

# WYOMING SCHOOL PERFORMANCE RATING MODEL

## IMPLEMENTATION HANDBOOK

(October 8, 2013)

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*<sup>1</sup>. A professional judgment panel (PJP) was prescribed by statute to engage in a standard setting process to establish cut-scores and other parameters for a school performance rating model. The PJP met on September 16, 17, and 18, 2013 and this report reflects the decisions made by that panel.

### INDICATORS BY GRADE

Indicators are a function of grade in school.

- Grade Three through Grade Eight School Indicators
  - Achievement
  - Growth
  - Equity measured by growth
- Grade Nine through Twelve Indicators
  - Achievement
  - Readiness
  - Equity measured by change in the achievement gap

The readiness indicator for grade nine through 12 was applied only to those schools from which students could earn a high school diploma. Some junior high schools have a grade nine. The grade nine readiness indicators were not used for school performance ratings at these schools. Some high schools have grades ten through 12. The grade nine readiness indicators were not used for school performance ratings at these schools.

Some schools had grade configurations that included both grades nine through 12 and grades eight and lower (e.g., schools with grades K-12). These schools had two school performance levels computed initially; one for grades eight and below and one for grades nine through 12. The school was assigned to the performance level that is the lower of the two computed performance levels.

### INDICATORS AND INDICATOR SCORES

---

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

## ACHIEVEMENT

There was one overall *school achievement score* for each school that included the performance in all tested grades and content areas at each school. The score was the percent of tested students who scored proficient or above on the Wyoming state achievement test. The 2012-13 achievement tests used for state accountability<sup>2</sup> included:

- 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 ACT
  - Reading test in grade 11
  - Mathematics test in grade 11
  - Science test in grade 11

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. Because fewer students were tested in science, exceptionally high or low performance on the science test would have less impact on the school achievement score than would exceptionally high or low performance on either the reading tests or the math tests<sup>3</sup>.

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

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

This school achievement score (i.e., the total percent proficient on all achievement tests) was used for assigning schools to one of three categories on the achievement indicator: (a) exceeding targets, (b) meeting targets, or (c) below targets. A professional judgment panel (PJP) of education stakeholders established the school achievement score cut points during a September

<sup>2</sup> In 2014 the student assessment of writing skills (SAWS) and the ACT Writing test will be included in the achievement scores for schools.

<sup>3</sup> Weighting for different tested content areas will be a function of the number of students taking a test in each content area. This weighting reflects the policy maker decisions about which grade-by-content areas to test. For example, when federal and state policy makers required testing in reading and math in seven grades but they required testing in science in just three grades they suggested the weights reflected in this rating model. As a result, more students take reading and math tests than science test and reading and math will carry more weight on the achievement indicator than science.

2013 standard setting session that were used to assign schools to these three categories. Separate cut-points will be established for each of three grade level bands. Schools below the low cut are not meeting targets, schools at or above the low cut and below the high cut are meeting targets and schools at or above the high cut are exceeding targets.

- Grade Band One = Grades 3 through 6
- Grade Band Two = Grades 7 and 8
- Grade Band Three = Grade 11

Table 2. 2013 Achievement Cut Points by Grade Band.

	Low Cut	High Cut
Grade Band 1 (3-6)	75	86
Grade Band 2 (7-8)	68	80
Grade Band 3 (11)*	63	78

Note. Established by the September 2013 professional judgment panel.

\*See Flicek & Paul October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013 report on *Data Preparation for Reporting ...* for additional information about grade band 3 cut points.

Some schools had students in both grade band one and grade band two. When this happened, cut points were adjusted to accurately reflect the number of students in each of the grade bands at the school using the procedure illustrated in Table 3. The school represented in Table 3 is a hypothetical middle school with grades six, seven, and eight.

Table 3. Illustration of Method of Adjusting a Cut Point when a School Includes Two Grade Bands

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

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

## GROWTH

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 was first

measured in grade four. Growth was computed separately for reading and for math on the Wyoming state test for students in grades four through eight.

The method used to measure growth will produce student growth percentiles<sup>4</sup> (SGPs) that indicate how an individual student's growth compared with that of all Wyoming public school students<sup>5</sup> from that particular year in the same grade that had similar scores in previous years. SGPs range from 1 to 99 with lower scores indicating lower growth and higher scores indicating higher growth. This measure of growth is independent of the achievement level performance of students<sup>6</sup>. Students with low achievement may have low or high growth. Likewise, students with high achievement may have low or high growth. Regardless of how high a student's test scores in past years were, they still may earn any of the SGPs from 1 to 99.

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

MGPs at each school will further be placed into one of three categories: (a) exceeding target, (b) meeting target and (c) not meeting target. The PJP established cut points for the MGPs that separated these three categories from one another. The cut point established by the PJP for school MGPs were a low cut of 45 (i.e., between below target and meeting target) and a high cut of 60 (i.e., between meeting target and exceeding target).

## EQUITY

An important goal of WAEA is to "minimize achievement gaps" [Wyoming Statute 21-2-204(b)(vi)]. During the 2013 session of the Wyoming legislature more specificity was added to the definition of equity for the purpose of accountability [Wyoming Statute 21-2-204(c)(vii)]. As a result there will be two methods used to measure equity in Wyoming schools. The method used for a particular school will depend upon whether there are measures of student growth available to the school. Measures of student growth were available to schools with students in grades four through eight. Since high schools do not have a measure of growth, an alternative measure of equity was required for high schools.

**Consolidated Subgroup.** When a school has growth measures, a consolidated subgroup consisting of all students who were below proficient during the previous year on the state test in

---

<sup>4</sup> See Betebenner, D. W. (2008). *Norm- and criterion-referenced student growth*. Available at <http://www.nciea.org>.

<sup>5</sup> Some private school and home school students take the PAWS test. If these students are not enrolled in a public school at the time of the testing, their score will not be included in the norm sample. If they enroll in a public school the following year and take the PAWS test, their previous PAWS test scores will be used to compute growth.

<sup>6</sup> Correlation coefficients for prior achievement with SGPs at the student level in Wyoming were all very near  $r = 0.00$ .

math and/or reading will be used in the measurement of equity. Because the previous year's test performance defines this group, educators will know who is in this group at the beginning of each new school year. This will permit educators to be strategic about planning to improve outcomes for students in this subgroup. The minimum  $n$  for the consolidated subgroup was 15 students. Schools with fewer than 15 students below proficient in the prior year will not have an equity indicator.

**Equity for Schools with Growth Scores.** For schools that have students with growth scores (i.e., SGPs) on the state test, a *growth to standard* approach is used for the measurement of equity. Specifically, adequate growth percentiles (AGPs) were computed for all students. For students in the consolidated subgroup, an AGP represents the minimum SGP that the students needs for the current year in order to be considered to be *on track* to reach proficiency within three years or by the end of grade eight. The equity indicator, therefore, for schools with growth scores was the percent of students in the consolidated subgroup who obtain SGP scores that are at or above their AGP score. The PJP determine the percentages of students meeting this criterion that resulted in schools being considered as exceeding targets, meeting targets or not meeting targets. The low cut score identified by the PJP was 40 high cut score was 55. Schools where less than 40% of students from the consolidated subgroup had SGPs that equaled or exceeded their AGPs were “not meeting” the equity target. Schools where 55% or more of students from the consolidated subgroup had SGPs that equaled or exceeded their AGPs were “exceeding” the equity target. The remainder of the schools that met the minimum  $n$  for the consolidated subgroup were in the “meeting target” category.

**Equity for Schools without Growth Scores in 2013.** The policy goal for an equity measure is to encourage a focus on improving the performance of the most high-risk students. The current plans call for a revision of the high school equity indicator for 2014. In 2013, the initial pilot year for school performance ratings, the measurement of equity was constrained by the available data. Specifically, the current year grade 11 students did not participate in census testing on any test in 2012. As such, it was not possible to establish a consolidated subgroup based upon prior year performance.

The equity measure used in 2013 is described here. In order for a high school to meet the minimum  $n$  requirement, at least 15 students needed a reading or math subject area test score on the ACT in 2013. High school equity was only measured in those schools that met the minimum  $n$  requirement. The 2013 method for identifying equity that was the final result is reported here.

- Step 1. The percent of test scores at each school on the subject area tests of reading and math that were not proficient were computed for 2013.
- Step 2. The percent of test scores at each school on the reading and math subtests of the PAWS that were not proficient were computed for 2012.
- A *change* score was computed to reflect the change in percent of students not proficient from 2012 to 2013.

- The change scores were used place each high school that met the minimum  $n$  for the current year into one of three categories. Approximately one third of schools were placed into each category<sup>7</sup>. The categories were:
  - Negative Change. Schools that had an increase in the percent of students not proficient (i.e., schools with an increase in the percent of students not proficient of 3.4% or more).
  - Positive Change. Schools that had a decrease in the percent of students not proficient (i.e., schools that had a decrease of not proficient students of - 3.1% or more).
  - Minimal Change. Schools that where the percent of students not proficient remained essentially unchanged from 2012 to 2013 (i.e., schools with change a change in the percent of not proficient students between 3.4% and -3.1%).

Schools in the *negative change* category were identified as not meeting targets, schools in the *minimal change* category identified as meeting targets, and schools in the *positive change* category were identified as exceeding targets.

**Equity for High Schools in 2014.** Next year’s grade 11 students will have PLAN scores from 2013 that will be used to identify a consolidated subgroup. The distance that this subgroup’s performance differed from overall state level performance will be computed for 2013 using the PLAN. The distance that the performance of those same students differed from the overall state level performance will be computed for 2014. A change score will be computed for each school to represent the change relative to the state mean from 2013 to 2014 for this cohort of students. This change score will become the school’s equity score and a PJP process will establish cut-scores for these equity scores. The major difference between the 2013 method and the 2014 method is that a cross section of students from each year was included in the analyses for 2013. The students were from different cohorts. Whereas, the cohort of the below proficient students from a prior year will be tracked longitudinally in 2014<sup>8</sup>.

## READINESS

Readiness was measured at all high schools (i.e., schools from which students may earn a high school diploma). There were two subindicators for readiness in 2013.

- Tested readiness as measured on tests in the ACT suite of tests (i.e., ACT Explore in grade 9, ACT Plan in grade 10 and the ACT in grade 11)
- A graduation index

These subindicator scores were combined into one overall readiness indicator. The weights and index values were first suggested by the advisory committee to Wyoming legislature’s select committee on school accountability during July, 2013. They were finalized by the PJP during

---

<sup>7</sup> See Flicek & Paul October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013 report on Data Preparation for Reporting ... for additional information about grade band 3 cut points.

<sup>8</sup> Flicek (2013) in an unpublished research paper compared this method with the growth-to-standard method that was used for grades 4 through 8. The Pearson correlation coefficient comparing school scores from both methods was  $r = .50$ .

September 2013. For 2013, tested readiness was weighted as 40% of the total readiness score and the graduation index was weighted as 60% of the total readiness score.

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

Table 4. ACT College Readiness Index Score Ranges.

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

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

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

A school was assigned 20 points for each student at a school who performed at level 1, 50 points for each student who performs at level 2, 80 points for each student who performs at level 3 and 100 points for each student who performs at level 4. A school received one overall readiness score for student performance on all tests from the ACT suite that were administered at the

school. The school’s tested readiness score was the mean index score for all students across all tests from this suite that were administered at the school.

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

**Graduation Index.** Table 5 illustrates the graduation index. The index point values in Table 5 were assigned by the PJP. The index points are assigned to the school for each student who meets the student result criteria in Table 5. The school’s graduation index score will be the mean of student index points.

Table 5. Graduation Index.

Criteria Numbers	Student Result	Points
4	Diploma Earned in Four Years or Less	100
3	Diploma Earned in More than Four Years	100
2	Continued Enrollment**	50
1	Noncompleters	0

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

Specific definitions of the criteria in Table 8 follow.

*Diploma Earned in Four Years or Less.* This criterion was met when students received their high school diploma four years or less from their first entry into grade nine.

*Diploma Earned in More than Four Years.* Any student who receives a high school diploma but who first entered grade nine more than four years earlier meets this criterion.

*Continued Enrollment.* Continued enrollment applies to students who first entered grade nine more than four years ago but remain enrolled in school on October 1<sup>st</sup> of a following school year. Students who graduate in that year would earn the school index points for diploma earned in more than four years in the following school year. The school will earn 50 points when this student remains enrolled after her four year cohort exited and another 100 points the following year if she graduates that year. When a school is awarded points for a student’s continued enrollment one year and that student does not go on to graduate and is not enrolled in school on October 1<sup>st</sup> of the following year, that student will be included with the noncompleters in that year.

*Noncompleters.* When computing the school index score, schools will be assigned zero points for noncompleters and they will be included in the computation of the mean student index score for

the school. Students will count as noncompleters when they were the grade nine drop-outs three years ago, the grade ten drop-outs two years ago, the grade eleven drop-outs one year ago and the current year grade 12 drop-outs. Continued enrollment students who do not graduate and fail to return a subsequent year will also be considered noncompleters.

The final readiness score for high schools in 2013 were computed by multiplying the school's average ACT suite tested readiness index by its weight (i.e., .40) and multiplying the school's average graduation index score by its weight (i.e., .60) and then summing the weighted scores. The cut-scores used for the high school readiness indicator were 71 and 81.

**Changes planned for 2014.** Work is underway to collect information about which students are working on alternate standards at each school in Wyoming. When this data becomes available an additional category is planned for the graduation index. This category would award index points to a school when students on alternate standards successfully complete their education program. No more than one percent of students statewide may be counted for this purpose.

*Alternate Standards Certificate per IEP*<sup>9</sup>. Students meeting this criterion will be those students who were on an individual education plan (IEP) that stipulated they were working on alternate standards. These students are not eligible for a diploma since their IEP teams had determined that their disability made working on alternate standards more appropriate than working on regular state standards. These points are awarded to the school only when the student is exiting high school for a final time (e.g., when they age out at age 21) and is determined to have successfully completed their educational program. The school may be awarded points for continued enrollment for these students each year after their four year graduation cohort exits but before these students successfully complete their program.

Two additional subindicators are planned for the readiness indicator for 2014.

- Grade nine credits earned.
- Hathaway scholarship eligibility level

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

---

<sup>9</sup> Current information systems do not contain information about students who were alternate standards certificate per IEP students. Collections will be established for the school year that follows the pilot. For the pilot year, identified alternate standards students from the relevant cohorts will be excluded from the computation of the graduation index.

Some students earn grade nine credits during a summer session. In order to be able to credit schools for ninth grade credits earned in the summer, the grade nine credits earned indicator will lag one year. In this respect it will be similar to the long standing practice in Wyoming of lagging the reporting of graduation rate for accountability purposes by one year so that students who graduate following the successful completion of required courses during the summer session may be included in a school’s graduation rate. When grade nine is housed at the high school, grade nine credits earned will be computed for all students who were enrolled in that school at the end of grade nine. When grade nine is housed in feeder schools, grade nine credits will be computed for all students enrolled at the high school on October 1<sup>st</sup> of the year after they first attended grade nine<sup>10</sup>.

A school’s score for grade nine credits will be the percentage of students that earned one fourth of the credits required to earn a diploma at the high school they are attending by the end of grade nine.

**Hathaway Scholarship Level.** There are four Hathaway scholarship levels in Wyoming. Eligibility for each level is based upon three criteria: (a) unweighted high school grade point average, (b) a minimum ACT or Work Keys score and (c) completion of the success curriculum at a particular level. The scholarship levels and the eligibility criteria are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility Levels and Criteria.

Criteria	Scholarship Level			
	Provisional	Opportunity	Performance	Honors
High School Minimum GPA	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.5
Minimum ACT*	17**	19	21	25
High School Curriculum	Success***	Success	Success	Success

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

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

\*\*\*Completion of a success curriculum as defined by the Wyoming Department of Education.

Hathaway Scholarship eligibility will be measured using an index for the purpose of computing school performance levels under WAEA. The index is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility Index.

Student Eligibility Level	Points*
Level 5: Honors	100
Level 4: Performance	90

<sup>10</sup> A potential negative unintended consequence could be associated with this particular business rule. Specifically, a district may choose to retain students in grade nine in a junior high if they do not have all credits needed to be considered “on-track” for high school completion. An additional unintended consequence would be a practice of becoming more lenient about awarding credits in grade nine. A choice by the professional judgment panel to place less weight on this readiness indicator compared to the other readiness indicators could mitigate the likelihood of the potentially negative changes in practice.

Level 3: Opportunity	80
Level 2: Provisional	70
Level 1: Not Eligible	0

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

The school’s score will be the mean of student points for the graduating class at the school. The possible scores for a school will range from 0 to 100.

The Hathaway eligibility used for accountability will not necessarily match Hathaway eligibility for awards. For awards, a students’ best ACT score can be used. The WDE Hathaway data collection may not include a student’s best ACT score. In addition, a students’ success curriculum performance will be computed electronically based upon transcript information. For award eligibility success curriculum performance and other eligibility criteria are judged by a human inspection of the student’s transcript.

### SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT

The indicator category scores were combined to arrive at a school performance level designation for each school in Wyoming using decision tables. The performance level associated with each cell in the decision tables were established during the September 2013 standard setting meeting 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. The decision tables are presented below.

Table 8. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels for Schools with Grades Three through Eight that have Three Indicators.

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

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

Table 9. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels for High Schools that have Three Indicators.

	Achievement	Achievement	Achievement
--	-------------	-------------	-------------

		Below	Meeting	Exceeding
Equity Below	Readiness Below	1	2	2
	Readiness Meeting	2	3	3
	Readiness Exceeding	2	3	3
Equity Meeting	Readiness Below	2	3	3
	Readiness Meeting	2	3	3
	Readiness Exceeding	2	3	4
Equity Exceeding	Readiness Below	2	3	3
	Readiness Meeting	2	3	4
	Readiness Exceeding	2	3	4

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

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

Table 10. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels when a School with Grades Three through Eight has Only Two Indicators.

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

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

Table 11. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels when a High School has Only Two Indicators.

	Achievement Below	Achievement Meeting	Achievement Exceeding
Readiness Below	1	2	2
Readiness Meeting	2	3	3
Readiness Exceeding	2	3	4

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

## 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.

Participation rate is computed for (a) all enrolled students and (b) all enrolled students who were below proficient in the prior year on each assessment that is used in computing Wyoming school performance levels. The students who were below proficient in the prior year serve as a consolidated subgroup<sup>11</sup>. As a group these are students with high needs and it is important that they not be systematically excluded from testing. All schools are expected to meet the minimum annual participation rate of 95 percent for both student groups. When a school fails to meet the minimum participation rate on all tests involved in computing school performance levels the school will be assigned to the school performance level that is one level below the computed performance level.

Any school that fails to meet an annual percentage rate of at least 90 percent on any test that is used in the assignment of Wyoming school performance levels will be declared “unscorable”. Consequences for schools that are unscorable will align with those for schools that fall within the school performance level of not meeting expectations and these schools will be reported as not meeting expectations.

### **Exemptions**

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

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

## **FULL ACADEMIC YEAR**

---

<sup>11</sup> For the purpose of computing participation rate, students who score below proficient on the subject-area tests of the ACT in grade 11 will comprise the consolidated subgroup. For the purpose of computing participation rate on the Explore and Plan, students who perform at the Level 1 of the readiness index will comprise the consolidated subgroup.

Student mobility varies across schools. Students sometimes move into a school just prior to testing. When computing school performance levels, it is reasonable to include only students who were present at the school for a full academic year (Marion & Domaleski, 2012). It is possible to exclude the performance of students who have recently arrived at the school from the school performance level computations.

“Full academic year” will be defined for Wyoming accountability as being enrolled in the same school on October 1 and on the day that is the midpoint of the testing window for each test used in the computation of school performance levels. Students who were not at the school for the full academic year will be excluded from school performance level computations.

### **MINIMUM *n* FOR ACCOUNTABILITY**

For accountability decisions, the minimum number of students (*n*) in the consolidated subgroup is 15. For schools with a consolidated subgroup of less than 15 the performance of the consolidated subgroup over multiple years will be considered. Subgroup performance will be considered over two years. If that results in 15 students in the consolidated subgroup equity would be measured for those combined years. If not subgroup performance will be considered over three years. If there are not 15 students in the subgroup over three years, equity will not be measured at the school.

Wyoming has a sizable number of schools with fewer than 15 tested students in an all students group. For the all students group at a school the minimum *n* size will be six. Schools with fewer than six tested students in any one year will be reviewed based on average performance over the previous two or three years depending upon which leads to at least six tested students being available. 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.

### **STUDENTS TESTED ON ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS**

Students on individual education plans who are working on alternate standards will be required to test on an alternate assessment. Students on alternate standards who do not test will be considered as not tested for the participation rate computations. Student performance on alternate assessments will be counted for school performance level determinations.

### **SCHOOLS WITH ONE OR NO TESTED GRADES**

There are schools in Wyoming with grade three as their only tested grade. When a school’s only tested grade is grade three have data for 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 a school that includes grade four and/or above. This ensures school performance levels are based upon more than just one indicator. The grade three achievement scores from these schools are combined with the achievement scores from their paired school when determining school performance levels. In other words, the combined school is treated as a single school for accountability.

In Wyoming there are schools with grade configurations that do not include any tested grade. For example, several LEAs have organized their elementary schools so that students attend grade K-2 in one building and then move to a different building for grades 3-5. In this case, the school performance level for the 3-5 school is used to hold the K-2 school accountable as well. The rationale for this is that the teachers in the two different schools need to be communicating across buildings to plan their curricular and instructional sequences for the successful transition of students between schools. Holding both schools equally accountable for the 3-5 school results should help foster this communication.

Table 12 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 12. Accountability School Pairings for Schools without Tested Grades.

School ID	School Name	Grades Served	Accountability Related School	Grades Served	School ID
0501002	Douglas Primary School	K-2	Douglas Intermediate School	3-5	0501010
0701007	North Elementary &	K-1	Baldwin Creek Elementary	4-5	0701009
0701008	Gannett Peak Elementary	2-3			
0706001	Crowheart Elementary	K-3	Wind River Elementary	K-5	0706002
0725001	Ashgrove Elementary School	K-2	Rendezvous Elementary	3-5	0725007
0725005	Aspen Park Elementary School	K-2			
0725003	Jackson Elementary School	K-2			
0801007	Lincoln Elementary	K-2	Trail Elementary	3-5	0801006
1001006	Meadowlark Elementary	K-3	Clear Creek Elementary	4-5	1001002
1101021	Lebhart Elementary	K-2	Fairview Elementary	3-6	1101013
1101010	Deming Elementary	K-3	Miller Elementary	4-6	1101022
1101040	PODER Elementary	K-3			
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	3-5	2001009

			Elementary		
2104001	Mountain View Elementary	K-2	Fort Bridger Elementary	3-5	2104002
2301003	Newcastle Elementary	K-2	Gertrude Burns Intermediate	3-5	2301001

## SMALL SCHOOL DEFINITION AND PROCEDURES

Schools that do not have at least six students included on any of the WAEA indicators. Furthermore, some schools have at least six students on just one of the three indicators. Schools in both of these conditions will be considered a small school for the purpose of WAEA accountability. To put it another way, in order for a school to be assigned a school performance level without using small school procedures, the school must meet the minimum  $n$  of six students on two indicators. For schools that do not meet the minimum  $n$  of six students on two indicators, two years of evidence will be combined in an effort to obtain the minimum  $n$  of six students on two indicators. If a minimum  $n$  of two indicators is reached by combining two years of evidence a school performance level will be assigned to the school based upon those two years of evidence. For schools that do not meet the minimum  $n$  of six students on two indicators when two years of evidence are combined, a third year of evidence will be added. Schools that then meet the minimum  $n$  of at least six students on two indicators when the third year of evidence is included will be assigned a school performance level based upon the three years of evidence. Finally, some schools will still not meet the minimum  $n$  of six students on two indicators when three years of evidence are combined. A small school review process is under development that will be used in assessing these schools.

## APPENDIX A

### **PERFORMANCE LEVEL DESCRIPTIONS** (for schools with grades 3 through 8)

**EXCEEDING EXPECTATIONS:** Schools in this category, which is reserved for schools considered models of performance, have demonstrated high growth overall, have average to high levels of achievement (proficiency rates) overall, and excel in promoting equity based on growth for students with prior below proficient performance.

**MEETING EXPECTATIONS:** Schools in this category have demonstrated acceptable levels of achievement and growth overall and are showing acceptable progress in promoting equity based on growth for students with prior below proficient performance.

**PARTIALLY MEETING EXPECTATIONS:** Schools in this category have demonstrated either acceptable levels of growth or acceptable levels of achievement overall. Schools in this category may or may not show acceptable performance in promoting equity based on growth for students with prior below proficient performance.

**NOT MEETING EXPECTATIONS:** This category is reserved for schools with unacceptable performance on many or most indicators. For schools in this category improvement is a priority. These schools have low levels of achievement overall and demonstrate low to average growth overall and fall short of producing growth for below proficient students that will move them toward proficiency.

### **PERFORMANCE LEVEL DESCRIPTIONS** (for schools that award diplomas)

**EXCEEDING EXPECTATIONS:** Schools in this category, which is reserved for schools considered models of performance, have demonstrated average to high levels of achievement (proficiency rates) overall, have high performance on graduation rates and other readiness indicators and have narrow and/or improving achievement gaps for students with below proficient performance.

**MEETING EXPECTATIONS:** Schools in this category have demonstrated either high levels of achievement overall or high performance on graduation rates and other readiness indicators and are showing acceptable performance in promoting equity based on the magnitude and/or improvement of the achievement gap for students with below proficient performance.

**PARTIALLY MEETING EXPECTATIONS:** Schools in this category have demonstrated either acceptable levels of achievement overall or acceptable performance on graduation rates and other readiness indicators. Schools in this category may or may not demonstrate acceptable performance for promoting equity based on the size of the achievement gap or improvement in the achievement gap for students with below proficient performance.

**NOT MEETING EXPECTATIONS:** This category is reserved for schools with unacceptable performance on many or most indicators. For schools in this category improvement is a priority. These schools typically have low levels of achievement fall short of expectations on graduation and other readiness indicators and have large achievement gaps that show little improvement.