

WYOMING SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY
2017 WYOMING SCHOOL PERFORMANCE RATING MODEL
IMPLEMENTATION HANDBOOK

(July 12, 2017)

The Wyoming School Accountability was piloted following the 2012-13 school year. Operational implementation began following the 2013-14 school year. The Wyoming Accountability in Education Act (WAEA) established a requirement to develop procedures for assigning all Wyoming public schools to one of four performance level categories: *Exceeding Expectations*, *Meeting Expectations*, *Partially Meeting Expectations* and *Not Meeting Expectations*. Each school's performance level determination was based upon the school's performance on various indicators that were prescribed by statute. The methodology for evaluating each schools performance on the indicators was established in accordance with the January, 2012, *Education Accountability Report*¹. A professional judgment panel (PJP) composed of Wyoming stakeholders as prescribed by statute engaged in a standard setting process to establish cut-points and other parameters for a school performance rating model. This handbook describes the 2017 operational implementation of Wyoming School Accountability.

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

Per Enrolled Act No. 64, Section 1, of the sixty-third legislature of the State of Wyoming, alternative schools are receiving informational reporting under WAEA and they are exempt from target level and school performance level determinations.

INDICATOR CATEGORIES

The student assessment used in grades three through eight is the Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students (PAWS) which measured math and reading skills in grades three through eight and science in grades four and eight. The assessments used in high school were from the ACT suite of tests. Specifically the Aspire test was administered in grade nine and ten and the ACT test was administered in grade 11. Because of the different measures and different statutory requirements there are two accountability models; one for schools serving grades three through eight and one for high schools.

- Indicators for Schools that have Grades Three through Grade Eight
 - Achievement
 - Growth
 - Equity
- Indicators for High School

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

- Academic Performance
 - Achievement
 - Growth
 - Equity
- Overall Readiness
 - Graduation
 - Additional Readiness
 - Tested Readiness
 - Grade Nine Credits Earned
 - Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility

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

INDICATORS AND SCORES FOR GRADES THREE THROUGH EIGHT

ACHIEVEMENT

There is one overall *school achievement score* for each school that represents student performance on the state assessment in all tested grades and content areas at each school that serves students in grades three through eight.

- The Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students (PAWS)
 - Reading in grades 3 through 8
 - Math in grades 3 through 8
 - Science in grades 4 and 8

The achievement indicator score for schools was the percent of proficient or above test scores in all three tested content areas on the PAWS. An illustration of how school achievement scores were computed is presented in Table 1. Assume the hypothetical school represented in Table 1 was an elementary school with grades kindergarten through six with 20 students per grade level. Science would only be tested in grade 4 at this school.

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

Content	Count of Tested Students	Count of Proficient Students	School Achievement Score
Math	80	65	137/180 = 76.1%
Reading	80	60	
Science	20	12	
Column Totals	180	137	

The school achievement score (i.e., the total percent proficient on all achievement tests) is used for assigning schools serving grades three through eight to one of three target levels for achievement using the cut-points established by the PJP.

Cut points for grade three through eight achievement:

- Meets Target = 52
- Exceeds Target = 69

GROWTH

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

The model implemented to measure growth produces student growth percentiles² (SGPs). SGPs indicated how an individual student's growth compared with that of all Wyoming public school students³ from that particular year in the same grade who had similar math/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 her academic peers. This measure of growth is independent of the prior achievement level performance of students⁴. 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 a student's test scores in past years were, they still may earn any of the SGPs from 1 to 99 depending upon how the changes in their scaled scores compare to that of their academic peers.

Students Included in the Growth Modeling Data Set. Only Wyoming public school students are included in the SGP norm cohort for a given year. The data set included the current year public school students with all of their prior public school test scores.

School Level Growth. The school growth score is the median 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 combined and the SGP that 50% of SGPs fall below and 50% of SGPs fall above is the MGP.

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

³ Some private school and home school students take the PAWS test. If these students are not enrolled in a public school at the time of the testing, their score will not be included in the norm sample.

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

MGPs at each school are further be placed into one of three target levels: (a) below target, (b) meets target and (c) exceeds target. The PJP established the following cut-points for the MGPs in September 2013 that separated these three categories from one another. The same cut points were used again in 2014.

Cut points for grades four through eight growth:

- Meets Target = 45
- Exceeding Target = 60

EQUITY

An important goal of WAEA is to “minimize achievement gaps” [Wyoming Statute 21-2-204(b)(vi)]. The equity indicator is designed to encourage schools to do as well as possible with the students who are most at risk. The school equity score was based upon the growth in math and reading of students identified as belonging to a consolidated subgroup at the school.

Students with low performance on the PAWS math or reading test in the prior school year are assigned to the consolidated subgroup. Students were in the consolidated subgroup for only the subject area tests where they met the score criterion. 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.

The 2014 PAWS served as a baseline year and the scale scores from this baseline year in reading and math that were at the 23rd percentile⁵ were identified and are presented in Table 2. These scale scores are the cut-points in reading and math that are used for assigning students to the consolidated subgroup. When reading or math test performance for a student was below the cut-points presented in Table 2, the student was placed into the consolidated subgroup.

Table 2. PAWS Scale Score Cut-Points for Consolidated Subgroup Identification.

Grade	Math	Reading
3	566	567
4	602	586
5	620	596
6	642	602
7	655	618

Technical analyses performed after the 2014 WAEA school performance levels were established documented suitable stability of school equity scores across years when the equity score was based on the MGP of the consolidated subgroup⁶. Therefore, a school's score for equity is the median student growth percentile (MGP) for the school's consolidated subgroup students in reading and math combined and for all grades combined.

⁵ See the *2015 School Performance Rating Model Implementation Manual* for more information about the selection criteria for consolidated subgroup membership.

⁶ Flicek, M. (2015). *Evaluation of an equity indicator*. Prepared for the Wyoming Department of Education.

Cut points for grades four through eight equity

- Meets Target = 47
- Exceeds Target = 60

**GRADE THREE THROUGH EIGHT
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT**

The decision table in Table 3 is used to identify the performance level for each school serving students in grades three through eight. The decision table has a cell that represents all possible combinations of target levels on achievement, growth and equity. Each school’s pattern of the three target levels is represented by a cell in the decision table. Each cell in the table is associated with a specific performance level (i.e., exceeds expectations, meets expectations, partially meets expectations and does not meet expectations). The performance level associated with each cell in the decision tables were established by the PJP. The median of PJP member judgments for each cell on a second round of making judgments were used to identify the performance level associated with each cell.

Table 3. School Performance Level Decision Table for Schools with Grades Three through Eight with Achievement, Growth and Equity Target Levels.

		Achievement Below	Achievement Meeting	Achievement Exceeding
Equity Below	Growth Below	NOT	PARTIALLY	PARTIALLY
	Growth Meeting	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
	Growth Exceeding	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
Equity Meeting	Growth Below	PARTIALLY	PARTIALLY	MEETING
	Growth Meeting	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
	Growth Exceeding	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING
Equity Exceeding	Growth Below	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
	Growth Meeting	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING
	Growth Exceeding	PARTIALLY	EXCEEDING	EXCEEDING

Some schools do not have a consolidated subgroup that meets the minimum *n* criteria of ten students. These schools do not have an equity target level. When schools have target levels on achievement and growth but not on equity, the decision table in Table 4 is used for determining the school performance level. The PJP determined which performance levels were represented by each cell in the decision table.

Table 4. School Performance Level Decision Table for Schools with Grades Three through Eight without an Equity Target Level.

	Achievement Below	Achievement Meeting	Achievement Exceeding
Growth Below	NOT	PARTIALLY	MEETING
Growth Meeting	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING
Growth Exceeding	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING

INDICATORS AND SCORES FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

ACHIEVEMENT. There is one overall *school achievement score* for each high school that represents student performance on the subject area tests of the ACT in grade 11. The achievement tests used for high school state accountability in Wyoming is:

- The grade 11 ACT subject area tests of:
 - Reading
 - Mathematics
 - Science
 - Combined English/Writing

The achievement indicator score for schools is the percent of proficient or above test scores on these four subject area tests of the ACT in grade 11. The computation of the high school achievement indicator is similar to that presented in Table 1.

The school achievement score (i.e., the total percent proficient on the subject area tests) is used for assigning high schools to one of three target levels for achievement using cut points established by the PJP:

Cut points for high school achievement:

- Meets Target = 32
- Exceeds Target = 45

GROWTH. Student growth in mathematics and reading is measured in grades ten and eleven. Growth refers to the change in the achievement within students as they progress from year to year. In order to compute growth scores, students must have at least two consecutive years of mathematics scores for math growth and two consecutive years of reading scores for reading growth. Grade ten growth will be measured from the prior year Aspire test in grade nine to the current year Aspire test in grade ten. Grade eleven growth will be measured from the grade nine Explore test two years prior to the grade ten Aspire test one year prior to the current year grade eleven ACT test.

The traditional score scales on the ACT suite mathematics and reading tests are quite coarse and not well suited to the measurement of growth. ACT has provided Wyoming with student level parameters from a three parameter IRT that permitted Wyoming to construct a Wyoming Scale⁷ for the mathematics and reading subject area tests used for the grade eleven ACT test in the current year. On the Wyoming Scale a score of 150 is equivalent to proficient performance and the scales have a standard deviation of 20. The fit of the growth model for grade 11 is improved when the Wyoming scale is used. For the current year grade ten growth, the Aspire scale will be used. Growth is computed separately for mathematics and reading for students in grades ten and eleven.

The method used to measure growth in high school is the same method used in grades four through eight. As such, a growth model is implemented to produce SGPs. SGPs indicate how an individual student's growth compared with that of academic peers that come from all Wyoming public school students from that particular year in the same grade who had similar math/reading scores in previous years. The SGPs range from 1 to 99 and growth is independent of a student's prior achievement level. The data set included the current year public school students with all of their prior public school test scores.

The school level growth score for the high schools is the MGP for all reading and math SGPs at the school. MGPs at each school are further be placed into one of three target levels: (a) below target, (b) meets target and (c) exceeds target. The PJP established the following cut points for the MGPs used to assign school to the three target levels.

Cut points for the high school growth:

- Meets Target = 47
- Exceeding Target = 60

EQUITY 2017. High school equity is measured for students in grade eleven. A consolidated subgroup was established that consisted of all students with grade ten Aspire subject area test scores at or below 420 in mathematics (bottom 25% of students in 2016) or at or below 418 (bottom 26% of students in 2016) in reading. Students were in the consolidated subgroup for only the subject area where they met the score criterion. 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. The high school equity score was the MGP for mathematics and reading combined of the consolidated subgroup.

Cut points for the high school equity for 2016:

- Meets Target = 47
- Exceeding Target = 60

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE TARGET LEVEL. Each high school was placed into an overall target level for academic performance. There are three target levels: below target, meets target and exceeds target. To identify the school's target level for academic performance, the target levels assigned to them for achievement, growth and equity were entered into the decision

⁷ Wyoming Department of Education. (2014). 2014 Wyoming ACT Performance. <http://edu.wyoming.gov/download/assessments/WyomingACTScaleLV2updDec2014.pdf>

table in Table 5. The PJP determined which academic performance target level was associated with each cell in the decision table.

Some schools may not meet the minimum n requirement for equity. For example, the school may not meet the minimum n requirement for their consolidated subgroup even after two years of look backs were applied. These schools will not have a target level for equity. When schools have target levels for achievement and growth but do not have a target level for equity, the decision table in Table 6 is used for determining the school's performance level.

Table 5. Academic Performance Target Level Decision Table for Schools with Achievement, Growth and Equity Target Levels.

		Achievement Below	Achievement Meeting	Achievement Exceeding
Equity Below	Growth Below	BELOW	BELOW	MEETS
	Growth Meeting	BELOW	MEETS	MEETS
	Growth Exceeding	BELOW	MEETS	MEETS
Equity Meeting	Growth Below	BELOW	MEETS	MEETS
	Growth Meeting	MEETS	MEETS	MEETS
	Growth Exceeding	MEETS	MEETS	EXCEEDS
Equity Exceeding	Growth Below	BELOW	MEETS	MEETS
	Growth Meeting	MEETS	MEETS	EXCEEDS
	Growth Exceeding	MEETS	EXCEEDS	EXCEEDS

Table 6. Academic Performance Target Level Decision Table for High School without an Equity Target Level.

	Achievement Below	Achievement Meeting	Achievement Exceeding
Growth Below	BELOW	MEETS	MEETS
Growth Meeting	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS
Growth Exceeding	MEETS	MEETS	EXCEEDS

When a school had either an achievement target level or a growth target level but not both, the target level on the one indicator became their academic performance target level.

OVERALL READINESS

There are two categories of readiness indicators on which target levels are established. The first is graduation and the second is additional readiness. Additional readiness has three subparts, each of which is prescribed by state statute. The subparts for additional readiness include Hathaway scholarship eligibility level, grade nine credits earned and tested readiness.

GRADUATION. Schools have two pathways for earning a graduation target level. The first pathway is their *four year on-time graduation rate*. The four year on-time graduation rate is a measure of graduation rate for a cohort of students attending a school who entered grade nine

four years earlier. The student is included in the cohort for the last school that had an enrollment record for that student. Figure 1 illustrates computation of the four year on-time graduation rate.

The second pathway for earning a graduation target level is an *extended graduation rate*. Students included in the extended graduation cohort include all students in the four year on-time cohort plus any other student at the school that graduated during that same school year. Typically these will be five year, six year or seven year graduates. The one exception is early graduates whose four year on-time cohort will graduate in the following year. The graduation of these early graduates will be credited to the school during the year that their four year on-time cohort graduates. In all cases the extended graduation rate will equal or exceed the four year on-time cohort graduation rate.

Figure 1. Formula for Four Year On-Time Graduation Rate.

4 year adjusted cohort graduation rate =	$\frac{\text{Number of four year on-time cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma by the end of the graduation year}}{\text{Number of first-time 9}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders in the fall of the school year 4 years prior to the graduation year (starting year) plus students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die prior to the graduation year}}$
--	--

Cut points for high school graduation:

- Meets Target = 80
- Exceeds Target = 90

ADDITIONAL READINESS. In addition to graduation, three other readiness indicators were prescribed by statute. A school's performance on these indicators is combined into one overall score that is referred to as additional readiness. Additional readiness consists of Hathaway scholarship eligibility level, grade nine credits earned and tested readiness (i.e., based on composite scores on the grade nine Explore, the grade ten Plan, and the grade eleven ACT).

A *Hathaway scholarship level* for accountability was assigned to each student who graduated during the prior school year. This includes early graduates and four, five, six and seven year graduates. Each graduate was assigned to one of five Hathaway levels for accountability based primarily upon information on their transcript. This level may or may not be their true Hathaway scholarship eligibility since the true eligibility is determined by a Wyoming higher education provider based upon a review of student transcripts and other information.

The Hathaway eligibility level for accountability is based upon three criteria: (a) unweighted high school grade point average (GPA), (b) the best composite ACT score or Work Keys total score and (c) completion of the success curriculum at a particular level. These three eligibility criteria are considered in a conjunctive fashion to determine a student's Hathaway eligibility level. The student's scholarship level is the level associated with that one of the three eligibility

criteria where the student's performance was the lowest. The eligibility criteria are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility Levels and Criteria.

Criteria	Scholarship Level				
	Not Eligible	Provisional	Opportunity	Performance	Honors
Unweighted GPA	<2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.5
Minimum ACT*	<17**	17***	19	21	25
Success Curriculum Level	None	Provisional	Opportunity	Honors/Performance	

*ACT can be the student's best ACT score from the student's transcript or from the Wyoming census administration in grade 11.

**If there is a WorkKeys score it is less than 12.

***A WorkKeys score of 12 also qualifies for provisional level.

The Wyoming Department of Education collects student transcripts for all high school graduates. A student's unweighted GPA is obtained from the student's transcript. Graduates without transcripts and graduates without an unweighted GPA are assigned to the not eligible scholarship level for accountability. When the unweighted GPA was less than 3.0 but at or above 2.5 the opportunity scholarship level is assigned for that criteria.

The ACT composite score used for the Hathaway scholarship eligibility level is the best ACT composite score from the transcript or the composite score from the Wyoming census administration of the ACT to grade eleven students. The highest ACT composite score is used for accountability. If a student was not enrolled in a Wyoming school during the census administration date for their cohort and does not have an ACT score on their transcript, the student's Hathaway scholarship eligibility level for accountability will be based upon their unweighted GPA and their success curriculum level only.

WorkKeys scores from a student's transcript are also considered. When the WorkKeys score is 12 or higher, the student can be placed at the provisional level. When a student has both a WorkKeys score and an ACT composite score, the student's level on the test score criterion is the higher of the levels represented by those measures.

Finally, a required field for the transcript collection is a success curriculum level that is assigned by the high school's analyses of the student's high school course of study and performance in classes. This school determined success curriculum level that appears on the transcript is used as the success curriculum level for accountability.

Once a student's Hathaway scholarship eligibility level for accountability is established, that level is converted to an index value for the purpose of computing an additional readiness score for the school. The index points associated with each Hathaway scholarship eligibility level are presented in Table 8. The school's score for the Hathaway scholarship eligibility level is the average of the index points for all prior year graduates from the school.

Table 8. Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility Index.

Student Eligibility Level	Points*
Level 5: Honors	100
Level 4: Performance	90
Level 3: Opportunity	80
Level 2: Provisional	70
Level 1: Not Eligible	40

*Index point values were assigned by the PJP.

The *grade nine credit* indicator is a lagged indicator. The school's grade nine credit score is the percent of prior year first time grade nine students who earned one fourth of the credits required to graduate from the designated high school. Use of prior year grade nine credits permits the inclusion of grade nine credits earned during the summer session. The Wyoming Department of Education collects transcripts from the schools for all first time grade nine students. Grade nine credits are obtained from the student transcripts.

A grade nine credit score is assigned to each high school. Grade nine may or may not be part of the grade configuration for all Wyoming high schools. Some Wyoming high schools serve students in grades ten through twelve even though most Wyoming high schools presently serve students in grades nine through twelve. Grade nine credits earned is an indicator for all high schools, regardless of the grade configuration of the school. The high schools that serve grades ten through twelve are paired with the schools that feed grade nine students to them for this indicator.

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

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

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

Tested readiness is the third component of additional readiness. Tested readiness has been based upon index scores derived from student composite scores on the ACT Explore test in grade 9, the ACT Plan test in grade 10 and the ACT test in grade 11. Table 10 below is from the *2015 Implementation Manual*. Table 10 shows how index points were assigned to schools based upon student performance on the ACT tests. In 2016, the ACT Explore and Plan tests are no longer available from the contractor for use. These tests have been replaced by grade specific version of the ACT Aspire tests.

Table 10. Initial Tested Readiness Score Ranges and Index Point Values.

Wyoming Tested Readiness Levels	Composite Score Ranges			Index Points*
	ACT Explore Grade 9	ACT Plan Grade 10	ACT Test Grade 11	
Level 4	>20	>21	>24	100
Level 3	18-20	19-21	21-24	80
Level 2	15-17	16-18	17-20	50
Level 1	<15	<15	<17	20

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

The process of identifying index score ranges on the grade 9 Aspire test and grade 10 Aspire test was as follows:

- The composite scores from the 2016 grade 11 ACT, grade 10 Aspire and grade 9 Aspire tests for all Wyoming students served as baseline scores to be used for establishing the new tested readiness index.
- The previously used cut-points for the grade 11 ACT were applied to the 2016 results and the percentage of students in each of the four tested readiness index levels was determined.

- Cumulative frequency distributions were computed for the grade 10 Aspire and separately for the grade 9 Aspire.
- Score ranges were identified that resulted in the proportion of students within each tested readiness level in grades 9 and 10 matched those obtained for the Grade 11 ACT test as closely as possible.
- Table 11 shows the composite score ranges for each of the three grades. The grade 11 score ranges and index point values remained unchanged (i.e., identical to those in Table 10).

Table 11. New Tested Readiness Score Ranges and Index Point Values.

Wyoming Tested Readiness Levels	Composite Score Ranges			Index Points*
	ACT Aspire Grade 9	ACT Aspire Grade 10	ACT Test Grade 11	
Level 4	>432	>434	>24	100
Level 3	427-432	429-434	21-24	80
Level 2	420-426	422-428	17-20	50
Level 1	<420	<422	<17	20

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

These new cut-points were applied to the 2016 test results for grades 9 through 11. Table 12 shows the proportion of students within each tested readiness level on each of the three tests when the score ranges in Table 11 were applied.

Table 12. Proportion of All Wyoming Students at each Tested Readiness Level in 2016.

Wyoming Tested Readiness Levels	Composite Score Ranges			Index Points*
	ACT Aspire Grade 9	ACT Aspire Grade 10*	ACT Test Grade 11	
Level 4	18%	18%	18%	100
Level 3	25%	27%	25%	80
Level 2	33%	30%	33%	50
Level 1	25%	25%	25%	20

*Approximately 4% to 5% of students were at each score point near the cut-points. This is why it was not possible to have an exact match of the percentages from the grade 10 Aspire with those from the ACT.

In order to compute a schools' tested readiness score, the school was assigned 20 points for each student at a school who performed at level 1, 50 points for each student who performed at level 2, 80 points for each student who performed at level 3 and 100 points for each student who performed at level 4. These index point values were assigned by the PJP in September 2013. The school's tested readiness score was the mean index score for all full academic year students across all tests from this suite.

The comparability of the tested readiness index scores based upon the 2016 Aspire scores in grades 9 and 10 versus those from the 2015 grade 9 Explore test and grade 10 Plan test was

assessed by computing Cohen’s *d* effect sizes comparing the grade specific tested readiness index means from 2015 and 2016 for each tested grade. The results are presented in Table 13. As can be seen from Table 13, the effect sizes are all near zero suggesting the tested readiness means were comparable across years even though the Aspire tests replaced the Explore and Plan tests in grades 9 and 10.

Table 13. Cohen’s *d* Effect Size Comparisons of the 2016 Tested Readiness Mean Scores for Grade 9, 10, and 11 with the 2015 Tested Readiness Mean Scores from those Same Grades.

GRADE	Pooled SD (2015 & 2016)	Mean - 2015	Mean - 2016	Effect Size
9	28.1	58.2	59.2	0.04
10	29.0	60.7	60.6	0.00
11	28.5	59.3	60.0	0.03

Students who take the alternate assessment are included on the tested readiness sub-indicator. Alternate assessment students are included in the participation rate calculation. Tested readiness index scores for students who take the alternate assessment are based upon the percentage of subject area tests on which they were proficient or better. The number of alternate tests taken may vary for a variety of reasons. Students eligible for the alternate assessments may take anywhere from zero to four alternate assessments. Specifically, a school is assigned the index points associated with Level 4 (i.e., from Table 5) for each student who earns a proficient or better score on all subject area tests that they take. A school receives index points associated with Level 3 for all students who earn a proficient or better score on 66 percent to 75 percent of subject area tests they take on the alternate assessment. Some students may earn scores of proficient or better on 50% of subject area tests administered. When this happened the school is assigned the number of index points that is the average of the index points associated with Level 2 and Level 3 (i.e., 65 points). This is equivalent to a Wyoming Tested Readiness Level of 2.5. Level 2.5 is only possible for students who take the alternate assessment. A school is assigned the index point associated with Level 2 for all students who were proficient or better on 25% and 33% of the alternate assessment subject area tests taken. Finally, a school is assigned the number of index points associated with Level 1 performance for all students who take the alternate assessment and are proficient or better none of subject area tests that they take.

The ***additional readiness score*** for high schools is an aggregate score which combines the Hathaway scholarship eligibility score, the grade nine credit score and the tested readiness score into one additional readiness score. To obtain the additional readiness score the component score is multiplied by a weight established by the PJP. As such the Hathaway scholarship eligibility score is multiplied by .40, the grade nine credit score is multiplied by .30 and the tested readiness score is multiplied by .30. The PJP then established cut points that were used to assign schools to the categories of below target, meeting target and exceeding target on additional readiness.

Additional readiness cut points:

- Meets Target = 68
- Exceeds Target = 79

There are some schools that have one or two of the additional readiness sub-indicators but not all three of them. These schools get an additional readiness target level based upon the sub-indicator or sub-indicators on which they met the minimum *n* requirement. This is accomplished by adjusting the meets and exceeds target cut-points so that the proportion of all schools (i.e., including those with all three indicators) within each target level is consistent with the proportion of three indicator school within each target level.

Assume, for example, that 50 high schools have all three indicators and 30% of those schools were below target level and 20% were in the target level for exceeds. Assume further that ten additional schools had only tested readiness because they were missing grade nine credit and Hathaway scholarship eligibility. These 10 schools would be combined with the 50 schools with scores on all three sub-indicators and cut-points for additional readiness only would be identified by finding the tested readiness only scores for these 60 schools that resulted in 30% of the schools in the below target category and 20% of the in the exceeds target category.

OVERALL READINESS TARGET LEVEL ASSIGNMENT. Each high school is placed into a target level for overall readiness. To identify the school's target level for overall readiness, the target levels assigned to the school for graduation and additional readiness are entered into the decision table in Table 14. The PJP determines which overall readiness target level is associated with each cell in the decision table.

Table 14. Overall Readiness Target Level Decision Table.

	Graduation Below	Graduation Meets	Graduation Exceeds	Graduation Undefined
Additional Readiness Below	BELOW	MEETS	MEETS	BELOW
Additional Readiness Meets	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	MEETS
Additional Readiness Exceeds	MEETS	MEETS	EXCEEDS	EXCEEDS
Additional Readiness Undefined	BELOW	MEETS	EXCEEDS	

Some schools may not have a target level on both graduation and additional readiness due to not meeting a minimum *n* requirement. In order to receive an overall readiness target level a school must have a target level for either graduation or additional readiness and the target level they have becomes their target level for overall readiness.

HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT

Each high school's target levels for academic performance and overall readiness are used to determine a school's performance level. Table 15 presents the decision table that was used to establish a high school's performance level (i.e., exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, partially meeting expectations or not meeting expectations). The PJP assigned the cell decision determinations.

Table 15. The High School Performance Level Decision Table.

	Academic Performance Below Target	Academic Performance Meets Target	Academic Performance Exceeds Target
Overall Readiness Below Target	BELOW	PARTIALLY	MEETING
Overall Readiness Meets Target	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
Overall Readiness Exceeds Target	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING

STUDENTS INCLUDED IN STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

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

PARTICIPATION RATE

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

There is a participation requirement of 95% and a participation threshold of 90%. When a school does not meet the participation threshold, the school is considered not scorable and the school is assigned to the not meeting expectations performance level. When a school meets the participation threshold but does not meet the participation requirement, the school is docked one school performance level. For example, a school with meeting expectations performance level that does not meet the participation requirement would drop to the partially meeting expectation performance level. Participation rate is computed for all students with an active enrollment in the school during the test window. There is no full academic year requirement for participation rate.

A *simple participation rate* is the number of students who tested divided by the number of students who should have tested at the school. For example, if a school has 10 students who were expected to test and only 9 tested, the school's simple participation rate would be 90%. In this illustration the school's simple participation rate was below the 95% requirement. The school had

one student that did not test. When one student not testing yields a participation rate score of 90% the school is really being held to a participation rate requirement of 100%. When 100% of students did not test the school would not meet the 95% requirement. For this school, then, the *actual participation rate requirement* to which they would be held is 100%. This illustrates the need for an adjustment rule to be employed when determining a school's participation in testing.

Whenever *this actual participation rate* for a school is above the requirement of 95% or the threshold of 90% the *one additional non-participant rule*⁸ will be applied. The school will be allowed to have one additional non-participant student and still be considered to have met the requirement/threshold. In the above example, the school was being held to an actual participation rate requirement above 95% (i.e., it was 100%), therefore the school is allowed one additional non-participant. Since the school had only one non-participant the school met the participation rate requirement. The school had a simple participation rate of 90% but the school met the requirement because it was allowed one additional non-participant. The one student who did not test is the one additional non-participant.

In another example, assume a school had 25 students with two non-participants. The school's simple participation rate would be 92%. If only one student was a non-participant the school would have a simple participation rate of 96%. Without the one additional non-participant rule the 95% requirement for this schools is actually a 96% requirement. The requirement is above 95%. Because 96% is above 95%, the one additional non-participant rule is applied. The school would be allowed one additional non-participant. Because of the one additional non-participant rule, the school with 25 students can have two non-participants and still meet 95% participation requirement.

⁸ The actual implementation of this rule is accomplished by setting a target for each subject in terms of the number of tests that need to be administered and scored at the school for the requirement $R(s)$ to be met in each subject s :

$$R(s) = \text{floor}(.95 \times \text{number of expected tests in } s)$$

And similarly for the threshold $T(s)$:

$$T(s) = \text{floor}(.90 \times \text{number of expected tests } s)$$

Then a requirement R and threshold T for the school is identified by summing these individual subject requirements and thresholds

$$R = \sum_s R(s) \text{ and } T = \sum_s T(s)$$

So if there are 10 students who need to test in two subjects m and r .

$$R(m) = 9, R(r) = 9$$

and

$$R = 18$$

There are multiple ways this requirement can be met:

- a) non-participation on one math test and one reading test
- b) full participation in math and non-participation on two reading tests
- c) non-participation on two math tests and full participation on reading

Case a) is the 'one additional non-participant rule', but this can be stretched to a subject specific 'two additional non-participant rule'.

Participation rates are computed at the test score level rather than the student level. In the example where the school had 25 students, assume they were consolidated subgroup students for the equity indicator. The equity indicator uses math scores and reading scores. For 25 students there would be 50 test scores involved. If two student did not test, there would be 46 test scores. The simple participation rate would still be 92%. By applying the one additional non-participant rule the school would be allowed two additional missing test scores, one for each of the two tests associated with the one additional non-participating student (e.g., a reading test and a math test). At the test score level this school would still be considered to have met the 95% participation requirement.

This one additional non-participant rule assures no school has an *actual required participation rate* requirement that is above the requirement/threshold. Whenever the one additional non-participant rule is applied, the school is allowed to have a simple participation rate below the requirement or the threshold.

This approach was implemented for each school by computing:

- Test scores needed to meet the requirement
- Actual tests with scores

When the actual tests with scores equaled or exceeded the test scores needed to meet the requirement/threshold the school “met” the requirement/threshold. The school was scored as “not met” on the requirement/threshold when the actual test scores were lower than the test scores needed to meet the requirement or threshold.

The participation requirements/thresholds are applied to the all students group and to the consolidated subgroup of students. As a group, consolidated subgroup students have high needs and it is important that they not be systematically excluded from testing. In the case of small schools where look backs to previous years are used to increase the school's *n* count, participation rate will be based upon current year students only.

For high schools, a participation requirement/threshold is applied for tested readiness also. Tested readiness uses composite scores from the Explore, Plan and ACT.

Exemptions

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

The Wyoming Department of Education will consider the amount of time left in the testing window to prepare for and administer the assessment. There must be evidence that the amount of

time left in the testing window is not adequate to allow for a valid administration. The Wyoming Department of Education may consider evidence about the individual student's response time when demonstrating academic knowledge if such evidence is provided. For approved exemptions the performance of the student is not considered in participation rate computations or in school performance level computations.

Testing Status

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

Exemption Types

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

Grade Tested

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

ONE PERCENT ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT CAP

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

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

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

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

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

TRANSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

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

- Students included on the WDE developed rosters will be:
 - Transcripts for Grade 9 Credits – Full academic year students at the designated school who were continuously enrolled from October 1st through the end of the school year. This will include any student with an exit date within 10 days of the final day of the school year. Only students attending grade nine for the first time are included.
 - Transcripts for Hathaway Eligibility Level – This will include all students with a graduate exit code for the year in question. This includes all students who

graduated between September 15th one year and September 14th the following year.

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

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

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

FULL ACADEMIC YEAR

When computing school scores, only students who were present at the school for a full academic year (Marion & Domaleski, 2012) are included. "Full academic year" is defined for Wyoming accountability as being enrolled in the same school on October 1 and on the day that is the midpoint of the testing window for each test used in the computation of school performance levels. Students who were not at the school for the full academic year will be excluded from school performance level computations.

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

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

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

MINIMUM n FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

The minimum n is 10 students for all indicators. A look back will occur independently for each indicator at a school that does not meet the minimum n provided the data required for the look back is available. The minimum n look back procedure is to first look back one year and see if the minimum n is reached. If the minimum n is not reached with a one year look back, the look back will go back a second year. If the minimum n is still not reached by looking back two years, the school will not have a score on that indicator.

On the achievement indicator, any student tested in reading, math, or reading and math will be counted to determine the schools n . No student will be counted more than once.

SMALL SCHOOL DEFINITION AND PROCEDURES

For schools with grades three through eight, a school will be considered a small school when the school does not have at least ten students on at least two of the WAEA indicators. To put it another way, in order for a school to be assigned a school performance level the school must meet the minimum n of ten students on at least two indicators. Schools with scores on just one indicator or no indicators will undergo a small school review.

High schools must have a target level on both academic performance and overall readiness in order to receive a school performance level. Schools that do not have target levels assigned on both academic performance and overall readiness will undergo a small school review.

Procedures for a small school review are included as Appendix C.

SCHOOLS WITH ONE OR NO TESTED GRADES

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

In Wyoming there are schools with grade configurations that do not include any tested grade. For example, several LEAs have organized their elementary schools so that students attend grade K-2 in one building and then move to a different building for grades 3-5. In this case, the school performance level for the 3-5 school is also applied to the K-2. In these situations, collaboration across buildings is important to the success of the students involved.

Table 16 is a list of Wyoming schools that do not contain any of the currently assessed grades and the school with which they are paired for accountability purposes. This table will be updated each year.

Table 16. Accountability School Pairings for Schools without Tested Grades.

School ID	School Name	Grades Served	Accountability Related School	Grades Served	School ID
0501002	Douglas Primary School	K-1	Douglas Upper Elementary School	4-5	0501010
0501013	Douglas Intermediate	2-3			
0701007	North Elementary &	K-1	Baldwin Creek Elementary	4-5	0701009
0701008	Gannett Peak Elementary	2-3			
0706001	Crowheart Elementary	K-3	Wind River Elementary	K-5	0706002
0725002	Ashgrove Elementary School	1-3	Rendezvous Elementary	4-5	0725007
0725009	Aspen Park Elementary School	K			
0725008	Jackson Elementary School	1-3			
0725010	Willow Creek Elementary	1-3			
0801007	Lincoln Elementary	K-2	Trail Elementary	3-5	0801006
1001006	Meadowlark Elementary	K-3	Clear Creek Elementary	4-5	1001002
1101021	Lebhart Elementary	K-2	Fairview Elementary	3-6	1101013
1101010	Deming Elementary	K-3	Miller Elementary	4-6	1101022
1201004	Kemmerer Elementary	K-2	Canyon Elementary	3-6	1201051
1202001	Afton Elementary	K-3	Osmond Elementary	4-6	1202005
1202003	Thayne Elementary	K-3	Etna Elementary	4-6	1202004
1601003	Libbey Elementary	K-2	West Elementary	3-5	1601005
2001010	Jackson Elementary	K-2	Colter Elementary	3-5	2001009
2301003	Newcastle Elementary	K-2	Gertrude Burns Intermediate	3-5	2301001

APPENDIX A

COMPUTING “AGP” – Technical Documentation

- From SGP Package in R
 - Obtain “Lagged” Projections
 - Projections are the SGPs needed to remain within or get to a particular performance level on a future test
 - Lagged indicates that projections were based upon the prior year’s test
 - As such the YEAR_1 projection is a projection of the SGP needed this year to assure a particular performance level
 - YEAR_2 projection is a projection of the SGP needed to assure a particular performance level in the year after the current year and so on
 - A student’s prior year performance level is not considered in the computation of the lagged projections
 - There are 3 levels of projections
 - LEVEL_1 projections give the SGP needed to remain/become Basic
 - LEVEL_2 projections give the SGP needed to remain/become Proficient
 - LEVEL_3 projections give the SGP needed to remain/become Advanced
- SGP_TARGETS were obtained from SGP Package. (The SGP target for a given year is the SGP needed in the current year to become/remain proficient in the current year or a given future year)
 - Lagged projections from SGP Package
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
 - SGP needed in the current year to become/remain proficient
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
 - SGP needed in the next year to become/remain proficient
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
 - SGP needed in 2 years to become/remain proficient
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_4
 - SGP needed in 3 years to become/remain proficient
 - Lagged projections from SGP Package were used to compute SGP_TARGETS for the CURRENT_YEAR, YEAR_1, YEAR_2 and YEAR_3

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

- CUKU_TARGETS (Catch Up Keep Up) take into consideration the proficiency status of the student on the prior year’s test were as lagged projection do not take this into consideration
 - CUKU_TARGET_CURRENT_YEAR
 - This equals the LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1 for all students
 - CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_1
 - For below proficient students is the *lowest* of:
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2

- For proficient and above students is the *highest* of:
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
 - CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_2
 - For below proficient students is the lowest of:
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
 - For proficient and above students is the highest of:
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
 - CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_3
 - For below proficient students is the lowest of:
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_4
 - For proficient and above students is the highest of:
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
 - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_4
- AGP (Adequate Growth Percentile) by grade
 - Is the CUKU_TARGET_CURRENT_YEAR for grade 8 students
 - Is the CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_1 for grade 7 students
 - Is the CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_2 for grade 6 students
 - Is the CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_3 for grade 4 & grade 5 students
- MET_AGP
 - True if $SGP - AGP \geq 0$
 - False if $SGP - AGP < 0$

APPENDIX B

2015 Performance Level Descriptors for Schools with Grades 3-8

Exceeding Expectations

Schools in this category are considered models of performance. These schools typically exceeded target in achievement and at least one other performance indicator - equity or growth – while meeting target on the other indicator.

Meeting Expectations

Schools in this category demonstrated performance that met or exceeded target on multiple performance indicators. All of these schools met or exceeded state targets in achievement. They typically met or exceeded targets on student growth and promotion of equity *or* fell below target on growth or equity while exceeding target on achievement.

Partially Meeting Expectations

Schools in this category typically performed below target on the growth and equity performance indicators *or* were below target in achievement. Many schools in this category met or exceeded state target levels in student growth *and/or* promoting equity for low-achieving students.

Not Meeting Expectations

Schools in this category had unacceptable performance on all indicators. Improvement is an urgent priority for these schools. These schools had below-target levels of achievement and student growth and showed insufficient academic improvement for low-achieving students.

2015 Performance Level Descriptors for High Schools

Exceeding Expectations

Schools in this category are considered models of performance. These schools exceeded state target levels in overall readiness for college and careers *and* in the academic performance indicator combining the school's achievement, student growth and equity.

Meeting Expectations

Schools in this category demonstrated performance that met or exceeded target on multiple indicators. All of these schools met or exceeded target in academic performance, combining achievement, student growth and equity. Their performance also met or exceeded target in overall readiness *or* exceeded target in the achievement/growth/equity indicator while being below target in overall readiness.

Partially Meeting Expectations

Schools in this category typically were below target on the academic performance indicator combining achievement, student growth and equity. Some schools met state target for achievement/growth/equity but performed below target in overall readiness for college and careers.

Not Meeting Expectations

Schools in this category performed at unacceptable levels on all indicators. Improvement is an urgent priority for these schools. These schools had below-target levels of academic performance, combining achievement, student growth and equity *and* fell below state targets in overall readiness for college and careers.

APPENDIX C

WYOMING SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY

PROCESS

SMALL SCHOOL DEFINITION

Wyoming has many very small schools. At times there are schools in Wyoming that have just one student. For the purpose of this small school review process a school serving students in grades three through eight will be considered a small school when the school is unable to meet the minimum *n* requirement on more than one indicator. High schools will be considered small schools when they do not have a target level on both academic performance or overall readiness.

PURPOSE OF SMALL SCHOOL REVIEWS

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

OPERATIONAL DETAILS

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

EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL

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

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

- Achievement
- Growth
- Equity
- Other relevant evidence

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

- Academic Performance
 - Achievement
 - Equity
 - Growth
- Overall Readiness
 - Graduation Rate
 - Additional Readiness
 - Grade nine credits
 - Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility
 - Tested Readiness

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

OUTCOMES OF A REVIEW

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

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

Checklist for Small Schools Review

Review criteria for each school improvement plan requirement:

• Limited or no evidence in plan (0 points earned per item)
▪ <i>Revise & Resubmit (0-12 total points earned)</i>
• Some evidence in plan (1 point earned per item)
▪ <i>Approved w/Recommendations (13-24 total points earned)</i>
• Strong evidence in plan (2 points earned per item)
▪ <i>Approved (25-36 total points earned)</i>

PLAN REQUIREMENTS

1. How does the school improvement plan specifically address performance improvement on the **achievement** indicator in the school performance report?

Evidence:

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence that the schools examined student performance on the WAEA indicators (i.e. PAWS, ACT)

___0 ___1 ___2: Wording in the plan shows that the school understands the indicator data from WAEA

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence of achievement data use beyond those from WAEA (i.e. MAP, DIBELS)

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence that the school has strategies for improving student achievement on the WAEA indicator(s)

___0 ___1 ___2: The school has a systematic process for regular review of individual student performance

Total points for achievement: _____/10 pts.

2. How does the school improvement plan specifically address the performance improvement on the **growth/readiness** indicator in the school performance report?

Evidence for growth (non high schools only):

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence that the schools examined student growth/readiness on the WAEA indicators (i.e. PAWS, ACT)

___0 ___1 ___2: Wording in the plan shows that the school understands the growth of their students and strategies for improving growth

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence of growth data use beyond those from WAEA (i.e. MAP, DIBELS)

___0 ___1 ___2: The school has a systematic process for regular review of individual student growth

Total points for growth: _____/8 pts.

(Continued on next page)

Evidence for readiness (high schools only):

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence that the schools examined student readiness on the WAEA sub-indicators (i.e. graduation rate, tested readiness, Hathaway eligibility, grade 9 credits)

___0 ___1 ___2: Wording in the plan shows that the school understands the readiness of their students and strategies for improving readiness

___0 ___1 ___2: The school has a systematic process for regular review of individual student readiness

Total points for growth/readiness: _____/6 pts.

3. How does the school improvement plan specifically address the performance improvement on the equity indicator in the school performance report?

Evidence:

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence that the school has a plan for addressing the needs of students with low performance on the WAEA indicators

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence that the school uses a tiered approach to academic intervention (services for students that perform low on the WAEA achievement and growth indicators)

___0 ___1 ___2: Wording in the plan shows that the school understands which students meet the definition for inclusion in the consolidated subgroup

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence of measures of equity beyond those from WAEA (i.e. MAP, DIBELS, High Schools Measures)

Total points for equity: _____/8 pts.

4. How does the school improvement plan address the needs of all at-risk groups?

Evidence:

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence that the school has a plan for properly identifying and serving students with unique educational needs

___0 ___1 ___2: Evidence that the school has strategies in place or plans to implement strategies to reduce risk for students with unique educational needs

Total points for all at-risk groups: _____/4 pts.

District Name: _____

School Name: _____

Total Points: _____/36 pts.

Decision: _____