

**Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE)
Assessment and Accountability in the Fifty States: 1999-2000**

WISCONSIN

This profile was verified by the staff of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction in July 2000. All information was current as of that date.

Index:

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

Performance Standards

Reporting Performance Data

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

1. Provide a brief overview and history of the assessment system as the context.

Over the past five years, a shift in Wisconsin education policy has been occurring. This shift changes the way that achievement is measured and represents a growing recognition that students must acquire and be able to demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to thrive in today's economy. To support this important shift, the education system places a new emphasis on academic standards and assessment and demands unprecedented levels of accountability from all segments of the community.

Various pieces of Wisconsin law point to this new direction. Through the creation of the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards, the signing of the executive order by the governor which institutionalized them, the administration of knowledge and concepts examinations at grades four, eight, and ten, and the implementation of a statewide accountability system, Wisconsin has moved steadily toward embracing a standards-driven model for education.

The current assessment system in Wisconsin is known as WSAS: the **Wisconsin Student Assessment System**. Wisconsin laws require all school districts to administer state-provided

tests to almost every student in four grade levels each year. The two forms of assessment are the **Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test** and the **Knowledge and Concepts** examinations.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state assessment system, including:*

- *Name of Assessment Instrument(s) or Program(s)* The Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) consists of two components: the Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test (WRCT) and the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE). The Department of Public Instruction contracts with a vendor to provide examinations and scoring services for the WKCE. At the moment, CTB/McGraw-Hill has the contract to administer their TerraNova test.
- *Grade Levels and Subjects Tested*
 - The WRCT is administered to third grade students to determine their level of reading proficiency and to identify students who may need additional assistance to improve their reading comprehension skills.
 - The WKCE are administered to grades four, eight, and ten in reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.
- *Norm or Criterion Referenced* WRCT is a criterion-referenced reading assessment; WKCE are norm-referenced.
- *Matrix or Census* Census
- *Item Types (including proportions if available via Internet or interview) such as: traditional or enhanced multiple choice, performance tasks, open-ended questions, portfolios, essays, etc.*

The 2000 Reading Comprehension Test included three reading passages (two narrative and one expository). Each passage was followed by a set of questions that measure reading comprehension. The students' test scores were based only on the reading comprehension questions. The test contained 63 multiple-choice reading comprehension questions and two short-answer reading comprehension questions. The short-answer questions asked students to provide the answers, rather than selecting from given answer choices as in the multiple-choice questions.

The Knowledge and Concepts Examinations include both multiple choice and short answer questions.

- *Time of Testing (specific month(s) or testing window)* March 6-24, 2000
- *High School Exit Exam (date of implementation and/or phase-in timeline)*

Currently, Wisconsin does not have a high school graduation test in place. However, by September 1, 2002, each school board must adopt a written policy specifying the criteria for granting a high school diploma. The criteria for granting a high school diploma must include

the number of credits required and other elements as identified in paragraph (a) of ss. 118.33; pupil score on the high school graduation test, pupil academic performance, and recommendations of teachers. The high school graduation test will be first administered in the fall, 2002. The use of the high school graduation test as criterion for graduation applies to the class of 2004. In other words, those students who plan to graduate at the end of school year 2003-2004 will be the first group affected.

According to state law, each school district operating high school grades must administer a high school graduation test beginning in the eleventh grade with at least four opportunities to take the test before graduation. If a district adopted the Wisconsin Model Academic Content Standards, it may use **either** the department-developed test or develop or purchase a test of its own. If a district did not adopt the Wisconsin Model Academic Content Standards, the district will have to develop or purchase its own test. Districts adopting or developing their own tests must notify the department by October 1 the year before the adopted or developed test is used.

The department-developed Wisconsin High School Graduation Test will assess whether students have met the academic standards for English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Each examination will have approximately 80 score points and will take roughly three hours to complete.

- *Other Assessments* NAEP, ACT, AP
 - *Transitional or Final Assessment System* Final Assessment system
3. *Who designed and produced the assessment(s) used by the state? Probe on:*
- *State Department of Education*
 - *Commercial Testing Organization*
 - *State teachers and administrators*
 - *Assessment Committee*
 - *Other*

The Reading Comprehension Test was developed by Wisconsin educators and MetriTech Inc., of Champaign, Illinois.

under the direction of the Department of Public Instruction and the Reading Comprehension Test Advisory Committee.

With regard to the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE), the Department of Public Instruction contracts with a vendor to provide examinations and scoring services. The contract can be renewed up to three years and currently must be rebid according to state purchasing requirements. The Department of Public Instruction provides vendors with guidelines and program requirements and vendors propose an off-the-shelf product, generate a new product, or bid a customized test. The last contract for Knowledge and Concepts Examination was awarded to Harcourt-Brace Educational Measurement and their Stanford 8 test series. The most recent contract was won by CTB/McGraw-Hill publishing company who proposed their new CTBS TerraNova assessment.

4. *What are the state requirements for local assessment, including the types of assessments and their use in areas such as reporting and accountability, as well as Title I adequate yearly progress? What grade levels and subjects are tested?*

Each LEA in Wisconsin is required to adopt academic standards, whether they are the state standards, or their own, locally-developed standards. The law states that standards must be adopted by the school board. Minimally, board policy should include a statement about the adoption of standards. Adoption of standards should also be recorded in board minutes. A district would be wise to elaborate its policy statement to address essential related issues. These might include assessment, accountability, and professional development.

As stated previously, each school district operating high school grades must administer a high school graduation test beginning in the eleventh grade with at least four opportunities to take the test before graduation. If a district adopted the Wisconsin Model Academic Content Standards, it may use **either** the department-developed test or develop or purchase a test of its own. If a district did not adopt the Wisconsin Model Academic Content Standards, the district will have to develop or purchase its own test. Districts adopting or developing their own tests must notify the department by October 1 the year before the adopted or developed test is used.

5. *Is the state assessment system aligned with the state standards? Are there plans for alignment, and if so, how will the assessment and standards become aligned? Probe on:*

The Wisconsin Department of Education has gone through a lengthy process of developing content standards, performance standards and proficiency standards. These standards are in four areas: English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. The Department of Public Instruction has also developed standards in a variety of other disciplines.

- Content Standards refer to *what* students should know and be able to do. They are usually broad descriptions of the knowledge in a subject area.
- Performance Standards tell *how* students will *show* that they are meeting a content standard. Performance standards specify or detail the type of demonstration needed to provide evidence of a student's achievement.
- Proficiency Standards indicate *how well* student must perform.

However, DPI does *not* determine a district's curriculum. Each local school board is responsible for adopting their own local standards. State statute required districts to adopt academic standards, either those developed by the state or locally-developed, by August 1, 1998. If districts elect to use the state high school graduation test, the DPI will ask for evidence of formal board adoption of the state standards.

The TerraNova assessment currently serves as the Knowledge and Concepts Examination and is substantially aligned with state standards.

6. *What is the state's approach for ensuring alignment and what evidence of that alignment is provided?*

The Knowledge and Concepts Examination is intended to measure student achievement in five subject areas: reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Wisconsin relies on a norm-referenced assessment, rather than a state-developed criterion-referenced assessment. However, as a result of a recent study, Wisconsin educators concluded that 97% of the test questions cover knowledge and skills contained in Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards

7. How is the data included in the state assessment system used?

Data from the Wisconsin Student Assessment System is used for the following purposes:

- Provide clear expectations or standards for student learning.
- Provide student achievement data relative to the expectations or standards.
- Use assessment methods that promote high quality curriculum and instruction.
- Provide feedback to students and their families to assist in educational planning.

The Reading Comprehension Test has four purposes:

- To identify the reading level of individual students with respect to statewide proficiency levels,
- To provide districts with information that will help them evaluate the effectiveness of their primary reading programs,
- To allow school districts to compare the performance of their students with state proficiency levels, and
- To provide data for meeting federal and state statutory requirements with respect to student assessment.

8. Are there changes planned for the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?

The following changes are anticipated to the assessment system in Wisconsin:

- A school board must adopt a written policy specifying the criteria that will be used for advancing a student from fourth grade to fifth and from eighth grade to ninth. The criteria must include the test score on the knowledge and concepts examination, pupil academic performance, recommendation of teachers based on academic performance, and any other academic criteria identified by the board. The policy will be effective as of September 1, 2002. Fourth and eighth graders in the 2002-2003 school year will be the first group affected by this legislation.
- By September 1, 2002, a school board must adopt a written policy specifying the criteria for granting a high school diploma. While the policy must be in place by September 2002, it affects students graduating in 2003-2004.

9. What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of state assessment? Explain.

Wisconsin officials note that Wisconsin does very well compared to the rest of the nation in most assessed academic areas. However, they still have consistently poor minority student

achievement. Hence, they are focusing efforts more toward improving minority student achievement. They are working on reports and research studies on how minority student have been performing.

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

1. What exclusions are made in the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP? Who makes the decision about exclusion of a particular child? Does the state collect data or in other ways monitor the number and types of students excluded? Does that vary by test?

Wisconsin notes the following regarding cases in which students may be excluded from statewide testing:

- By law, all students enrolled in grades 4, 8, and 10 are expected to take statewide tests except students with severe disabilities, students at early levels of English proficiency, and students who are excused by their parents.
- Approximately 1 to 2% of ALL students have disabilities so severe that they should be excluded from statewide tests. This is about 10 to 20% of all students with disabilities.
- Approximately 1% of ALL students are limited-English proficient (LEP) at the earliest English proficiency levels and should be excluded from statewide tests. This percent is slightly higher at grade 4 and lower at grade 10 and is nearly half of all LEP students enrolled.
- Approximately 2 to 3% of all students enrolled are appropriately excluded or are excused by their parents. In other words, Knowledge and Concepts Examination participation rates should be 97-98% of all students enrolled.
- Expectations vary across districts and schools because the proportions and characteristics of students with disabilities and Limited English Proficiency students varies across districts and schools.
- Although difference in attendance rates may explain some of the differences in the Knowledge and Concepts Examination participation rates, a three-week testing window is provided to allow local flexibility in scheduling and for administering makeup tests to students absent on test days.

Policies with regard to students with disabilities: According to department policy, Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams are responsible for determining how a student with a disability will participate in standardized statewide and district assessments. IEP teams must make this decision based on several factors including a student's present level of education performance, IEP goals and objectives, and the content and format of the standardized test. IEP teams must collect multiple pieces of evidence such as classroom work samples, teacher or parent reports, and classroom observations to make decisions about participation in the standardized assessment.

Participation in general statewide and district assessments for students with disabilities is not an all or nothing decision. Options for participation in such assessments include that the student: (1) participates without accommodations, (2) participates in all or portions (some of the content areas) of assessment with accommodations as needed; participates in an alternate assessment process for remaining portions (content areas) (3) participates in an alternate assessment process for all portions (content areas).

Policies with regard to LEP students: Students are expected to participate in the Reading Comprehension Test and Knowledge and Concepts Examination as soon as they achieve an English proficiency level that allows them to demonstrate their knowledge and skills on these tests. Decisions regarding participation in locally-developed standards-based alternate assessments must be consistent with federal and state legislation.

Three options reflect the alternatives for the inclusion of students with Limited English Proficiency: 1) Participation in the WKCE without accommodations, i.e., changes in the administration or format of the test that do not alter the test content or intent of the test. 2) Participation in the WKCE with accommodations, or 3) Participation in locally-developed, standards-based alternate assessments.

For local educators to determine which of the above options is most appropriate for each student with LEP, a thorough, individualized *English Language Proficiency Assessment* must first be conducted by qualified school staff.

2. *What accommodations and/or modifications are made on the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP?*

The following are examples of accommodations in these domains which would not compromise the validity of the WSAS assessments:

1. Time Accommodations

- administer the test in shorter sessions with more breaks or rest periods
- space testing over several days
- administer the test at a time most beneficial to the student
- allow the student more time to complete the test

2. Environment Accommodations

- administer the test to a small group or in an individual session
- allow the student to work in a study carrel
- place the student in the room or part of the room where he or she is most comfortable
- allow the special education teacher or aide to administer the test
- provide verbal praise or tangible reinforcers to increase motivation

3. Format Accommodations

- use an enlarger or enlarged copy of the test for students with visual impairments
- use a Braille edition of the test for students with visual impairments
- administer practice tests or examples before the administration date of the assessment
- assist the student to track the test items by pointing or placing the student's finger on the items
- use sign language for directions and items for students with hearing impairments
- allow use of equipment or technology that the student uses for other tests and school work. (It is inappropriate to use audiotaped, videotaped, or any other type of electronic versions of the Reading Comprehension Test or Knowledge and Concepts Examination reading test.)
- read directions and items for Knowledge and Concepts Examination tests (mathematics, science, and social studies only).

4. Recording Accommodations

- have someone record the student's responses
- use a computer board, communication board, tape recorder, etc., to record responses and then transfer responses to test booklet

3. *Does the state provide assessments in languages other than English? If so, describe. In what grades and subjects?*

No, the state of Wisconsin determined that the translation of large scale assessments into all of the languages spoken by students with LEP in the state was not viable. Hence, local alternate assessment offers the best solution for full inclusion of students with LEP at early English proficiency levels.

4. *Does the state provide alternative assessments for students with disabilities? If so, describe. For which students and in which subjects and at what ages?*

Alternate assessment in Wisconsin is performed by relying upon the alternate performance indicators. The alternate performance indicators (APIs) are extensions of the academic content standards for all students. They describe how students with disabilities may demonstrate learning associated with designated content and performance standards aligned with the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards (WMAS) or district-developed standards. APIs can serve as a framework for constructing a detailed review for the students who participate in the statewide assessment system through an alternate assessment process for some portions or the entire test. APIs are also intended to assist Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams in communicating with parents and educators about a student's current level of performance relative to the academic content standards.

5. *Does the state have a goal for the inclusion of students with disabilities and/or LEP students on the statewide tests? Does the state use any strategies to encourage the inclusion of students with disabilities? LEP students?*

Yes, Wisconsin affirms that its academic content, performance and proficiency standards are for ALL students in the state.

6. *Are changes planned in the for the inclusion of SWD and LEP students in the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

No changes are currently anticipated.

Performance Standards

1. *How many and what performance levels has the state established for its assessments?*

Wisconsin currently uses four proficiency categories: **advanced**, **proficient**, **basic**, and **minimal performance**. For accountability purposes, the key category is the proficient category. School achievement will be measured in terms of the percent of students scoring in the proficient category or above on the statewide Knowledge and Concepts Examinations. The proficient category is a high standard that has been defined as competence in the subject area, including mastery of the important knowledge and skills necessary for progress in school.

General Descriptions of the Proficiency Categories:

- **Advanced:** Distinguished achievement. In-depth understanding of academic knowledge and skills tested.
- **Proficient:** Competent in the important academic knowledge and skills tested.
- **Basic:** Somewhat competent in the academic knowledge and skills tested.
- **Minimal Performance:** Limited achievement in the academic knowledge and skills tested.

Proficiency Category Summaries In terms of TerraNova Scale Scores

READING	Minimal Performance	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Fourth Grade	~427-599	600-624	625-683	684-797+
Eighth Grade	~498-654	655-671	672-717	718-820+
Tenth Grade	~512-665	666-693	694-726	727-838+
LANGUAGE ARTS	Minimal Performance	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Fourth Grade	~455-598	599-630	631-667	668-793+
Eighth Grade	~502-639	640-668	669-706	707-825+
Tenth Grade	~530-666	667-692	693-733	734-835+
MATHEMATICS	Minimal Performance	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Fourth Grade	~385-580	581-622	623-658	659-788+
Eighth Grade	~487-673	674-717	718-749	750-850+
Tenth Grade	~513-715	716-743	744-781	782-892+
SCIENCE	Minimal Performance	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Fourth Grade	~400-586	587-618	619-670	671-799+
Eighth Grade	~483-661	662-691	692-728	729-857+
Tenth Grade	~489-684	685-717	718-755	756-893+
SOCIAL STUDIES	Minimal Performance	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Fourth Grade	~430-607	608-626	627-660	661-763+
Eighth Grade	~515-648	649-669	670-701	702-803+
Tenth Grade	~530-673	674-691	692-720	721-821+

2. *Has the state set acceptable levels or targets for schools, districts or the state on tests, drop-out rates or other measures (e.g. 70% of students in Maryland pass the MSPAP)?*

- *Target level*

- *Percentage of students expected to attain target level*
- *Time period in which to attain level*
- *Annual increase required*

Wisconsin has set two targets for schools for the academic year 1999-2000. To meet annual review requirements, schools must meet one of the following criteria:

- **90% Rule.** According to this rule, the percentage of students enrolled in the school for the full prior academic year who, in 1999-2000 scored at or above the “Proficient” level needs to be greater than or equal to the percentages in the table below:

90% Rule by Subject and by Grade

Grade	4	8	10
Reading	62%	58%	57%
Language Arts	65%	64%	56%
Mathematics	47%	27%	32%
Science	58%	50%	39%
Social Studies	56%	62%	59%

- **Required CPI:** The CPI, or “Continuous Progress Indicator” is a measure of the improvement in performance of successive groups of students in grades 4, 8, and 10. Schools are credited for improvement in the percent of students scoring at or above the “Proficient” category and for movement of students from the “Not Tested on WKCE” or “Minimal Performance” categories into the “Basic” category or above. Students excluded from the Knowledge and Concepts Examination who are performing at the “Pre-requisite Skill/English” level (Alternate Assessment) are counted in the “Not Tested on WKCE” group for CPI computation purposes. The school’s 1999-2000 CPI needs to be greater than or equal to the Required CPI below:

Baseline % At or Above Proficient	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	Greater than 80
Required CPI	4	3	2	1	0 – stay above 80

Through the CPI, Wisconsin sets a target percentage of students to perform at a given level, an annual required increase in test scores, and a means for closing the gap between high and low performing students.

3. How are these performance standards calculated? What data are included in the calculations, and at what proportions (e.g. assessment results 60%, dropout and attendance rates 40%). How are the calculations made? What is the final unit of analysis for reporting school and district achievement levels (e.g. performance index, grade, category)?

The performance standards are calculated entirely on the basis of assessment results; non-cognitive indicators are not included. For 1999-2000 CPI the “Baseline % Proficient + Advanced” is the average of the school’s “% Proficient + % Advanced” for 1997-98 and 1998-

99. Note that three years of proficiency scores will be used to calculate the 1999-2000 CPI. Results for 1999-2000 are compared to the averaged of the results for 1997-98 and 1998-99. Averaging results across years to calculate the CPI addresses certain concerns about variation in the characteristics of successive groups of students at the given grade level, particularly at very small schools.

4. Are all students, schools and districts included in these performance calculations? If not, who is excluded?

All students are included in the performance calculations. Indeed, the CPI takes into account the number of students “Not Tested.” Students in this category are grouped with students scoring at the “Minimal Performance” level for purposes of calculating the CPI, and hence a high percentage of students “Not Tested” can negatively impact a school’s CPI.

5. Are changes planned for the state performance standards (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?

The most imminent change in performance standards and calculations will be the discontinuation of the 90% rule beginning with the test results for the academic year 2001-2002. At that point, the CPI will be fully implemented; the previous four years of data would be used for annual review purposes.

6. What proportion of schools and/or districts fail to meet acceptable levels on performance targets?

Thirty-seven districts and 216 schools were identified as in need of improvement during the 1999-2000 academic year, based on the previous two years of data.

Reporting Performance Data

1. Describe the characteristics of the state performance data reporting system (by whom, what data, who is the audience) for each of the following levels:

Wisconsin Accountability Law includes the following provisions with regard to the public reporting of performance data:

115.38 SCHOOL PERFORMANCE REPORT; EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW.

(1) The state superintendent shall develop a school and school district performance report for use by school districts under sub. (2). The report shall include all of the following by school and by school district:

(a) Indicators of academic achievement, including the performance of pupils on the tests administered under s. 121.02 (1) (r) and the performance of pupils, by subject area, on the statewide assessment examinations administered under s. 118.30.

(b) 1. Other indicators of school and school district performance, including dropout, attendance, retention in grade and graduation rates; percentage of habitual truants, as defined in s. 118.16 (1) (a); percentage of pupils participating in extracurricular and community activities and advanced placement courses; percentage of graduates enrolled in postsecondary educational programs; and percentage of graduates entering the workforce.

2. The numbers of suspensions and expulsions; the reasons for which pupils are suspended or expelled, reported according to categories specified by the state superintendent; the length of time for which pupils are expelled, reported according to categories specified by the state superintendent; whether pupils return to school after their expulsion; the educational programs and services, if any, provided to pupils during their expulsions, reported according to categories specified by the state superintendent; the schools attended by pupils who are suspended or expelled; and the grade, sex and ethnicity of pupils who are suspended or expelled and whether the pupils are children with disabilities, as defined in s. 115.76 (5).

(c) Staffing and financial data information, as determined by the state superintendent, not to exceed 10 items. The state superintendent may not request a school board to provide information solely for the purpose of including the information in the report under this paragraph.

(d) The number and percentage of resident pupils attending a course in a nonresident school district under s. 118.52, the number of nonresident pupils attending a course in the school district under s. 118.52, and the courses taken by those pupils.

(e) The method of reading instruction used in the school district and the textbook series used to teach reading in the school district.

(2) By January 1, 1993, and annually thereafter by January 1, each school board shall distribute to the parent or guardian of each pupil enrolled in the school district, including pupils enrolled in charter schools located in the school district, or give to each pupil to bring home to his or her parent or guardian, a school and school district performance report that includes the information specified by the state superintendent under sub. (1).

(3) Annually, the state superintendent shall publish and distribute to the legislature under s. 13.172 (2) a summary of the reports under sub. (2).

(4) Beginning in the 1993-94 school year and annually thereafter, the state superintendent shall identify those school districts that are low in performance and those schools in which there are pupils enrolled who do not meet the state minimum performance standards on the examinations administered under s. 118.30. The state superintendent shall make recommendations regarding how the programs and operations of the identified school districts and schools may be improved and periodically assess school district implementation of the recommendations.

- *Student reports*

Parents receive a report on the performance of their child on state assessments.

- *School reports*

School Knowledge and Concepts Examination results are available on the Department of Public Instruction website, including the following data:

- ✓ Subject (Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies)
- ✓ Grade 4, 8, or 10
- ✓ Total enrollment in Grade
- ✓ Percent not tested on WKCE
- ✓ Percent Scoring Minimal
- ✓ Percent Scoring Basic
- ✓ Percent Scoring Proficient
- ✓ Percent Scoring Advanced
- ✓ National Percentile Rank
- ✓ Disaggregated by: Nation, State, Students not in District Full Academic year (FAY), Students in District FAY, Single School FAY, Male, Female, Am Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, While, Limited English Proficient, English Proficient, Students with Disabilities, Nondisabled, Economically Disadvantaged, Not Economically Disadvantaged.

School-level results on the Reading Comprehension Test are also available on the DPI website. These are expressed as percentages of students who scored in the Advanced (62 through 67 points), Proficient (49 through 61 points), Basic (32 through 48 points), and Minimal (0 through 31 points) proficiency levels. No results are reported for any school or district in which five or fewer students were enrolled.

In addition, the State-level **School Performance Report** (SPR) is available for download from the DPI website. The data included in the SPR may be accessed for individual schools. The SPR contains a range of cognitive and non-cognitive indicators of school performance. For more information on this report, please see below.

- *District reports*

District Knowledge and Concepts Examination results are available on the DPI website, including the following data:

- ✓ Subject (Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies)
- ✓ Grade 4, 8, or 10
- ✓ Total enrollment in Grade
- ✓ Percent not tested on WKCE
- ✓ Percent Scoring Minimal
- ✓ Percent Scoring Basic
- ✓ Percent Scoring Proficient
- ✓ Percent Scoring Advanced
- ✓ National Percentile Rank
- ✓ Disaggregated by: Nation, State, Students not in Dist Full Academic year (FAY), Students in Dist FAY, Single School FAY, Male, Female, Am Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific

Islander, Black, Hispanic, White, Limited English Proficient, English Proficient, Students with Disabilities, Nondisabled, Economically Disadvantaged, Not Economically Disadvantaged.

District-level results on the Reading Comprehension Test are also available on the DPI website. These are expressed as percentages of students who scored in the Advanced (62 through 67 points), Proficient (49 through 61 points), Basic (32 through 48 points), and Minimal (0 through 31 points) proficiency levels. No results are reported for any school or district in which five or fewer students were enrolled.

In addition, the State-level **School Performance Report** (SPR) is available for download from the DPI website. The data included in the SPR may be accessed for individual districts. The SPR contains a range of cognitive and non-cognitive indicators of school performance. For more information on this report, please see below.

- *State reports*

The **Wisconsin School Performance Report (SPR)** was created in 1991 with the passage of State Statute 115.38. It serves as the state's annual public school report card, and represents the department's most comprehensive resource for data on school performance and student achievement.

Information in the School Performance Report comes from three sources:

- ✓ Wisconsin's 426 public school districts and its two state schools (Wisconsin School for the Deaf and Wisconsin School for the Visually Handicapped)
- ✓ Private firms that administer assessments to Wisconsin's students (ACT, AP, etc.)
- ✓ DPI data collections other than SPR (PI- 1505 Annual Report, PI-1202 Fall Staff Report, and PI-1215 Curriculum Report)

The contents of the School Performance Report are organized into two broad categories: Student Performance Indicators and Opportunity-to-Learn Indicators.

Student Performance Indicators give readers a look at eight different measures of achievement:

- ✓ Advanced Placement Test
- ✓ American College Test (ACT)
- ✓ Graduation Statistics
- ✓ Knowledge & Concepts Examinations (grades four, eight and ten)
- ✓ Postgraduation Intentions
- ✓ Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test (formerly Third Grade Reading Test)

Opportunity-to-Learn Indicators offer insight into the classes and experiences available to public school pupils. This section is divided into a District Profile and a Student Profile.

The District Profile includes:

- ✓ Advanced Coursework
- ✓ General Fund Expenditures
- ✓ General Fund Revenues

- ✓ High School Graduation Requirements
- ✓ Pupil/Staff Ratios

The Student Profile includes:

- ✓ Attendance
- ✓ Dropouts
- ✓ Expulsion
- ✓ Extra/Co-Curricular Activities
- ✓ Habitual Truancy
- ✓ Retention
- ✓ School-Sponsored Community Activities
- ✓ Suspension (Out-of-School)

The statewide School Performance Report is available for download from the DPI website in three separate zip files.

State WKCE results are available on the DPI website, including the following data:

- ✓ Subject (Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies)
- ✓ Grade 4, 8, or 10
- ✓ Total enrollment in Grade
- ✓ Percent not tested on WKCE
- ✓ Percent Scoring Minimal
- ✓ Percent Scoring Basic
- ✓ Percent Scoring Proficient
- ✓ Percent Scoring Advanced
- ✓ National Percentile Rank
- ✓ Disaggregated by: Nation, State, Students not in District Full Academic year (FAY), Students in District FAY, Single School FAY, Male, Female, Am Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, While, Limited English Proficient, English Proficient, Students with Disabilities, Nondisabled, Economically Disadvantaged, Not Economically Disadvantaged.

- *Title I reports*

Wisconsin does not have separate indicators solely for Title I programs, as all students are held to the same high standards statewide. However, Wisconsin complies with federal requirements for Title I reporting.

2. How are the data distributed? When during the year (month or time period after assessment)? To whom (students, teachers, parents, the media, the community)?

A substantial amount of data is easily accessible on the Department of Public Instruction website. In addition, state statutes require that each school board distribute to the parent or guardian of each pupil enrolled in the school district, including pupils enrolled in charter schools located in the school district, or give to each pupil to bring home to his or her parent or guardian, a school and school district performance report.

3. *At what level(s) are data disaggregated (state, district and school levels)? For what groups are disaggregated data reported (see Internet sites for state, district and school level report cards)?*

Wisconsin disaggregates the Knowledge and Concepts Examinations on the following variables: Male, Female, Am Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, White, Limited English Proficient, English Proficient, Students with Disabilities, Nondisabled, Economically Disadvantaged, Not Economically Disadvantaged.

All disaggregated data is available on the Department of Public Instruction website. In September 2000 the newly developed WINNS website will have additional disaggregated data elements.

4. *Does trend data exist from the state assessments (example: Texas State Assessment data is available from “1996-97 on”)?*

When reporting performance data on the Knowledge and Concepts Examination, the Department of Public Instruction website includes two to three years of data. When reporting data on the Reading Comprehension assessment, five years of trend data are available.

5. *How are the results of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency reported? Are they included in the aggregate scores reported to the public, or disaggregated by group?*

Wisconsin includes the scores of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students in the overall scores, but also disaggregates the results of these groups. Both aggregated and disaggregated data are available in public reports.

6. *What are the state’s requirements for the use of data in school and district improvement planning?*

The state expects schools in need of improvement to use assessment data in the following manner when developing a school improvement plan:

Analyzing student performance

- Review test content
- Study student objectives performance
- Break down results by student groups

Analyzing curriculum/instruction

- What is taught?
- When is it taught?
- How is it taught?
- What is missing?
- Where can teaching be improved?

Taking action -- planning for improvement

- Changes in curriculum-content and focus
- Changes in school organization
- Changes in teaching and learning strategies
- Changes in instructional materials
- Timeline for implementation
- Evidence to evaluate progress

7. *Are changes planned for performance reporting (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the accountability system (Title I or in general)?*

No changes to the reporting system are currently anticipated.

8. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of performance standards and reporting? Explain.*

One issue relevant to the reporting of performance data in Wisconsin is the protection of student privacy. Care has been taken to avoid disclosure of test results for small groups of students, either directly or indirectly. Indirect disclosure occurs when results are reported both for all students in a group and for a large subset of this group leaving only a small subset not reported. A group is considered small if the number of students in the group is five or less.

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the accountability system as the context.*

In response to feedback from Wisconsin educators, as well as in response to state and federal law, Wisconsin developed and is in the process of implementing a Continuous Progress Index. This index, or CPI, which forms the basis of the Wisconsin accountability system, integrates several components: the movement of students out of the lowest performance category, the increase of students in the “Proficient” performance category, and the number of students not tested. The CPI determines the progress that is expected of each school annually. In addition, Wisconsin is in the process of developing student accountability measures that will be in effect as of September 2002.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state accountability system?*

- *Who is held accountable (students, schools, districts)?*
- *For what are they held accountable (adequate yearly progress, student achievement, processes, multiple non-cognitive indicators, etc)?*
- *Using what criteria (state assessments, local assessments, both state and local criteria)?*
- *To what targets or performance levels?*
- *With what consequences (promotion or graduation, program improvement, additional planning, state takeover, rewards, assistance, etc.)?*

- *Student Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

Two statutes have recently expanded the accountability system to include students. One statute required students to earn a passing score on a high school graduation test as a condition for receiving a high school diploma. The other statutes required students to receive a proficiency score of basic or above on the fourth and eighth grade Knowledge and Concepts Examination as a condition for advancement to fifth and ninth grades. Popularly referred to as the “No Social Promotion” legislation, the real goal of this law focused on setting high expectations for grade advancement.

In accordance with this law, a school board must adopt a written policy specifying the criteria that will be used for advancing a student from fourth grade to fifth and from eighth grade to ninth. The criteria must include the test score on the Knowledge and Concepts Examination, pupil academic performance, recommendations of teachers based on academic performance, and any other academic criteria identified by the board. The policy will be effective as of September 1, 2002. Fourth and eighth graders in the 2002-2003 school year will be the first group affected by this legislation.

In addition, by September 1, 2002, a school board must adopt a written policy specifying the criteria for granting a high school diploma. The criteria must include the number of credits required, pupil score on the high school graduation test, pupil academic performance, and recommendations of teachers.

- *School Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

Accountability in Wisconsin is focused on the school level. Wisconsin notes that both state and federal law require the annual review of school performance to determine academic achievement and progress. This review is based on the WKCE score of students enrolled in the school for a full academic year. To meet annual review requirements for 1999-2000, schools were required to meet one of the following criteria.

- **90% Rule.** According to this rule, the percentage of students enrolled in the school for the full prior academic year who, in 1999-2000 scored at or above the “Proficient” level needs to be greater than or equal to the percentages in the table below:

90% Rule by Subject and by Grade

Grade	4	8	10
Reading	62%	58%	57%
Language Arts	65%	64%	56%
Mathematics	47%	27%	32%
Science	58%	50%	39%
Social Studies	56%	62%	59%

- **Required CPI:** The CPI, or “Continuous Progress Indicator” is a measure of the improvement in performance of successive groups of students in grades 4, 8, and 10. Schools are credited for improvement in the percent of students scoring at or above the “Proficient” category and for movement of students from the “Not Tested on WKCE” or “Minimal Performance” categories into the “Basic” category or above. Students excluded

from Knowledge and Concepts Examination who are performing at the “Pre-requisite Skill/English” level (Alternate Assessment) are counted in the “Not Tested on WKCE” group for CPI computation purposes. The school’s 1999-2000 CPI needs to be greater than or equal to the Required CPI below:

Baseline % At or Above Proficient	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	Greater than 80
Required CPI	4	3	2	1	0 – stay above 80

For 1999-2000, the “Baseline % Proficient + Advanced” is the average of the school’s “% Proficient + % Advanced” for 1997-98 and 1998-99. School at lower baseline achievement levels are expected to make more progress than other schools. Note that three years of proficiency scores will be used to calculate the 1999-2000 CPI. Results for 1999-2000 are compared to the averaged of the results for 1997-98 and 1998-99. Averaging results across years to calculate the CPI addresses certain concerns about variation in the characteristics of successive groups of students at the given grade level, particularly at very small schools.

No specific amount of progress would be prescribed for schools that exceed 80% at or above Proficient level as long as over 80% of each successive group of students score at or above the Proficient level. Continued progress of these schools, to the goal of all or nearly all students attaining the Proficient level, will be considered as DPI clarifies its policy regarding the identification of Distinguished schools.

Schools will not be identified as “in need of improvement” in a subject unless the school fails to meet the annual review criteria for two consecutive years. Once identified as “in need of improvement,” a school must meet the annual review criteria of two of three consecutive years.

- *District Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

The state does not enforce any district accountability policies. However, beginning with 1998 proficiency test data, school boards were authorized to establish local goals for improvement. Using objective summary data, boards can focus on improvement plans.

3. *What methods of measuring progress are used in the state accountability system?*

- *Relative growth*
- *Absolute target*
- *Narrowing the Gap between high and low achievers*

The Wisconsin accountability system sets a target for all schools to achieve, as well as a growth target for schools that have not yet achieved that target. Because the CPI takes into account the number of students who move out of the lowest performance category, it is a measure of how well schools are narrowing the gap between high and low achieving students.

4. *Are all students included in calculating the measures of progress? If not, who is excluded (probe on inclusion of SWD and LEP students)?*

All students are included in the measures of progress in Wisconsin: the CPI takes into account both those students who took the assessment and those who did not take the assessment.

5. How do the general state accountability system and the system of accountability for Title I schools compare? Are they the same, or different? How?

The general state accountability system and the Title I accountability system are one and the same. The progress of Title I schools is measured with the CPI, as is the progress of all other schools. The requirements for entering and exiting program improvement are the same for all schools, regardless of Title I status.

6. Are subgroup performance results used as an indicator in the calculation of state accountability measures? If so, how? To identify schools or districts in need of improvement? For recognition and rewards?

Performance data is routinely disaggregated, but subgroup performance is not used as an indicator in the calculation of state accountability measures.

7. Are charter and/or non-public schools included in the accountability system? If so, how?

Charter schools are included in the state accountability system but non-public schools are not.

8. Are changes planned for the state accountability system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?

Several changes are anticipated for Wisconsin's accountability system:

- Use of the 90% rule will be discontinued after 2000-2001, when the CPI will be fully implemented.
- The high school graduation test will be first administered in fall, 2002. The use of the high school graduation test as a criterion for graduation applies to the class of 2004. In other words, those students who plan to graduate at the end of school year 2003-2004 will be the first group affected.
- The Department of Public Instruction is developing a policy regarding the identification of Distinguished Schools.
- By September 2002, a school board must adopt a written policy specifying the criteria that will be used for advancing a student from fourth grade to fifth and from eighth grade to ninth. The criteria must include the test score on the knowledge and concepts examination, pupil academic performance, recommendations of teachers based on academic performance, and any other academic criteria identified by the board. The policy will be effective as of September 1, 2002. Fourth and eighth graders in the 2002-2003 school year will be the first group affected by this legislation. The Department of Public Instruction has developed extensive guidance to assist local districts in the development of their promotion policies.

9. What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of accountability? Explain.

Wisconsin officials note that they are relatively new to the standards, assessment and accountability framework. There is a need to build districts' capacity to use assessments and accountability to induce educational change.

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

1. How are schools and districts identified as low performing? Using what criteria? Do the identification processes and/or criteria differ for Title I and non-Title I schools?

Schools are identified as low-performing on the basis of their CPI. If a school fails to meet the annual review criteria for two consecutive years then it will be identified as "in need of improvement." The identification processes and criteria are not different for Title I and non-Title I schools.

2. Does the district or the state decide whether a school is low performing? If the district is involved in the process, how much discretion do they have?

Under Wisconsin law the state superintendent is responsible for identifying low performing schools and districts, but federal law places this responsibility at the district level, so it is a shared procedure in Wisconsin.

3. What types of assistance are provided to these schools and districts by the state?

- *Evaluation and Planning*
- *Financial*
- *Expert Assistance*

After a school is preliminarily identified as "in need of improvement," based upon state test results, the DPI will:

1. notify the district of the department's preliminary finding
2. offer the district the opportunity to review data validity and/or cite other evidence of continuous progress
3. confirm or withdraw the "identification"
4. for schools "identified," offer assistance which may take any of the following forms:
 - a. review, analyze data
 - b. conduct collaborative needs assessment
 - c. provide subject area consultant or team visit(s)
 - d. highlight opportunities available through state and federal school improvement grants
 - e. offer referral to a Cooperative Education Services Agency (CESA) standards and assessment center, or other CESA resource
 - f. offer referral to other appropriate resources (WASDI, University of Wisconsin, educational associations, peer reviewers, consultants)
 - g. provide other assistance as may be appropriate

4. *Who provides the state assistance?*

- *School/district support teams*
- *Regional centers*
- *Distinguished educators*
- *SDE staff*
- *Other – Explain*

School Improvement Teams are the initial providers of assistance to low performing schools. These teams, which consist primarily of cross-agency DPI staff, look at the academic areas tested, focus on the areas on which the school should focus efforts, review curriculum, instructional techniques, etc.

In addition, Wisconsin operates 12 Cooperative Education Service Agencies, or CESAs. In each of the CESAs there is a standards and assessment specialist who is available to assist low performing schools and districts. The State superintendent has also earmarked low performing schools for additional funding when available. Finally, the state tries to target resources to low performing schools, for example, through conferences aimed at strategies for staff development.

5. *Does support to Title I and all low performing schools and districts differ? Is support generally provided for all schools and districts, or are services specifically designed to help those that are low performing?*

Wisconsin operates one system of support; both state and federal law are married into one system. However, Wisconsin does have a consultant who works specifically with Title I low performing schools, and a Title I-specific school improvement team.

6. *Has the state established a set of criteria and/or a process for getting schools and districts out of low performing status? If so, what do they include?*

If a school has been identified as in need of improvement, it must meet the annual review criteria for two of three consecutive years.

7. *Once a school or district is identified as low performing, what types of plans must it prepare? Who are they submitted to once completed? How do they differ from other planning documents?*

Schools that are identified as low-performing must complete a needs assessment, review and analyze data, and produce a school improvement plan. It is the district responsibility to supervise the preparation of these plans, and the improvement plans must be submitted to the district, not the state.

8. *Are changes planned for the state system of identifying and assisting low performing schools or districts (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

There will be some changes to the state accountability system, but these will not particularly impact the system of identifying and assisting low performing schools.

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

1. What criteria are included in the definition of adequate yearly progress for schools and districts under Title I?

- *What measures are used (relationship between cognitive/non-cognitive data)?*
- *What targets have been established?*
- *Are local assessment systems included as criteria? If so, does the state provide guidance? Monitor their use?*
- *Is subgroup performance included in the criteria?*

The criteria included in the Wisconsin definition of adequate yearly progress are the same as those included in the CPI, described above. The Continuous Progress Indicator is based entirely on the Knowledge and Concepts Examinations.

2. What are the definitions of adequate yearly progress for the following:

- *Title I schools and non-Title I schools*
- *Targeted vs. schoolwide programs, charter, non-public and small schools*
- *Districts*

Are these transitional or final definitions? If transitional, when will the final definitions be in place and what criteria and processes will they include?

The CPI functions as the definition of adequate yearly progress for all schools in Wisconsin, whether they are Title I targeted assistance, Title I schoolwide, charter schools, or non-Title I schools. If schools make the expected progress as calculated with the CPI, they are considered to have made adequate yearly progress under Title I. The CPI applies to districts as well: the scores of district schools are aggregated to determine adequate yearly progress.

No specific amount of progress would be prescribed for schools that exceed 80% at or above Proficient level as long as over 80% of each successive group of students score at or above the Proficient level.

3. What is the process for identifying those schools and districts that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools? If the districts plays a role, does the state provide guidance on local criteria?

In Wisconsin, both the district and the state have responsibility to identify schools that have not made adequate yearly progress, as the state has one accountability system that incorporates both state and federal law.

4. What are the criteria and processes for identifying schools and districts in need of improvement under Title I? What plans must be prepared? How can a school or district get out of Program Improvement? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools?

In Wisconsin, both the district and the state have responsibility to identify schools in need of improvement, as the state has one accountability system that incorporates both state and federal

law. The department sends out a formal letter identifying schools based on the results of the CPI. However, the district also has a responsibility under the federal Title I legislation.

If a school or district fails to make adequate yearly progress for two years, it is then identified as “in need of improvement.” A school or district must make two years out of three of adequate yearly progress to lose the program improvement status.

Schools and districts in need of improvement must prepare an improvement plan that includes all elements of school reform. The school must conduct a needs assessment, review curriculum and instruction techniques, identify models that could be successfully implemented, etc. The plan must be data driven, and based on DPI research on school improvement. The plan is reviewed by staff in the DPI School Improvement and Title I office.

5. *What types of assistance are provided to those in need of improvement under Title I?*

- *Evaluation and Planning*
- *Financial*
- *Expert Assistance*

Title I schools are eligible for all the types of support that are outlined in the previous section on low-performing schools. In addition, under Title I there is a supplemental grant for schools that are in the greatest need for improvement for additional technical assistance.

6. *Who provides the assistance?*

- *School/district support teams*
- *Regional centers*
- *Distinguished educators*
- *SDE staff*
- *Other – Explain*

Title I assistance is largely the same as that which is available for all low-performing schools, as described earlier. However, Title I schools also have a designated Title I consultant and school improvement team.

7. *Have waivers played a role in this process?*

Waivers have not played a significant role in Title I in Wisconsin.

8. *Are there future plans for the state system for schools or districts receiving Title I funding (proposed or enacted and to be implemented) or for the definition of adequate yearly progress? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

With regard to future plans, Wisconsin officials intend to review the CPI to ensure that it is meeting the accountability needs of the state

In addition, Wisconsin plans to develop a school improvement website, to be called WINNS. This website will allow schools to “walk through” the school improvement and planning process,

identifying components of successful schools, essential data analysis, research-based improvement models, available resources, and more. Officials anticipate the website to be operable in the fall 2000.

9. Is there alignment between Title I and non-Title I systems for adequate yearly progress?

Yes, there is alignment between Title I and non-Title I systems of adequate yearly progress: the same CPI measure applies to all schools in the same manner.

10. What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of Title I? Explain.

One of the challenges that state officials identified was how to work effectively and cooperatively with other divisions in the Department of Public Instruction in order to make the best use of limited resources.

In addition, officials are concerned with ensuring that curriculum, standards, and assessments are all appropriately aligned.

Contact Information

Assessment and Accountability

Scott Jones
Director
School Improvement Team
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction 128 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53797-7841
(608) 261-6324
b.scott.jones@dpi.state.wi.us

Gary H. Cook
Director
Office of Educational Accountability
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction 128 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53797-7841
(608) 267-9111
h.gary.cook@dpi.state.wi.us

Title I

James Wall
Title I Director
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction 128 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53797-7841
(608) 267-1072
james.wall@dpi.state.wi.us