* sizes between 10 and 100, the one additional student rule is applied when appropriate even for *n* sizes above 100.

In the above example where 10 students were expected to test, use of a simple participation rate, without the one additional non-participant rule, would have resulted in the school being held to an actual participation rate requirement of 100%. In that situation, the school is allowed one additional non-participant. Since the school had only one non-participant, the school met the participation rate requirement and no penalty for non-participation would be applied. The school had a simple participation rate of 90%, but the school met the participation requirement because it was allowed one additional non-participant. As a result, the school was not held to a 100% participation rate requirement. 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 95% 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 FAY 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. The denominator at this school when the percent proficient is computed would be at least 18.

If there were fewer than 18 test scores (e.g., just 16 test scores because 2 students did not test), the achievement calculation (i.e., percent proficient) would still be based upon the 18 expected tests. 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 were 10 students with just 17 tests, because one student took a reading test but not a math test, the expected tests would still be 18 and the percent proficient at this school would be 58.8%.

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.

With participation rates computed for both *all enrolled students* and *all FAY students*, there are three patterns of not meeting the 95% participation rate requirement. A school may meet the 95% participation rate requirement for:

1. neither *all enrolled students* nor *all FAY students*,
2. *all enrolled students* but not for *all FAY students*, or
3. *all FAY students* but not *all enrolled students*.

When a school does not meet the 95% participation rate requirement for *all FAY students* (i.e., patterns 1 and 2 above), the only consequence is to add non-tested student(s) to the denominator when calculating the school percent proficient score. This, in effect, results in some non-tested students being counted as if they tested and were not proficient. When *all enrolled students* do not meet the 95% participation requirement but *all FAY students* meet the 95% participation requirement (i.e., pattern 3 above), there is no effect on the school achievement score since only FAY students are included in the achievement score. Because participation rate is required for all enrolled students, not just all FAY students, the consequence for pattern 3 will be a deduction of 0.1 points from the school's AICS for ESSA accountability and 0.1 points will be deducted from the weighted average indicator score for WAEA accountability for each 5% increment the school is below the 95% participation criterion for *all enrolled students*. This consequence is not applied under pattern 1 since the school already had the consequence that applies when a school does not meet the 95% participation rate requirement for the FAY students.

Participation Rate on the ACCESS 2.0. There is a 95% participation rate requirement for active EL students on the ACCESS 2.0 test. All identified EL students, including EL students for whom parents are refusing services, are required to take the ACCESS 2.0 test during the testing window each school year. This includes both FAY EL students and EL students who are not FAY.

The participation rate procedures for EL students will generally mirror the participation rate procedures for achievement testing on the state test. The participation rate determination for EL students will include the *one additional non-participant rule,* and the table in APPENDIX B is applicable to the EL participation rate determinations. A school may meet the 95% participation rate requirement for:

1. neither *all enrolled students* nor *all FAY students*,
2. *all enrolled students* but not for *all FAY students*, or
3. *all FAY students* but not *all enrolled students*.

Beginning in the 2019-20 school year, when a school does not meet the 95% participation rate requirement for FAY EL students (i.e., patterns 1 and 2 above), the non-tested FAY student(s) in excess of the 5% allowed, were added to both the numerator and the denominator when calculating the school percent of EL students meeting their annual target for English proficiency progress. This, in effect, results in some non-tested students being counted as if they tested and did not meet the English proficiency progress target. When all enrolled EL students do not meet the 95% participation requirement, but all FAY students meet the 95% participation requirement (i.e., pattern 3 above) there is no consequence for the school.

MINIMUM *n* AND LOOKBACKS

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. Schools with grades 3 through 8, must have target levels on both the achievement and the growth indicators in order to receive a school performance rating. High schools must have target levels on both the achievement indicator and the graduation indicator in order to receive a school performance rating. Additionally, both 3 through 8 and high schools must have at least 10 students in the consolidated subgroup (i.e., with achievement scores in the bottom 25% on the prior year's state test) in order to receive a target level for the equity indicator.

Schools without a school performance rating will be assigned to a small school review process.

Note. For high schools, no growth scores were computed for grade 9 prior to the 2017-18 school year. Therefore, lookbacks could only go back one year for grade 9 in 2018-19.

Lookbacks for Achievement

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 applied 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 had 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 both the ESSA and WAEA traditional school models, the equipercentile links were established for the proficient cut-score only. For the WAEA 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 10 presents the cut-scores identified for the prior year tests that were comparable to the current year performance level cut-scores.

Table 10. 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

FULL ACADEMIC YEAR (FAY)

When computing school scores, only FAY students are included. For computation of school performance levels, 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 the WY-TOPP testing window and the ACCESS 2.0 testing window. Students not identified as FAY students will be excluded from school performance level computations. For the credit-earning and post-secondary readiness indicators, FAY for both traditional and alternative schools 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.

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 fewer than ten days.

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

Performance scores of students who are primarily enrolled in one school but take one or more courses in another school are attributed to the school in which the student is primarily enrolled.

LONG-TERM GOALS AND INTERIM TARGETS

Both ESSA and WAEA required the state to establish long-term goals with interim targets for overall school performance and for subgroup performance. School performance on the interim targets for the long-term goals 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 of the accountability 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 based on the recommendations of the Accountability Advisory Committee[20]. 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.

Establishment of 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 established by the state based upon data analysis and were vetted with the PJP and State Board of Education.

Wyoming implemented a new state test for math achievement and ELA achievement during the 2017-18 school year. The proposed long-term goals submitted and approved by the U.S. Department of Education[21] as a part of the Wyoming state ESSA plan were no longer relevant since they were based upon the prior state test that is no longer in use. Therefore, upon obtaining the results of the new 2017-18 state assessment (i.e., the WY-TOPP), long-term goals were revised by applying the parameters to the 2017-18 results for math achievement and ELA 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 the ELP long-term goals. As such, a new baseline year was established for these three goal areas. The long-term goal for the four-year, on-time graduation rate remained the same.

---

[20] Advisory Committee Chair, Judy Catchpole, report drafted by S. Marion, J. Martineau, & Thanos Patelis from the Center for Assessment (December 31, 2016).

[21] For ELP, the scale scores used for standard setting had not been finalized at the time that state plan goal setting was performed.

The parameters and business rules reported here were used to derive the long-term goals in the state plan, including the graduation rate long-term goal, and were also used with baseline 2017-18 WY-TOPP and ELP data to produce the long-term goals for the remaining three goal areas. 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 as follows:
    a. The acceptable long-term goal for overall school performance was determined to be the performance of the school with a school score at the 65th percentile rank during the baseline year.
    b. The acceptable long-term goal for subgroups during the baseline year was determined to be the performance of the school at the 80th percentile for the school score on that indicator[22]. 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. A low-performing school was the school with overall school performance at the 15th percentile rank during the baseline year. The same parameter was used for each subgroup on each indicator.
    b. 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.
5. The results of steps 3 and 4 were used to inform judgments about the term that was appropriate for the long-term goals.
    a. The parameter for the term of the long-term goal was 15 years.
    b. 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.
    c. 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 is all schools will perform as well as or better than the school with an indicator score at the 65th percentile rank during the baseline year.
- For subgroups, the long-term goals were established as follows:

---

[22] The frequency distributions were smoothed using regression and the percentile ranks utilized were those from the smoothed distribution.

- The goal for all schools is all schools with the subgroup will perform as well or better than the school with a subgroup indicator score at the 80th percentile rank for that subgroup during the baseline year – or –
    - The long-term goal is a value higher than the 80th percentile rank from the baseline year when a higher goal is needed to ensure that the subgroup gap decreases by 30% by the end of the goal term – or –
    - When fewer than 10% of Wyoming schools have a subgroup, the long-term goal for that subgroup is the score that represents a 30% decrease in the gap from the baseline to the end of the goal term (percentile ranks based upon frequency distributions with so few schools could be unreliable) – or –
    - When the baseline year gap between the subgroup and the all student group is less than 5% or positive (i.e., the subgroup performed above the all student group), and there are more than 10 schools that meet the minimum *n,* the long-term goal is the 65th percentile rank for the subgroup from the baseline year – or –
    - When the baseline year gap between the subgroup and the all student group is less 5% or positive, and there are fewer than 10 schools with the subgroup, the subgroup goal is the all student goal and minus the baseline year gap (this ensures the subgroup does not lose ground on the all student goal over time) – or –
    - If there are fewer than 10 schools, but the gap is greater than 5%, the long-term goal is based upon a 30% gap reduction (percentile ranks based upon frequency distributions with so few schools could be unreliable) – or –
- When there are no schools that meet the minimum *n* for a subgroup, the statewide student level gap is measured and the long-term goal is 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 15th 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 is 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, ELA 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, ELA, and ELP indicators

Interim Target Computation for *Schools <u>below</u> the Long-Term Goal during the Baseline Year* is illustrated in Table 11.

- 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 11.
- 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 11. 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 Progress	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 <u>above</u> 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).

Baseline Years for Small Schools. The long-term goals were set using performance data from the "baseline-year students" only and did not include lookbacks for schools that did not meet the minimum *n* of 10. School performance for each school each year will be based upon the current year data without lookbacks as well. The first year that a school meets the minimum *n* will

become the baseline year for that school. The same 15-year term for meeting the long-term goal will apply to all schools regardless of when a school first meets the minimum *n* (i.e., a school's baseline year)*.* Specifically, if a school first meets the minimum *n* in Year 3, the school will be in Year 3 of the long-term goal term and the Year 4 interim target increase will apply that school just as it will to all other schools. For long-term goal reporting, schools will receive an N/A for any year in which they do not meet the minimum *n.* The *n* count will be reported for all years. When schools meet the minimum *n* one year and not the following year, but then meet the minimum *n* again in a third year, the baseline year does not change for the school.

Identified Long-Term Goals. The baseline year for the long-term goal for the four-year, on-time graduation rate is the 2015-16 school year. Graduation is a lagged indicator so that summer graduates can be included in the graduation year. Therefore, the baseline accountability year for the graduation rate is the 2016-17 school year. The 2017-18 accountability year is Year 2 for the graduation rate indicator.

The other three indicators with long-term goals are mathematics achievement, ELA, and English language proficiency. None of these indicators are lagged. The baseline accountability year for these three indicators is the 2017-18 school year. The long-term goals for all students at a school and for each subgroup are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. ESSA Long-Term Goals.

	4YR Grad Rate	Grade 3-8 Math	Grade 3-8 English and Language Arts	High School Math	High School English and Language Arts	ELP Progress
All Students	88	57	59	47	53	
Asian	93	64	66	60	59	
Black	89	46	57	35	43	
English Learner*	81	43	43	26	28	
Free or Reduced Lunch	88	53	55	41	48	
Hispanic	86	53	54	37	45	
IEP	78	35	37	26	30	
Native American	69	34	37	30	38	
Pacific Islander	90	51	54	29	34	
Two or More Races	84	65	62	43	51	
White	90	61	62	51	55	
Active English Learner						53[23]

*Active ELs and English proficient ELs in years 1 through 4 of monitoring.

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 do not have data for the growth or equity indicators. For the purpose of accountability, these schools are "paired" with the school their students feed

---

[23] The ELP long-term goal was reset in 2018-19 using the specified goal setting parameters because of changes to the indicator. Each school's score in 2018-19 is the school's interim target for that year. 2018-19 will remain year 2 of the 15 year term for the ELP long-term goal.

into after grade three. 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 ratings. In other words, the paired schools are treated as a single school for accountability calculations and both schools are assigned the same performance rating.

In Wyoming, there are schools with grade configurations that do not include any tested grade. For example, LEAs organize 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 rating for the 3-5 school is also applied to the K-2 school. In these situations, collaboration across buildings is important to the success of the students involved.

Table 13 is a list of Wyoming schools that are paired for school accountability. This table is updated each year.

Table 13. Schools Paired for School Accountability.

School ID	School Name	Grades Served	Accountability Related School	Grades Served	School ID
0501002	Douglas Primary School	K-1	Douglas Upper Elementary	4-5	0501010
0501013	Douglas Intermediate	2-3			
0502004	Grant Elementary	K-3	Glenrock Intermediate	4-6	0502007
0701008	Gannett Peak Elementary	2-3	Baldwin Creek Elementary	4-5	0701009
0706001	Crowheart Elementary	K-3	Wind River Elementary	K-5	0706002
0725002	Ashgrove Elementary School	1-3	Rendezvous Elementary	4-5	0725007
0725009	Aspen Early Learning Center	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
1801001	Bondurant Elementary	K-3	Pinedale Elementary	K-5	1801002
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.

	Meets Target Cutscore	Exceeds Target Cutscore
All Students - Achievement	47.7	58.6
All Students - Growth	47.1	54.5
All Students - Equity	47.5	56.2
All Students - ELP	27.7	50.0
All Students - Graduation Rate	82.3	90.3
All Students - Post-Secondary Readiness	41.8	65.4
Asian - Achievement	53.3	75.0
Asian - Growth	50.9	57.5
Asian - Equity	47.5	56.2
Asian - ELP	27.7	50.0
Asian - Graduation Rate	87	91.3
Asian - Post-Secondary Readiness	54.9	62.6
Black - Achievement	32.9	45.7
Black - Growth	43.3	48.6
Black - Equity	38.9	44.8
Black - ELP	27.7	50.0
Black - Graduation Rate	69.2	80
Black - Post-Secondary Readiness	31.1	41.7
ELL - Achievement	20.8	39.5
ELL - Growth	45.3	55.3
ELL - Equity	45.6	52.5
ELL - ELP	27.7	50.0
ELL - Graduation Rate	68.4	80.6
ELL - Post-Secondary Readiness	7.3	20.0
Lunch Eligible - Achievement	36.0	47.6
Lunch Eligible - Growth	45.5	52.0
Lunch Eligible - Equity	45.3	52.3
Lunch Eligible - ELP	27.2	50.0
Lunch Eligible - Graduation Rate	71.5	84.2
Lunch Eligible - Post-Secondary Readiness	28.8	54.5
Hispanic - Achievement	35.0	46.2
Hispanic - Growth	46.2	53.8
Hispanic - Equity	46.2	55.2
Hispanic - ELP	27.7	50.0
Hispanic - Graduation Rate	73.6	88.7
Hispanic - Post-Secondary Readiness	31.5	55.8
IEP - Achievement	14.5	24.0
IEP - Growth	42.5	49.5
IEP - Equity	43.1	50.3
IEP - ELP	6.3	41.2
IEP - Graduation Rate	56.5	72.7
IEP - Post-Secondary Readiness	9.4	17.2
Native American - Achievement	22.2	35.0

Native American - Growth	44.2	51.2
Native American - Equity	43.4	49.2
Native American - ELP	5.0	23.2
Native American - Graduation Rate	54.1	64.0
Native American - Post-Secondary Readiness	5.5	18.9
Pacific Islander - Achievement		
Pacific Islander - Growth		
Pacific Islander - Equity		
Pacific Islander - ELP		
Pacific Islander - Graduation Rate		
Pacific Islander - Post-Secondary Readiness		
Two or More Races - Achievement	42.3	55.9
Two or More Races - Growth	47.9	52.5
Two or More Races - Equity	45.2	56.8
Two or More Races - ELP	27.7	50.0
Two or More Races - Graduation Rate	67.4	84.4
Two or More Races - Post-Secondary Readiness	33	63
White - Achievement	50.0	61.4
White - Growth	47.7	54.4
White - Equity	48.2	55.8
White - ELP	27.7	50.0
White - Graduation Rate	82.8	91.7
White - Post-Secondary Readiness	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.

APPENDIX C

Participation One Additional Non-Participant Rule:
How it Plays Out

No school is held to a participation rate above 95%. The table below shows that schools with an *n* of 10 through 19 would be held to an actual participation rate of 100% if one student did not test. By allowing these schools to have ONE ADDITIONAL STUDENT not test, they are *not* held to a participation rate above 95%. Schools with *n* sizes from 10 through 20 are permitted to have one non-tested student and still meet the 95% participation rate requirement.

- An n size of 20 is the highest *n* size for which 1 non-participant is permitted.
- Beginning with an n size of 21 up through and *n* size of 40, 2 non-participants are permitted.

The table below shows that there are five *n* sizes highlighted in yellow up through an *n* size of 100 at which the actual participation rate is 95%.

n	*n*.95	Actual Participation Rate	N of Students Permitted to Not Test
10	9.5	90	1
11	10.45	90.91	1
12	11.4	91.67	1
13	12.35	92.31	1
14	13.3	92.86	1
15	14.25	93.33	1
16	15.2	93.75	1
17	16.15	94.12	1
18	17.1	94.44	1
19	18.05	94.74	1
20	19	95	1
21	19.95	90.48	2
22	20.9	90.91	2
23	21.85	91.3	2
24	22.8	91.67	2
25	23.75	92	2
26	24.7	92.31	2
27	25.65	92.59	2
28	26.6	92.86	2
29	27.55	93.1	2
30	28.5	93.33	2
31	29.45	93.55	2
32	30.4	93.75	2
33	31.35	93.94	2
34	32.3	94.12	2
35	33.25	94.29	2
36	34.2	94.44	2
37	35.15	94.59	2

38	36.1	94.74	2
39	37.05	94.87	2
	38	95	2
	38.95	92.68	3
	39.9	92.86	3
	40.85	93.02	3
	41.8	93.18	3
	42.75	93.33	3
	43.7	93.48	3
	44.65	93.62	3
	45.6	93.75	3
	46.55	93.88	3
	47.5	94	3
	48.45	94.12	3
	49.4	94.23	3
	50.35	94.34	3
	51.3	94.44	3
	52.25	94.55	3
	53.2	94.64	3
	54.15	94.74	3
	55.1	94.83	3
	56.05	94.92	3
	57	95	3
	57.95	93.44	4
	58.9	93.55	4
	59.85	93.65	4
	60.8	93.75	4
	61.75	93.85	4
	62.7	93.94	4
	63.65	94.03	4
	64.6	94.12	4
	65.55	94.2	4
	66.5	94.29	4
	67.45	94.37	4
	68.4	94.44	4
	69.35	94.52	4
	70.3	94.59	4
	71.25	94.67	4
	72.2	94.74	4
	73.15	94.81	4
	74.1	94.87	4
	75.05	94.94	4
	76	95	4
	76.95	93.83	5
	77.9	93.9	5
	78.85	93.98	5
	79.8	94.05	5
	80.75	94.12	5
	81.7	94.19	5

	82.65	94.25	5
	83.6	94.32	5
	84.55	94.38	5
	85.5	94.44	5
	86.45	94.51	5
	87.4	94.57	5
	88.35	94.62	5
	89.3	94.68	5
	90.25	94.74	5
	91.2	94.79	5
	92.15	94.85	5
	93.1	94.9	5
	94.05	94.95	5
	95	95	5