Wisconsin

ESEA Flexibility

Accountability Addendum

November 15, 2013

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, DC 20202

In order to move forward with State and local reforms designed to improve academic achievement and increase the quality of instruction for all students in a manner that was not originally contemplated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), a State educational agency (SEA) may request flexibility, on its own behalf and on behalf of its local educational agencies (LEAs), through waivers of certain provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and their associated regulatory, administrative, and reporting requirements (ESEA flexibility). However, an SEA that receives ESEA flexibility must comply with all statutory and regulatory provisions that are not waived. For example, an SEA must calculate a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, as set forth in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b), and disaggregate that rate for reporting. Similarly, an SEA must use an "n-size" that ensures, to the maximum extent practicable, that all student subgroups are included in accountability determinations, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 200.7(a)(2)(i)(B). Furthermore, an SEA may continue to use technical measures, such as confidence intervals, to the extent they are relevant to the SEA's ESEA flexibility request. This accountability addendum replaces a State's accountability workbook under NCLB and, together, an SEA's approved ESEA flexibility request and this accountability addendum contain the elements of the State's system of differentiated recognition, accountability and support.

Contents

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) 2

Annual Measurable Achievement Objective 3 (AMAO 3) under Title III 3

Subgroup Accountability 4

State Accountability System Includes All Schools and Districts 5

State Accountability System Includes All Students 8

Assessments 14

Statistical Reliability 14

Other Academic Indicators 16

Graduation Rate 17

Participation Rate 18

Instructions to the SEA: Please provide the requested information in the "State Response" column in the table below. Please provide the information in sufficient detail to fully explain your response. Also, please indicate whether the information provided is the same as that in your State accountability workbook under NCLB or reflects a change. Note that these instructions, the "change" column, and the "ED Comments" column of the table will be removed in the version of this document that is posted on ED's website.

Subject and Question	State Response
Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)	
Please attach the State's AMOs for reading/language arts and mathematics for the all students group and each individual subgroup. If the State has different AMOs for each school or LEA, attach the State-level AMOs and provide a link to a page on the SEA's web site where the LEA and school level AMOs are available.	Wisconsin's AMOs are available here: http://oea.dpi.wi.gov/oea_amo (valid as of 5.12.13). AMO targets are the same for all schools. A word version of Wisconsin's AMOs is attached.

Annual Measurable Achievement Objective 3 (AMAO 3) under Title III	
Please affirm that the State determines whether an LEA that receives funds under Title III of the ESEA meets AMAO 3 (ESEA section 3122(a)(3)(A)(iii)) based on either of the following: • Whether the subgroup of English Learners has made adequate yearly progress (AYP) under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B); or • If the State has received a waiver of making AYP determinations, whether the subgroup of English Learners has met or exceeded each of the following: o Its AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics. o 95 percent participation on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. o The State's goal or annual targets for graduation rate if the LEA includes one or more high schools.	Districts that receive Title III funds are evaluated on attainment of AMAO 3 based on whether the English Learners subgroup has made annual measurable objectives (AMOs). This includes each of the following: • AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics; • 95-percent test participation on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; and • The state's goal or annual improvement targets for graduation rate if the LEA includes one or more high schools.

Subgroup Accountability	
What subgroups, including any combined subgroups, as applicable, does the State use for accountability purposes, including measuring performance against AMOs, identifying priority, focus, and reward schools, and differentiating among other Title I schools? If using one or more combined subgroups, the State should identify what students comprise each combined subgroup.	Subgroups in Accountability Index Calculations for School Report Cards Wisconsin applies the following subgroups in calculations within the State's School Accountability Index: economically disadvantaged, English learners, students with disabilities, and race/ethnicity (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, black, Hispanic, White), and all students. Within the Closing Gaps Priority Area of the Accountability Index, the following supergroups may also apply, when individual subgroups do not alone meet cell size (20): economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities supergroup; economically disadvantaged and English learners supergroup; English learners and students with disabilities supergroup; economically disadvantaged, English learners, and students with disabilities supergroup. Note that students are not double counted in supergroups. Subgroups in Focus and Priority School Identification The traditional subgroups listed above as well as the supergroups listed above were used for Focus School identification calculations. Per Federal requirements, only the All Students group was applied in calculations to identify Priority Schools. Subgroups in AMOs: Wisconsin has established supergroup AMOs as part of determining Focus School exit criteria. Information about Supergroup AMOs is attached. Subgroups in Reward School Identification: In most cases, only traditional subgroups apply for Reward School identification, but one Reward School type is schools that fall in the Significantly Exceeds Expectations rating category. Rating category placement is based on Accountability Index calculations, which include both traditional subgroups, and, in the Closing Gaps Priority Area, the supergroups listed above.

State Accountability System Includes All Schools and Districts	
What is the State's definition of a local educational agency (LEA)?	Wisconsin's definition of LEA (school district) is established in state statute (115.01(3)) as the territorial unit for school administration. School districts are classified as common, union high, unified and 1st class city school districts. A joint school district is one the territory of which is not wholly in one municipality.
What is the State's definition of a public school? Please provide definitions for elementary school, middle school, and secondary school, as applicable.	According to state statute (115.01(1)), public schools are the elementary and high schools supported by public taxation. 115.01(2) states that the first eight grades as well as kindergarten are considered "elementary grades." Kindergarten includes both 4- and 5-year-old kindergarten, where applicable. Grades 9-12 are the high school grades. A middle school is a school in which grades 5-8 are taught. A Junior high school is grades 7-9. A senior high school is grades 10-12. Local school boards determine grades assigned to a defined public school.
How does the State define a small school?	Small schools have fewer than 20 total students in tested grades. Small schools are included in the alternate accountability system, which results in an accountability rating.
How does the State include small schools in its accountability system?	The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) provides accountability ratings for all schools. Over the 2012-13 school year, DPI met with five focus groups of alternate schools, including small schools, schools with no tested grades, and alternative high schools that serve high risk students to identify possible measures that would allow these schools to be included in Accountability Index calculations. The process below is based on their recommendations as well as cross-agency discussions. Small schools receive an accountability rating based on a district-supervised, standardized self-evaluation process. This process requires evaluation of performance based on measures in alignment with DPI's accountability system, including AMOs and the four Priority Areas of the Accountability Index: Student Achievement, Student Growth, Closing Gaps, and On-Track to Graduation and Postsecondary Readiness. Alternate accountability ratings fall into two categories indicating acceptable and unacceptable progress. These ratings differ from the five rating categories of the Accountability Index because the self-evaluation process, while standardized, does not provide sufficient detail to distinguish between five possible rating categories.

How does the State define a new school?	For accountability purposes, a new school is one first open in the year of accountability, or a school open for equal to or less than one school year. For example, for 2012-13 accountability reporting, a new school is a school with a unique school ID first in existence in 2012-13. New schools have no FAY students. These schools receive an accountability rating in year 1 in the same manner as described above for small schools.
How does the State include new schools, schools that split or merge grades (*e.g.*, because of overpopulation or court rulings), and schools that otherwise change configuration in its accountability system?	All public schools receive School Report Cards, but not all schools receive accountability ratings. New schools (schools in their first year of existence with a new school code) do not receive a rating. When schools split or merge, one of the existing school codes is maintained and, as such, schools retaining an existing school code would have no lapse in accountability reporting. The school that receives a new school code resulting from a split would be considered a new school. DPI has a set of decision rules for determining if a school that otherwise changes grade configuration would be assigned a new school code or not. If a new code is warranted, that school is considered new; if not, the existing school code would remain and accountability ratings would continue uninterrupted by new school status. (Please note that the school code decision process document is attached.)
How does the State include schools that have no grades assessed (*e.g.*, K-2 schools) in its accountability system?	There are two options for schools with no tested grades in Wisconsin's accountability system. Accountability calculations for K-2 schools with a direct feeder pattern (i.e., for which 75% or more of their population go to the same school for third grade) apply assessment results from the third grade students at the receiving school. Attendance data from the K-2 school is also used. This approach is appropriate because Wisconsin currently tests students in the fall. K-2 schools without a direct feeder pattern or schools with different grade configurations that do not include tested grades receive an alternate accountability rating based on a district-supervised, standardized self-evaluation process. This process requires evaluation of performance based on measures in alignment with DPI's accountability system, including AMOs and the four Priority Areas of the Accountability Index: Student Achievement, Student Growth, Closing Gaps, and On-Track to Graduation and Postsecondary Readiness. Over the 2012-13 school year, DPI met with five focus groups of alternate schools, including small schools, schools with no tested grades, and alternative high schools that serve high risk students to identify possible measures that would allow these schools to be included in Accountability Index calculations. The process above is based on their recommendations as well as cross-agency discussions.

	Alternate accountability ratings fall into two categories indicating acceptable and unacceptable progress. These ratings differ from the five rating categories of the Accountability Index because the self-evaluation process, while standardized, does not provide sufficient detail to distinguish between five possible rating categories.
How does the State include alternative schools in its accountability system? Consistent with State law, alternative schools include, but are not limited to: • State schools for deaf and blind, • Juvenile institutions, • Alternative high schools, and • Alternative schools for special education students. If the State includes categories of alternative schools in its accountability system in different ways, please provide a separate explanation for each category of school.	All Wisconsin public schools receive a rating; however some schools, designated as alternate schools, are not rated on the basis of accountability calculations described in the waiver request. This includes juvenile institutions that are classified as public schools, alternative high schools that serve high risk students, alternative schools for special education students, and alternative vocational education schools. Over the 2012-13 school year, DPI met with five focus groups of alternate schools, including small schools, schools with no tested grades, and alternative schools to identify possible measures that would allow these schools to be included in Accountability Index calculations. As a result, the school types listed above will complete a district-supervised, standardized self-evaluation process. This process requires evaluation of performance based on measures in alignment with DPI's traditional accountability system, including AMOs and the four Priority Areas of the Accountability Index: Student Achievement, Student Growth, Closing Gaps, and On-Track to Graduation and Postsecondary Readiness. Alternate accountability ratings fall into two categories indicating acceptable and unacceptable progress. These ratings differ from the five rating categories of the Accountability Index because the self-evaluation process, while standardized, does not provide sufficient detail to distinguish between five possible rating categories.
How does the State include charter schools, including charter schools that are part of an LEA and charter schools that are their own LEA, in its accountability system?	All charter schools—including school district charters, multi-district charters, and independent charters (schools chartered by the City of Milwaukee, UW-Milwaukee, or UW-Parkside) are included in accountability calculations. They all receive School Report Cards and are all eligible for Reward, Priority, and Focus status. Most charter schools in Wisconsin are charted by a district and thus are not LEAs. However, there are some independent charters that are considered LEAs.

State Accountability System Includes All Students	
What are the State's policies and procedures to ensure that all students are included in its assessment and accountability systems?	All students are expected to participate in the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (which includes the WKCE and WAA-SwD). Test participation calculations disregard FAY status. Students who do not take either WKCE or WAA-SwD during the designated testing window—including those who do not test because of a parent opt out—count against the school's test participation calculations. Student enrollment is established using the Wisconsin Student Locator System and confirmed via various data collections throughout each school year. Districts have an opportunity to confirm their enrollment lists through a record editing process following the testing window.
How does the State define "full academic year"?	An FAY student is one who has been continuously enrolled in a school or district for 9.25 months, not including time that the student is not in school during summer. Since schools and districts across the state have different starting and ending dates, the 9.25 months is calculated in ISES, Wisconsin's Individual Student Enrollment System, used to track student enrollment and other student data. The calculation is based on students continuously enrolled in a school during the annual fall census of the prior year to the current year (12 months). For students that move together from one school to the next at transitional grades (often 3, 5, 9), enrollment is considered FAY for the school if the students are FAY for the district. See the "Months in School" and "Months in District" headings at http://lbstat.dpi.wi.gov/lbstat_isescalc or http://oea.dpi.wi.gov/oea_faq#Acct (see last question in the FAQs under heading of "Accountability and Testing of Students in Various Situations") for more information. (urls valid 10.30.13)
How does the State determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?	The Wisconsin Student Number Locator System (WSLS) tracks student assignment to Wisconsin Public Schools. A student is considered continuously enrolled unless a gap of 30 days or more (excluding summer) is found. Wisconsin maintains separate full academic year indicators at the school, district, and state levels based on the length of continuous enrollment.

To which accountability indicators does the State apply the definition of full academic year?	Wisconsin's Accountability Index is broken into four Priority Areas: Achievement, Growth, Closing Gaps, and On-Track to Graduation/Postsecondary Readiness. All indicators that involve student performance on the state examination apply the definition of full academic year (FAY), specifically: • Achievement priority area: performance on state assessments in reading and mathematics • Growth priority area: change in performance over time on state assessments in reading and mathematics • Reading Gap (contained within the Closing Gaps priority area) • Mathematics Gap (contained within the Closing Gaps Priority Area) • Third Grade Reading (contained within the On-Track Priority Area) • Eighth Grade Mathematics (contained within the On-Track Priority Area) In addition, although AMOs do not impact a school's score within the Accountability Index, students must be FAY in order to be included within the school's mathematics and reading AMO calculations.
What are the procedures the State uses to ensure that mobile students, including students who transfer within an LEA or between LEAs, are included at the appropriate level (school, LEA, and State) of the accountability system?	Mobile students who transfer within an LEA or across LEAs outside of the normal matriculation process no longer have FAY status for a single school, and are not included in accountability determinations at the school level. Within the Absenteeism Student Engagement Indicator, however, students are included in calculations regardless of FAY status. As such, schools are held responsible for the attendance/engagement of students even if those students are enrolled for less than a full academic year. Additionally, all students, regardless of FAY status, are expected to participate in state assessments, with the limited exceptions noted in questions below. Students who transfer between schools within the same LEA outside of the normal matriculation process, however, will continue to be included in AMO calculations at the LEA and State levels Wisconsin does not currently make accountability determinations for the state as a whole, but the School Report Cards do provide contextual information of statewide data. All students, regardless of FAY status, will be included in these calculations.

Does the State include in accountability determinations the proficient and advanced scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities on assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards? If so, does the State limit the number of those scores at the LEA and State levels, separately, so that the number of proficient and advanced scores included in the determinations does not exceed 1.0 percent of all students in the grades assessed?	Yes, scores from the Wisconsin Alternative Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD)—which assesses alternate academic standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities—are used in accountability calculations as well as scores from the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam. The one exception is within the Student Growth Priority Area because Wisconsin does not calculate growth using WAA-SwD data. Wisconsin is participating in a grant through the Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium that is exploring the possibility of growth modeling for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The state does limit the number of WAA-SwD test takers so that the number of proficient and advanced scores included in the determination does not exceed 1.0 percent of all students in assessed grades. Please see response below regarding process for making 1% cap determinations.
If the State provides an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards, does the State include in accountability determinations the proficient and advanced scores of students with disabilities who take that assessment? If so, does the State limit the number of those scores at the LEA and State levels, separately, so that the number of proficient and advanced scores included in the determinations does not exceed 2.0 percent of all students in the grades assessed?	Wisconsin does not provide an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards.

What is the State process if an LEA or the State exceeds either the 1.0 or 2.0 percent proficiency cap?	For accountability purposes, schools and districts may count the *proficient* and advanced scores of students who participated in the WAA-SwD (alternate assessment). However, the number of scores cannot exceed 1% of the total state or district population in the grades tested. A school district may apply for a higher limit if it can demonstrate that it has a larger population of students with significant cognitive disabilities. This limitation applies only to districts and not individual schools. A district is required to complete a waiver request form if it is notified by DPI that it has exceeded the 1% cap. This waiver form can be found at: http://sped.dpi.wi.gov/sped_assmt-waa. If the DPI approves the district waiver, then all proficient or advanced scores on the WAA-SwD are included at full weight in accountability calculations. To-date, the DPI has not found circumstances that warrant denying a district waiver. Because the state has never exceeded the 1% cap it has not specified a process to reduce the number of proficient scores in excess of 1%. The number of districts required to submit a district waiver has decreased significantly over the past 5 years. Districts that exceed 1% are usually very small; consequently a small number of students have a large impact on the 1% calculation. In the unlikely event that the State or an unapproved LEA exceeds the 1% cap, results will be adjusted to ensure compliance with the federal requirements.
What are the State's policies and procedures to ensure that students with disabilities and English Learners are provided appropriate accommodations? In addition, please provide a link to a page on the SEA's web site where the State's accommodations manuals or test administration manuals may be found.	Students who have either an IEP or 504 plan, or who are identified as an English Language Learner may receive assessment accommodations. All accommodations must be consistent with day-to-day instructional methods. Accommodations should enhance access to the assessment without changing the skill or construct being measured. Accommodations used on the assessment must be recorded on the back of the student test book or student answer document. The Assessment Accommodation Matrices for both Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners can be found at: http://oea.dpi.wi.gov/oea_accommtrx. (5.12.13) Test administration manuals for both the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination and the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities can be found at: http://oea.dpi.wi.gov/oea_publications. (5.12.13)

Does the State include, for up to two accountability determination cycles, the scores of former students with disabilities in making accountability determinations for the subgroup of students with disabilities? If so, how?	No. Former students with disabilities are currently considered students without disabilities for accountability calculations.
Does the State count recently arrived English Learners as having participated in the State assessments for purposes of meeting the 95 percent participation requirement if they take (a) either an English language proficiency assessment or the State's reading/language arts assessment; and (b) the State's mathematics assessments?	Recently arrived English Learners are not required to participate in the reading assessment. Instead, they are required to participate in the English language proficiency (ELP) assessment. Therefore, test participation calculations for the reading and mathematics assessments include all English Learners, even those who have attended schools in the United States for less than one year. They are not included in the numerator or denominator for calculation of reading achievement results. Their scores are included in the calculation of mathematics achievement results because they are expected to participate in that assessment, with accommodations as necessary.
Does the State exempt a recently arrived English Learner from one administration of the State's reading/language arts assessment?	Yes. English learners who are new to the country are exempt from one administration of the reading assessment.

Does the State exclude from accountability determinations the scores of recently arrived English Learners on the mathematics assessment, the reading/language arts assessment (if administered to these students), or both, even if these students have been enrolled in the same school or LEA for a full academic year?	Yes. For the WKCE and WAA-SwD reading assessments, the scores of English Learners who are new to the country are excluded from accountability calculations for, Student Achievement, Student Growth, Closing Gaps, and Postsecondary Readiness measures that include reading results. They are included in accountability calculations for the mathematics assessment. For the mathematics assessment, FAY students who are ELs new to the country are included in those calculations. Test participation calculations for the reading assessment include recently arrived English Learners. These students are not expected to take the reading assessment (WKCE or WAA-SwD) but are required to take the English language proficiency (ELP) assessment, counting toward test participation calculations for the reading assessment. If a student has not taken either the regular reading test or the ELL language test, they count as not-tested for accountability purposes.
Does the State include, for up to two accountability determination cycles, the scores of former English Learners in making accountability determinations for the subgroup of English Learners? If so, how?	Yes. Any student that exited LEP status within the last two years is included within the English Learners subgroup for any component of the Accountability Index that utilizes subgroups. Specifically, this includes: • Closing Gaps Priority Area • Test Participation Student Engagement Indicator
What are the State's criteria for exiting students from the English Learner subgroup?	Wisconsin exits students from English learner status based on results from the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs® assessment. Students in K-3 are automatically considered fully English proficient if they attain a composite score of 6.0 on the ACCESS test. Students in grades 4-12 are considered fully English proficient if they attain both composite and literacy scores of 5.0 or above *or* if they attain a composite score of 6.0. Educators may exit a K-12 student from English learner status if the student has attained a composite score of 5.0 or above on ACCESS and shows clear evidence of proficiency as demonstrated by scores on standardized academic assessments, writing samples, and academic records. This is a local decision. This provides a highly standardized and consistent approach to exiting students from the English learner subgroup while at the same time allowing educators and families to use information from multiple measures to inform the decision in exceptional cases.

Assessments	
Which assessments, including alternate assessments, is the SEA using for reporting achievement under ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) (*i.e.*, reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments)?	The Wisconsin Student Assessment System includes both the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) and the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD), which both cover the following content areas: reading, mathematics, language arts/writing, science, and social studies. Reading and mathematics assessments are administered in grades 3-8 and 10. Language arts/writing, science and social studies assessments are administered in grades 4, 8, and 10.
What additional assessments, if any, does the State include in its accountability system and for what purpose is each assessment included?	The ACCESS for ELLs assessment is used to measure English language proficiency for English learners, and results are used in Title III accountability determinations. The On-Track to Graduation and Postsecondary Readiness Priority Area of Wisconsin's Accountability Index, includes ACT participation and performance.
Statistical Reliability and Protection of Students' Privacy	
What is the State's minimum "n-size" for determining each of the following? • Participation rate • Performance against AMOs • Graduation rate • Other (as applicable, please specify use)	A minimum n of 20 for all accountability calculations.
What is the State's minimum "n-size" for protecting students' privacy when reporting?	Wisconsin DPI is currently taking steps to reconcile differing suppression and redaction rules. Presently, accountability reporting via the School Report Cards applies suppression/redaction for cell sizes of fewer than 20 students.

What confidence intervals, if any, does the State use in its accountability system to ensure the statistical reliability of school classifications, and for which calculations are these confidence intervals applied?	The component of the Accountability Index that incorporates a confidence interval is the Growth Priority Area. Because the Growth Priority Area is driven by Student Growth Percentile (SGP) calculations, which are created by statistical models subject to error, DPI chose to utilize a confidence interval when calculating each school's raw growth rate. Specifically, a 75% Wald confidence interval is applied. In addition, although AMO determinations do not have any impact on a school's accountability score, a 95% Wald confidence interval is applied to proficiency calculations within the AMO determinations. If a school does not meet its AMOs through the conventional calculations, it can alternatively meet its AMO through a confidence interval. This was done to maintain consistency with Wisconsin's AMO calculations under No Child Left Behind.
Does the State base accountability determinations on multiple years of data? If so, which years, and how, if at all, are the years weighted?	In order to reduce the amount of random variation of scores over time, DPI uses multiple (i.e., up to three) years of data in many pieces of the Accountability Index. In addition, a weighting scheme is applied that gives more weight to more recent years of data, and more weight depending on the number of students going into the calculations. Weighting is applied to as many years of data that are available, though the vast majority of schools have three years of achievement data. The three years are weighted according to this simplified formula: • Most current year's weight = (proportion of students represented in data) x 1.5 • Prior year's weight = (proportion of students represented in data) x 1.25 • Second prior year's weight = (proportion of students represented in data) x 1.0 This formula is applied to all sections of the index that use multiple years of achievement data, specifically: • Achievement priority area • Closing Gaps priority area (excluding graduation gaps component) • Third Grade Reading (contained within the On-Track priority area) • Eighth Grade Math (contained within the On-Track priority area)

	The Student Growth priority area does, by definition, use multiple (i.e., two) years of data. However, there are no weights applied to this data because this priority area is meant to measure the growth trajectories of a cohort of students over two years, and weighting the observations of the same group of students would not provide an accurate measurement of the students' trajectories. In addition to the components of the Accountability Index mentioned above, Student Engagement Indicators also use multiple years of data. Specifically, for the Test Participation student engagement indicator, schools are expected to test at least 95% of their students in both mathematics and reading, and schools can meet this benchmark through either their current year's percent tested, or a three-year average percent tested. The three year average is a pooled student average, meaning that the percent tested in each year is weighted by the number of students eligible for testing in that year. However, no other weights are applied to this figure. The Absenteeism and Dropout Rate Student Engagement Indicators also apply the calculation for both the current year and a three-year average. Finally, in remaining consistent with policies enacted under No Child Left Behind, Annual Measureable Objectives (AMOs) use up to two years of data in making school determinations. Schools can meet their AMOs using either current year proficiency rates or a two-year average proficiency rate. The two-year average is a pooled student average, meaning that the percent proficient in each year is weighted by the number of students tested in that year. However, no other weights are applied to this figure. AMOs do not have an impact on a school's accountability determination.
Other Academic Indicators	
What are the other academic indicators for elementary and middle schools that the State uses for annual reporting? What are the State's goal and/or annual targets for these indicators?	For elementary and middle schools, DPI uses attendance rates for annual reporting. Wisconsin's attendance target is consistent with previous accountability measures, set at 85% or growth from the previous year.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Graduation Rate</th></tr>
<tr><td>What are the State's graduation rate goal and annual graduation rate targets?

Please provide a table with State-level goal and annual targets for all students and by subgroup beginning with the 2012–2013 school year.

If graduation rate annual targets vary by school, provide a link to the page on the SEA's web site where the LEA and school targets are available.</td><td>Wisconsin's graduation rate goal is 85 percent. Separate graduation rate improvement targets are used for the four- and six-year rates. A school meets the graduation rate AMO for graduation if (1) the graduation rate for the most recent year, or for the most recent two years combined, meets the 85 percent goal; or (2) the improvement in graduation rate meets the applicable target. DPI will first evaluate whether a school met the goal or target for the four-year rate. If it does not, the school is evaluated using the six-year rate.

Graduation targets for AMO determinations:

<table><tr><th>Graduation Rate</th><th>Four-Year Graduation Rate Improvement Target</th><th>Six-Year Graduation Rate Improvement Target</th></tr><tr><td>60% to 85%</td><td>2 percentage points</td><td>5 percentage points</td></tr><tr><td>Less than 60%</td><td>5 percentage points</td><td>5 percentage points</td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>If the State has received a timeline extension and is not using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for accountability determinations, please specify what rate the State is using and when the State will begin using a four-year adjusted cohort rate.</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td>What, if any, extended-year graduation rate(s) does the State use? How does the State use its extended-year graduation rate(s) in its accountability system?</td><td>In 2012-13 and beyond, a six-year adjusted cohort rate will be used as the extended rate.

For a school, a group's performance compared to its AMO is measured by the higher of the four- or six-year cohort graduation rates for that group. A cell size of 20 is applied to determine whether or not an AMO was missed.

The extended rate is included to reflect state statute ensuring students have the right to a free and appropriate education until the age of 21.</td></tr>
</table>

Participation Rate	
How does the State calculate participation rates?	The State calculates both current-year and multi-year test participation rates. Groups can meet test participation expectations based on the higher of the current year or the multi-year rate. Calculating Test Participation for the Current Year 1. Count the total number of students enrolled in tested grades at test time in the current year. This is done at the "All Students" level, and for each ESEA group. 2. For any students for whom the accountability year was their first year in the country, the calculation confirms that these students participated in the English language proficiency assessment or the WSAS reading assessment. If a student did not participate in either assessment, the student counts as not-tested. This step is done for reading only, as these students are not required to take the reading WSAS, but are still required to take the mathematics section of the WSAS. 3. Count the total number of students who took either the WKCE or the WAA. This is done at the "All Students" level, and for each ESEA group. This step is done separately for both math and reading. 4. To derive each group's current year participation rate, divide the number of students tested (the count from step 3) by the number of students enrolled (the count from step 1). This is done at the "All Students" level, and for each ESEA group. This step is done separately for both mathematics and reading. 5. Apply traditional rounding rules – for example, if a group had at least 20 students enrolled, and its participation rate in mathematics was 94.8%, this would round up to 95%, and the group is considered to be meeting the goal. Calculating Test Participation for Multiple Years 1. Count the total number of students enrolled in tested grades at test time in each of the last three years. This is done at the "All Students" level. 2. In each year, for any students for whom the accountability year was their first year in the country, the calculation confirms that these students participated in the English language proficiency assessment or the WSAS reading assessment. If a student did not participate in either assessment, the student counts as not-tested. This step is done for reading only, as these students are not required to take the reading WSAS, but are still required to take the mathematics section of the WSAS. 3. If there were at least 20 students enrolled in tested grades in each of the last three years, then test participation will be calculated using three years of data. If there were at least 20 students enrolled in tested grades in each of the last two years, then test participation is calculated using two years of data. If there were at least 20 students enrolled in tested grades in only the current year, then test participation is calculated using only the current year's data. 4. For each year going into the multi-year rate: Count the total number of students who took either the WKCE or the WAA. This should be done at the "All Students" level, and for each ESEA group. This step should be done separately for

	both mathematics and reading. 5. Sum the counts from steps 1 and 4: a. If the school is using three years of participation data (as derived in step 3), sum the total number of students enrolled in each of the last three years (the counts from step 1) and the total number of students tested in each of the last three years (the counts from step 3). This should be done at the "All Students", and for each individual group. This step should be done separately for mathematics and reading. Note that when three years of data are being used, the cell size for each group becomes 60. b. If the school is using two years of participation data (as derived in step 3), sum the total number of students enrolled in each of the last two years (the counts from step 1) and the total number of students tested in each of the last two years (the counts from step 3). This should be done at the "All Students", and for each individual group. This step should be done separately for mathematics and reading. 6. Derive each group's participation rate by dividing the number of students tested (the count of students tested derived in step 5) by the number of students enrolled (the count of students enrolled derived in step 5). This should be done at the "All Students" level, and for each ESEA group. This step should be done separately for both math and reading. 7. Apply the cell size to each group: a. If the school is using three years of data, the count of students enrolled in a group (derived in step 5) must be at least 60 in order for that group's multi-year participation rate to be calculated. b. If the school is using two years of data, the count of students enrolled in a group (derived in step 5) must be at least 40 in order for that group's multi-year participation rate to be calculated. 8. Apply traditional rounding rules – for example, if a group's multi-year participation rate in mathematics was 94.8%, this would round up to 95%, and the group is considered to be meeting the goal.
How does the State use participation rates within its differentiated accountability system (*i.e.*, index)?	Test participation is included as a Student Engagement Indicator (along with dropout rate and absenteeism) in the State's accountability system. Schools not meeting the expected target of 95% test participation (with rates between 85-94.4%) for all students and each subgroup receive a five-point deduction from their Overall Accountability Score. Schools with a test participation rate below 85% receive a ten-point deduction.