The Questions in this section were posed during the webinar. The written answers were provided by Mary Ann Hudziak, facilitator, Amy Marsman & Laura Pinsonneault representing DPI and Tammy Gibbons, AWSA. Questions were removed from the webinar chat if the question was answered live. Please view the webinar for detailed clarifications.

QUESTION	ANSWER
Are there any resources to support a data retreat with our staff to dig deeper into the results of subgroups and individual students to create student goals and school improvement goals	We have some resources on our resource page. I would also contact your Accountability Trainer (list on the resource page) - they may have PPT templates already prepared for data retreats. http://dpi.wi.gov/accountability/resources
The scoring criteria were set by DPI with the input from the design team, right? There's nothing in state law that requires the specific grading scale being used.	The final scale for overall scores (0-100) was set by DPI along with the Governor's office and legislature. State law does require five rating categories, with the names and stars associated with those categories. The specific weighting scale that adjusts achievement and growth weighting (new this year) was also put in state law via the most recent biennial budget. I hope this helps! Please let me know if you have more questions about this.
With just one year of Forward data, how was growth calculated?	Growth is calculated across assessments (Badger-Forward).
Why would open enrolled students not be included?	This business rule was also required in state law. My understanding is that district with virtual schools that have high proportions of open enrolled students advocated for these schools not to count ""against"" district calculations.
Will you be sharing the number of schools and/or districts that met each of the five categories?	Yes, with the public release of the report cards we provide summary information that would include how many schools and districts that are in each category.
So....are open enrolled IN student scores included if they are under 50%?	Yes. In virtual schools with less than 50% full time open enrollment, all students in the virtual school are included in the district report card calculation.
If growth is calculated across different assessments over multiple years, how are comparisons made? Did you use national percentile?	Starting this year, the report cards use a value-added calculation. Value-added models allow for a measure of growth across different assessments by factoring in characteristics of each individual assessment. As a reminder, the value-added measure this year looks at growth from Badger to Forward only.
I thought Eco Dis came from WI Forward as well...	That's correct; we usually use ISES 3rd Friday of September data for all demographics, but last year applied demographics from Forward where we had them because you all had an opportunity to update/correct those demographics during the test window. As Mary Ann mentioned, because of the transition to WISEdata we plan to use the WISEdata snapshot for demographics this year instead of Forward.

Why would my district report card not have open enrollment percentage when my building report cards have it?	Well, the school open enrollment is what affects the district report card calculation, but the district open enrollment doesn't affect anything. So, we didn't want to create confusion by reporting a percentage of open enrollment at the district level. Though apparently we've created confusion by not including it!
I am still unclearâ€¦are open enrolled students included in the school report card? (under 50%)	Every school gets a school report card, and open enrolled students ARE included in school report card calculations. In virtual schools that have more than a 50% open enrolled population, NO students from the virtual school (open enrolled or not) are included in the district's calculation.
Why are ACT aspire results not factored in?	DPI has received requests to include ACT Aspire results and is exploring but the DPI complies with what the legislature decides.
Why is the year 14-15? 0n the chart	Can you clarify which chart?
Why isnâ€™t Aspire 9/10 data included in the %proficient and advanced?	DPI has received a number of requests to include ACT Aspire date in the report cards and will continue to explore. DPI complies with what the legislature decides.
how does a STEM school play into the school comparisons?	STEM is not currently factored into the school report cards.
Was it more difficult to score ""Advanced"" on Forward as compared to Badger? We went from 30+ percent advanced to around 12%. We had students scoring in the 93rd percentile for the state and they scored only ""Proficient"".	The standard setting for Forward did result in cut scores that looked much more like our NAEP-based cut scores for the WKCE. In other words, we see the percentage of students in Advanced to look similar to 2013-14 WKCE performance. Badger cut scores were not NAEP-based. You can check this out on WISEdash today because last year's assessments are in the WISEdash Public Portal as of today.
Would that include similarly sized charter schools, or just grade band charters?	I'm not exactly sure what you are asking. It is my understanding that the comparison schools are strictly referring to schools with similar grade bands.
are they compared to only other STEM schools or are they compared to other k-6 etc?	Your school will be compared to K-6 (or most comparable grade band). We don't compare to STEM.
Can you repeat or text the types of 6 grade bands again?	K-5 6-8 K-8 6-12 K-12 9-12
I don't understand your comment on 8th grade ACT as our state assessment being used in the student achievement since the removal of the high school ACT.	I think Mary Ann misspoke - 8th grade Forward and 11th grade ACT are used in report cards. The ACT used to be in On-Track priority area, but now is used in Student Achievement.
Are the value added models controlling for characteristics of the schools as well?	Value-added controls for the following student population in the school: ELL, SwD, race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, as well as student's prior test scores.

I was told that the achievement was determined from WKCE and ACT - three years of data. Because we only have two years of ACT, one of the three years still brings forward the percent proficiency on the 1oth grade WKCE. For next years report card, we will have three years of data 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17.	Correct.
The Oak Tree analogy is a good explanation, however that does little to explain why student achievement is less important for schools with high % of poverty when calculating school performance.	You're correct; the oak tree analogy applies just to the value-added calculation itself. The weighting between growth and achievement was a policy decision by the governor's office and legislature in the last biennial budget. Given concerns in prior years' report cards about the negative correlation between achievement and economic status (i.e., that as poverty increases, scores go down), I think the policy change was an attempt to "break" that correlation by weighting growth more in high poverty schools and districts.
Re: growth: What does value-added have to do with using several different assessments over multiple years?	The value-added model (and actually, our old model, SGPs) allow for calculations of growth across different assessments by factoring in characteristics of the assessment into the model. As a reminder, the 2015-16 growth calculation looks at one year of growth, from Badger to Forward.
For closing gaps calculation, it is using best fit line slope but was weighted for size? How does the weighting work?	Gaps uses a weighted linear model with the weight being the number of students by year. The Technical Guide may provide more details on the calculation.
We have no GAPS to close. Why are penalized for this?	Are you saying that you do not have a gaps score or that, within closing gaps, you have no gaps? If the prior, the report card calculations are designed not to advantage or disadvantage any school or district for having or not having data in any particular priority area. If the latter, our the Closing Gaps calculation is designed to assign the highest achieved score in situations in which a target group exceeds the performance of the state comparison group. Such performance should not be a penalty.
So, what reporting DOES not use FAY? Can you be more clear?	FAY status is applied for achievement-based calculations (anything that is based on assessment results). FAY is NOT applied to test participation calculations, graduation rate, or calculations based on attendance.
Follow -up - dpi tECHNICAL GUIDE To reduce the impact of year-to-year fluctuations that may be due to randomness, three sequential	Yes, we use three years of data in the achievement calculation. Student growth is one year of growth (for this year, until we add more years of spring assessment results). Closing gaps uses three to five years data.

years of testing data are used. This improves the reliability of scores.	
Why do we have to give the Aspire of it is not used for anything?	Aspire may be used in future report cards. Do you think it ought to be?
Donâ€™t assume we know â€œlast yearsâ€	I did not mean to assume you knew the previous report cards, I was only trying to point out the difference/change for those that were very familiar with the previous process and calculations.
So what would a k-6 school be compared to?	A K-5 school would be the closest comparison.
Does the WKCE for 10th grade count in the 3 year calculation along with the 2 years of ACT?	Yes.
Just to confirm, for the HS ACT, our science, writing and reading composite do not count toward this report card?	Correct. Composite scores do not count. We instead look at ELA and mathematics scores.
The value-added technical manual is very complex. How do we best go about better understanding how our value added score was calculated?	Have you looked at the value-added brief yet? It may be a helpful starting point.
Why would we have not done NAEP based on the Badger Exam? That essentially makes that data useless?	The cut scores for Badger were based on a national standard setting. Having different cut scores does not make the data useless; it just makes it different. Again, the value-added model accounts for characteristics (including cut scores and standard errors of measure) of each of the assessments, which allows us to measure growth across different assessments.
If you do not have any cell sizes large enough to have Closing Gaps, is this good, bad, or no impact on your score?	No impact on your score. Having or not having a component within a priority area, or an entire priority area does not advantage or disadvantage a school. The index accounts for schools that have different components. High schools, for example, do not have Student Growth scores; this doesn't hurt or help HS.
Why does the State look at the 3rd grade language arts and 8th math for on track? Why not add the 3rd grade math and 8th reading too, or do the same subject for each grade? How was this determined?	These are research-based measures as key touchstones for future success. They were selected by the accountability design team a few years ago. We plan to revisit the On-Track priority area to see which measures best reflect the college and career readiness we are striving for. The measures used in On-Track may also evolve as we get other data in (e.g. perhaps post-secondary enrollment).
If you do not have any cell sizes large enough to have any Student Growth, is this good, bad, or no impact on your score?	It's okay not to have a growth score. The calculations that combine priority area scores into an overall score are designed neither to advantage nor disadvantage schools based on having or not having sufficient data to have scores for every priority area.

How can the district growth score be so vastly different than the individual school growth scores... bot MS and Elem are near state score and District is half the score. Need talking points. Tech manual did not clarify.	We are working on talking points right now and hope to have those out in the next week or so. They will address district report card calculations. There is also an FAQ on this topic. To answer the question here, though, remember that district report cards can have more subgroup-level calculations, possibly affecting test participation and closing gaps calculations. If the district has a growth score, the percentage of students in poverty may also look different at the district level than any individual school, which would affect the weighting that combines the achievement and growth scores.
If we are a union high school, with no other schools, do we use the 40% or 50% for achievement and 40% or 25% for closing gaps. The same students can come up with significant differences in calculations	Have you looked at the Accountability Report Cards Technical Guide? The step by step calculations may answer your question more completely. Generally speaking, you do not have growth, so you use your achievement score. You only have graduation rate so that component is locked at 20% of the overall score. So the additional 5% in that area is shared between closing gaps and achievement.
Are the value added models only controlling for student characteristics at the school level? Are there any controls for things like school size or rural vs urban?	VA doesn't control for locale (rural/urban) but rather similar student populations and similar test performance history.
If we could use Aspire we would have growth data for high schools. Does DPI not have faith in the validity of Aspire?	DPI has received requests to include ASPIRE and is exploring but complies with legislative changes.
Is the economically disadvantaged percentage pulled from the 3rd Friday count during the 2015-2016 SY?	The economically disadvantaged percent is actually a combination of the 2015-16 3rd Friday count and demographic data that came from the Forward portal. The reason for this combination in 2015-16 is that districts had an opportunity and were encouraged to review and update/correct their demographic data in the Forward portal during the test window so we felt those data would be more accurate. As Mary Ann mentioned, we aim to use only WISEdata as our data source for demographics.
Why would we have a gap score for ELA and Math, but not for graduation?	Generally, most schools have more students taking the ELA and math tests so they meet cell size; there are many cases where the graduating class isn't large enough to do subgroup analysis and gap calculations.
Is the Econ. Disadvantaged figured based on students tested or school information from the front page of the report card?	It is based on the entire population for the achievement-growth variable weighting. For value-added calculations, the ECD is based just on the tested population.
Our district's Closing Gaps score is tanking our averages. We have N/A for graduation rate gaps; is this being	No, not having data would not impact your score. It may seem like this because you see a state comparison score for graduation but that state comparison is provided just for informational purposes

weighted disproportionately in our overall calculation?	given that most districts do have a graduation rate gap. But, again, having or not having sufficient data to calculation a graduation rate gap neither advantages nor disadvantages your score.
Where is that calculator located?	On our resource page see the variable weighting calculator: http://dpi.wi.gov/accountability/resources
Yes, if we have to take time out of instruction to give the Aspire 9 and 10, it should be used in the report card. Why wouldnâ€™t it be used to calculate student growth?	We are considering using it for accountability purposes - to have Student Growth scores at the HS level. It is part of the discussion of how the report cards will evolve under the new federal ed law, ESSA. We have heard from others - in ESSA listening sessions - that they would like to include Aspire. We'd have to figure out if it would also then be used in Test Participation rates, etc.
Page 7 of the report provides our value added score. Where/how do we find out more information about our specific calculation?	The calculations for value-added are very complex and are done by the Value-Added Research Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. There is a value-added technical manual that you can review but there isn't a step-by-step guide for value-added calculations because you would need statewide student-level data to calculate your score.
How can the calculations of my District's report card be lower than the calculation of each of the three buildings? This is going to confuse our public and teachers.	We are going to provide talking points on this topic, and there is also an FAQ already available, for your information. In short, though, because district calculations are based on the whole population of the district, it is possible that there are more subgroups that meet the minimum cell size. They would then be included in test participation and closing gaps calculations. Also, if the district has a growth score, the percent of poverty may look different at the district level which would impact the overall score, given the achievement-growth variable weighting.
The report cards share an example ""trend line"" graph for closing gaps. Can we calculate these on our own? Why don't you include these in place of the tables?	We are interested in providing graphical representation of closing gaps calculations but doing so would add about ten pages to the PDF. So, we are exploring how to do this in WISEdash for Districts so you can see that information alongside the report cards.
SO, growth would be calc on only grades 4 and 5 in a 3-4-5 school?	Correct. Growth would be measured from grade 3 to grade 4 and from grade 4 to grade 5. So there are two growth intervals in that particular school.
If the K-3 school does not have a "closing gap" score because it only has tests in 3rd grade, how do 9-12 schools have this score with tests only in 11th grade?	A K-3 school could have a closing gaps score; I'm guessing that the reason it doesn't is because there aren't enough students in any subgroup in that grade to produce a score. High schools are often larger and may have more than 20 students in a subgroup even in one tested grade.
So in my 4K-3 building, my scores will always be based on achievement rather than student growth and closing the gaps	Based on achievement and on-track, most likely. If there are enough students in any subgroup in the 3rd grade, it could be possible to have a closing gaps score, but a 4K-3 school would not have a growth score.
Since high schools will have "student growth data" for 2016-17, will the 40% for	HS do not have growth data since only one grade is tested.

"closing gaps" then be reduced in the calculation?	
On the HS ACT what are the cut scores for advanced, proficient, basic, below basic?	Cut scores are available here: http://dpi.wi.gov/assessment/act/data/proficiency
Did more school see a decrease or increase in their school report card scores from the prior rating?	We saw both. Basically the distribution of scores spread out so we see a bunch more at the top and at the bottom. We will have final number with the public release of the report cards. We'll provide summary information at that time detailing how many schools and districts fall into each category, etc.
We have a sub-group (Low SES) that are performing lower than expected. We'd like to address their needs, but with the limits on accessibility to identify these student we're finding addressing these particular needs challenging. How do you suggest we address this subgroup?	Administrators should have access to who comprises this subgroup. This data is protected beyond that usually to protect student privacy. However, I'd suggest reviewing the detailed report card to see if there are priority areas (achievement, growth, etc) that especially look problematic; or is it by content area (ELA, math)? I like to start with attendance and absenteeism data as you can't improve and intervene if they students aren't showing up. There are a lot of great resources available on improving attendance among low income groups. Also check WISEdash to see if the problems exist across grade levels, across all tested subjects (science etc).
When you send the summary/ppt..could you please include the links to the Value added â€œone pagerâ€ and tech guide? Thanks	Here's the link to our resources which has both VA summary, VARC technical manual, plus our interpretive and technical guides. http://dpi.wi.gov/accountability/resources
Is a student considered FAY if they are present on the third Friday in Sept., gone during the winter months, but returns to the district before the end of the assessment period? They are not truly present the FAY, but are they counted as such?	They would not count as FAY, and therefore would not be in assessment calculations (student achievement and growth). But this student would be included in attendance, graduation and test participation rates.
Using Aspire 9 and 10 would actually have helped us this school year in Test Participation rates as they both have a WINDOW of opportunity for students to complete the test as opposed to a ONE day and ONE make up day on the ACT to complete it. This hurt our participation rate this school year as students were well	DPI is exploring the use of ASPIRE but complies with legislative changes.

aware of the dates when ACT was given and avoided school on those two dates.	
Can you better define ""Test Participation Lowest Group Rate""? What is meant by Lowest Group Rate?	Lowest Group Rate refers to the test participation of the student group (ELL, SwD, race/ethnicity, etc) in your school. We look at the group that has the lowest test participation rate as it is an equity issue.
If kids "opt out", does that count against your Test Participation?	Yes, opt-outs count against test participation rates. But they do not count against performance calculations. So opt-outs are removed from Student Achievement, Student Growth, Gaps, etc - they don't count against performance (just participation).
What constitutes non-continuous enrollment for FAY? How is this reported?	Non-continuous enrollment is a break in enrollment for more than 30 days.
Is there a confidence interval that may indicate the student is not college ready by the cut score, but is calculated in as ready because they are within a point of the cut score?	Here's some information from the ACT technical manual: For the current ACT, the standard error of measurement was targeted at approximately 2 scale score points for each of the subject-area test scores and subscores and 1 scale score point for the Composite. In addition, the scales for the ACT were constructed using a method described by Kolen (1988) to produce score scales with approximately equal standard errors of measurement along the entire range of scores. Without Nearly equal standard errors of measurement, standard errors of measurement at different score levels would need to be presented and considered in score interpretation (see AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999, p. 31). Given the properties just described, and the assumption that the distribution of measurement error is approximated by a normal distribution, an approximate 68% confidence interval can be constructed for any examinee by adding 2 points to and subtracting 2 points from his or her reported scale score for any of the ACT tests or subscores. An analogous interval for the Composite score can be constructed by adding 1 point to and subtracting 1 point from the reported Composite score.
We had 3 severely handicapped students whose parents opted them out of testing. This gave us a deduction in participation. Why is parent opt out held against districts and students with severe disabilities?	Federal law requires all students to take the test, the only exception being a significant medical emergency. In the report cards, we balance state and federal law by counting non-tested students in test participation calculations (and, again, we calculate this using current year data and a three-year rate and a school or subgroup has to miss both rates to get a deduction) but not including those students in any achievement-based calculations.
That's crazy that opt-out penalizes your school/district. Makes no sense	It could only impact test participation calculations. It does not impact any achievement-based scores.
With the analysis of the Report Card results, will the DPI disaggregate the data to compare schools with similar subgroups?	With the public release of the report cards, we provide a large data download file, which is essentially all the data from the front page of the report cards. Users can sort it by district, CESA, locale type (rural/urban), priority area scores, school type, etc. We make this data available so users can conduct this type of comparison. In the future - outside of the report cards themselves - we'd like to provide a similar school's analysis for schools to identify schools like themselves and pair up with those that are

	succeeding, to share best practices, etc. For example, if you wanted to find another rural K-12 school with an ELL population similar to your own, that is seeing a lot of growth with that subgroup, you'd be able to identify that school and discuss strategies that are effective.
Did I hear that students who opt out count in the test participation calculation?	Yes, they do count in test participation (federal requirements). But opt-outs do NOT count in achievement calculations.
What does Lowest Group Rate mean under Test Participation	This is the subgroup that has the lowest participation rate in the school. It is possible that more than one subgroup is below the 95% threshold, and we report the lowest participating subgroup.
How soon will WI move to an online ACT so we have a window of opportunity to have students take the ACT rather than the one day paper/pencil version? What can we do as DACâ€™s to help the state see the wisdom of moving to online?	I'm not aware of the timeline specifics for this transition and have reached out to the Office of Student Assessment for more detail.
Please share the act cut scores for advanced, proficient, basic and below basic.	The cut scores are available here: http://dpi.wi.gov/assessment/act/data/proficiency.
If you multiply the On Track score by .8, then that is a penalty, since it does not count as heavily in the overall score, and we have a high graduation rate. If we had a great Closing Gaps score, that would help us as well. We have NA/NA, so it hurts us. How can it not hurt schools that do WELL in these areas?	The presence of a priority area score does not inherently hurt a school's overall score. All else equal, having results for and doing well across all priority areas compared to having results or just a few priority areas should not be an impediment because of the design of the system. (We align the distributions of scores for each priority area to the distribution for student achievement, and this matters because it means that having or not having data in certain areas does not give unfair advantage or disadvantage.) Other schools have raised the same question as you. We encourage them to look at their subgroup performance under Student Achievement. Many of our small high schools are in the same situation, too small for a gaps score and no consecutive grades for growth score, and when they look at the subgroup performance (pg 5 of report card) they often see that they don't have a group large enough (need at least 20) and/or they see that the subgroup that is there isn't performing exceptionally well when compared to All Students. If that is the case, there is no certainty that a school would score better with a Closing Gaps score. If you'd like some more information about how this works, or would like to talk in more detail, just let us know: oeamail@dpi.wi.gov.
With the result in changes in new weighting did it result in the majority schools going up in overall scores or down?	We will provide some statewide data closer to the public release of report cards but, generally, the distribution of district scores became wider. This means that there are more districts in the top categories and in the bottom categories, but generally more scores went up than went down.

Did we have to initiate an inquiry on the school or district level in order for our report card calculations to be reconsidered?	Yes, initiating an inquiry is the only way that we know you need to review your data. The inquiry window has closed at this point so please email me individually if you have something you need to talk about: laura.pinsonneault@dpi.wi.gov
We are a 7-12 school, is it possible to see how the 7-8 vs. 9-12 factor into our 7-12 report card since we would have growth accounting for 7&8, but not 9-12.	I'm sorry, but we can't run the report card for different grade configurations. Please note that the growth score for the school would be based on grades 7-8, so that calculation does isolate that population.
We submitted an inquiry to DPI on our report card but have not received a response. When can we expect it?	If we haven't responded yet, I would expect a response in the next day or two. You can also email us oeamail@dpi.wi.gov to follow-up. We've received a record number of inquiries this year and are working through those as quickly as possible. If inquiry forms described a data correction, it was prioritized over general questions.
Why was 40% the percentage determined for the closing gaps category for high schools?	In a way, we need to walk the backwards through the decision. The decision was to lock On-Track at 20% and then equally weight the priority areas (thought there's now an exception to that for schools with growth scores). As such, when a school or data does not have sufficient data for a particular priority area, the weight of the remaining areas adjusts equally. For HS this means 20% for On-Track, 40% for Gaps and 40% for Achievement. Please note that the distributions of the priority areas are aligned to that of achievement; this is how we avoid the impact of a school or district benefiting or being negatively impacted by having or not having data in a particular priority area. This is also why we lock the weight of attendance/graduation at 20% of the overall index, so all schools/districts have the same weighting for that particular component.
It seems that the lowest subgroup (SwD) impacts the overall score with participation. How do we communicate out the reason for a deduction in overall score without singling out those students?	The detailed report card will show the participation rates for all groups so it will be public, but I understand the tricky messaging here. Perhaps something along these lines: Every student including (especially) those with disabilities has the right to demonstrate what they know and can do. Having valid assessment data helps shine a light on disparities and reveal achievement gaps. We are held accountable for both state and federal laws. It is important that we know how all of our students are performing so we can appropriately address/intervene and shape our school improvement plan around those areas of focus.
Can we get an overall growth score comparison. Not just in the categories.	Do you mean growth in overall accountability score from the last report card (2013-14) to this report card score (2015-16)?
With test participation, group sizes as small as 20 mean that only 2 students not testing puts you below the 95% benchmark. We have a situation where we tested every single student in one our	There has been and continues to be interest from national and local civil rights and student advocacy groups to use smaller cell sizes (some even advocate for a cell size of 10) in order for more students to be "counted" in the system. When Wisconsin built our current accountability system about five years ago, there was consensus that a move from a cell size of 40 to 20 was appropriate. That said, you're not the only school to raise this concern and I am planning for OEA to put together a variety of options

schools except for 2. The two students we did not test were opted out by their parents because the students had very significant medical concerns during the testing window. Moreover, the students were in grades that did not allow us to deny a parent opt out (though we wouldn't have in this case since student well being is the more important). The same two students were opted out for the same reasons the prior year. This meant we missed the 95% benchmark two years in a row. While DPI believes that 95% gives schools some "buffer room," it did not in our case. I'm fairly frustrated by this and found other districts had similar frustrations. While I understand the federal mandate is 100%, why can't the minimum group size be raised to 40 so that there is actually some buffer room?	for how test participation can count in the report cards going for future years. We sympathize with the fact that 1 or 2 students can affect scores and will explore ways in which test participation can work differently, yet still fulfill federal requirements and honor state law, in the future but remain committed to the underlying issue of equity.
Have you considered or are you considering your population sizes of certain subgroups in calculations? For example, in our district we have a much larger population of some minorities than the state averages. Is that considered in the calculations?	The closing gaps calculation is a weighted average that does account for group size. Value-added calculations also account for the demographic characteristics of the school.
Why was 20 chosen as the minimum number for a "group" for test participation purposes when that allows only one student non-participation for any reason before a deduction occurs? This gives very little flexibility for situations out of a school's/district's control, like foreign	First, a reminder that test participation calculations are based on a current year of test participation rates and a multi-year rate (using up to three years of data). A subgroup must miss the target with BOTH rates before a deduction is applied. Two non-participant students would result in a test participation rate below 95% (not one) for a single year rate based on a group of 20 students. Second, there has been and continues to be interest from national and local civil rights and student advocacy groups to use smaller cell sizes (some even advocate for a cell size of 10) in order for more students to be "counted" in the system. When Wisconsin built our current accountability system about five years ago, there was consensus that a move from a cell size of 40 to 20 was appropriate. That

students moving in during the testing window.	said, you're not the only school to raise this concern and I am planning for OEA to put together a variety of options for how test participation can count in the report cards going for future years. We sympathize with the fact that 1 or 2 students can affect scores and will explore ways in which test participation can work differently, yet still fulfill federal requirements and honor state law, in the future but remain committed to the underlying issue of equity.
In a 6-12 building what test score are being compared to show growth?	There are two growth intervals for schools in this grade band: 6 to 7 and 7 to 8.
I'm trying to put sgp and value added together in my head. Please talk about the differences and what information would be most useful to parents and teachers.	We have a HYPERLINK http://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/accountability/pdf/Value%20Added%20Brief_Web.pdf value-added brief that provides a summary of how value-added models work in general. For specifics about Wisconsinâ€™s calculation, we also have a HYPERLINK http://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/accountability/pdf/WI%20DPI%20School%20VA%20Technical%20Report.pdf value-added technical manual with all the details of the calculation. In general, though, value-added models calculate a projected growth for a school or district, controlling for a variety of demographic characteristics of students in the school or district. The model then compares that projected growth to the actual growth demonstrated by the population. The difference between the projected growth and the actual growth is the value-added. This is a bit different than SGPs which looked at individual students and their growth trajectories. SGPs compare students with similar test score histories; VA compares similar student groups.
The value-added measures, the complexity of the calculation, make it difficult to utilize this data for improvement.	We sympathize with this. We felt SGPs provided important student-level information and as the basis of Student Growth in past report cards, hoped that schools and districts could use it to drive improvement. We plan to still provide SGPs so you can still utilize this data. The change to VA was legislatively required. We will work with VARC to provide resources to make the VA data as useful as possible.
If we didn't submit an inquiry would the only change in the updated report cards the first week of November be if there was a change in test participation from the ACT writing portion?	Yes, if you have an 11th grade it is possible that your ACT test participation may look different.
Since my questions regarding the 40% being used for closing gaps has not been answered, who can I contact at DPI to get clarification on this point?	oeamail@dpi.wi.gov
Since it is a law, why do we allow parent opt outs?	There is a contradiction between state and federal law.

Did the score go up?	More districts are in the top two categories than in prior years, but more districts are also in the bottom two categories than in prior years. Overall, more scores when up than went down.
No, I mean the overall score for a school, with the overall score for the state for like schools. Example, we received an overall score of 61.3. What is the average overall score for high schools across the state. In other words, state score was provided in priority areas, why not for the overall score.	We have not calculated a state overall score. The closest way to do this would be to combine the priority area scores for the K-12 state comparison.
We recognized that the numbers of participation between page 15 (test participation) and page 6 (student achievement) are different for many of the subgroups. Can you please explain why this is the case? thank you	Test participation calculations are based upon all students enrolled at the time of testing (regardless of FAY status). Achievement-based calculations only include results of students who were enrolled for the full academic year.
Why is the deduction so drastic --- 5 pts. off the total.	At the time that the deductions were set (about five years ago), five points was not seen as dramatic; it does not automatically result in a drop in rating category (something the U.S. Department of Education pushed for and we pushed back against). That said, we can and will continue to explore other options for test participation deductions, but we have to continue to acknowledge the importance of test participation, as I mentioned on the call. We sympathize with the fact that 1 or 2 students can affect scores and will explore ways in which test participation can work differently, yet still fulfill federal requirements and honor state law, in the future but remain committed to the underlying issue of equity.
Yes, the same subgroup has to meet the deduction both ways, but the demographic categories also changed to seven groups this year and some of our students who were listed as "Asian" in past years were listed as "Two or More Races" this year, meaning you have a data validity issue there too. Why not pause on this factor until the data can smooth out?	The transition to the seven race/ethnicity categories actually increases data accuracy and aligns the report cards with WISEdash and with federal reporting (including the census). It also results in smaller groups because some students, as in the example you provide, "leave" one subgroup to identify as "two or more." That said, this shouldn't be a data validity issue; it's a data transition issue.

We would like to see the VARC provide sample examples of value added score calculations - something more that the technical manual or brief. Explanation for general public understanding is lacking - especially for those schools in which the value added measures appears to be a critically important part of the overall report card score.	Thanks for this request. We'll look into it, though I have to say we expect this would be pretty complicated, too, because value-added is run with all student-level data in the state. I'm not sure how VARC would create examples, but we can ask!
The answer regarding 40% for high schools (closing gaps) does not make sense. It is not 40% for elementary and middle, where gaps should be addressed earlier with interventions than in the last four years of a K-12 program.	The 40% weighting is based on the fact that most high schools do not have growth scores to factor into their overall score, at least for now. It is not a reflection of greater priority for closing gaps in high school grades versus elementary or middle school grades. The reasoning that led to 40% for Gaps was first, we lock On-Track at 20% and then equally weight the priority areas (thought there's now an exception to that for schools with growth scores). As such, when a school or data does not have sufficient data for a particular priority area, the weight of the remaining areas adjusts equally. For HS this means 20% for On-Track, 40% for Gaps and 40% for Achievement. Please note that the distributions of the priority areas are aligned to that of achievement; this is how we avoid the impact of a school or district benefiting or being negatively impacted by having or not having data in a particular priority area. This is also why we lock the weight of attendance/graduation at 20% of the overall index, so all schools/districts have the same weighting for that particular component.
Will the inquiry process be longer than a week in the future? One week is not enough time to dig in and try to find problems.	Thanks for sharing. I think test participation will continue to be discussed over the coming year. And congratulations on testing so many of your students! The decision was to lock On-Track at 20% and then equally weight the priority areas (thought there's now an exception to that for schools with growth scores). As such, when a school or data does not have sufficient data for a particular priority area, the weight of the remaining areas adjusts equally. For HS this means 20% for On-Track, 40% for Gaps and 40% for Achievement. Please note that the distributions of the priority areas are aligned to that of achievement; this is how we avoid the impact of a school or district benefiting or being negatively impacted by having or not having data in a particular priority area. This is also why we lock the weight of attendance/graduation at 20% of the overall index, so all schools/districts have the same weighting for that particular component.
Does federal law require states to deduct 5-points for sub group participation?	Federal law does not stipulate the deduction amount, because - since the ESEA flexibility waivers four/five years ago - each state's accountability system is unique. Instead, the federal government held a peer review process for the accountability systems and they required approval by the peer review board and the U.S. Department of Education. Our five-point deduction was approved at that time.

	Just so you know, current proposed (so, not yet final) regulations for ESSA would stipulate that an accountability system automatically doc a rating category for missing the test participation target. The proposed regulations also stipulate that non-tested students count against proficiency rates.
I disagree that it's difficult to miss the test participation rate. For 3 years in a row, my school tested ***every single student*** except for two medically fragile students whose parents opted them out. We still received a deduction. Am we supposed to force students with severe medical challenges to test to avoid this in the future? This is a serious equity concern as well. While I appreciate that the calculations change with increasing numbers of non-participation, I also strongly believe that student well being must come first and schools should not be penalized for trying to do the right thing .	Thanks for sharing. I think test participation will continue to be discussed over the coming year. And congratulations on testing so many of your students! We sympathize with the fact that 1 or 2 students can affect scores and will explore ways in which test participation can work differently, yet still fulfill federal requirements and honor state law, while remaining committed to the underlying issues of equity and data accuracy.
Past data analysis (WKCE) included the ability to correlate student performance to content standards. Will this be available so schools and districts can evaluate performance in terms of content standards. This would allow for more usable data analysis to impact instructional practices and curricular review.	This is a good question for the office of student assessment. I'll pass it along to them, but you can also send them an email, if you want: osamail@dpi.wi.gov.
Offhand, do you know who the accountability trainer is at CESA 2?	Ed O'Connor ed.oconnor@cesa2.org Nicole Barlass nicole.barlass@cesa2.org
You answered earlier that more schools seemed to go up in their score. Was this trend true for high schools as well? Did more high schools report cards go up?	My response was based on district scores. I don't have the school-level data right now but we'll provide some state-level summary information closer to the public release.

if SwD do not take the ACT, but take the DLM does it still count as an opt out?	No
If it's Federal Law that we have to consider the participation rates, why isn't it law that students have to take the exam? We don't control it, yet are penalized by it? Still makes no sense, sorry.	Yes, there is a contradiction between state and federal law.
In a 5-8 school would there be 2 or 3 growth intervals? 5 to 6, 6 to 7, 7 to 8	A grade 5-8 school has the following four growth intervals: 4-5, 5-6, 6-7, and 7-8.
to clarify for the Test Participation for subgroups it must meet the minimum cell size of 20 students to have an impact?	Yes, you have to have 20 students enrolled at the time of testing to trigger a test participation calculation for that group.
At 9:59 a viewer asked about the HS ACT. Could I get clarification about the ELA score. Is it simply the ELA score or is it a combination of performance in ELA, writing and reading?	The ELA score is a combination (equally weighted) of English, reading, and writing. The test participation was originally based on having a score in all three subtests, but OEA is re-calculating that so that participation in two of the three sub-tests counts as a participant.
I'm in a 5-8 school, does my 5th grade factor in our Student Growth score? I assume we are considered to fit with the 6-8 grade band of schools.	A grade 5-8 school has the following four growth intervals: 4-5, 5-6, 6-7, and 7-8. Yes, the comparison school is 6-8 but that's just for comparison/context and does not affect your score in any way.
In a 5-8 school are there 2 or 3 growth intervals? Are our fifth grade scores computed with our ES then?	A grade 5-8 school has the following four growth intervals: 4-5, 5-6, 6-7, and 7-8.

The following are responses to questions sent in beforehand that DPI responded to in preparation for the webinar held on October 18, 2016.

How was full academic year determined?

With the transition to spring testing, full academic year is continuous enrollment from the third Friday of September through the completion of testing.

The 35% F/R mark regarding the calculation of achievement/growth. How does it work and how can I tell if the score is calculated correctly?

The sliding scale to determine the variable achievement and growth priority area weighting was established by the Governor's office is the 2015-17 biennial budget. It's a sliding scale that starts a 5% economically disadvantaged and goes up to 65% economically disadvantaged, varying the

weighting of achievement and growth according to that percentage. 35% economically disadvantaged is the point at which achievement and growth are equally weighted.

OEA has created a weighting calculator that can show you the exact relative weighting of achievement and growth based on your school's percent economically disadvantaged. Please see the variable weighting calculator on the report card webpage.

Will this format stay with us over the next state budget cycle? Beyond? What other "tweaks" will we see over the next year or two?
Any answer here is speculation as it can be difficult to know what the legislature will choose to focus on this coming year, particularly given that it's a budget year. DPI is interested in continuing to explore measures and metrics regarding college and career readiness. We've heard a lot of requests to include ACT Aspire data in the report cards; this is something else we'll explore. But we do not control what the legislature decides to change. I wouldn't be surprised if there were legislative discussion this year regarding test participation, particularly as it relates to students whose parents opt them out of state testing.

I'd like to understand the growth model in detail. I'm not too concerned about the weighting of poverty as much as how the growth score is calculated.
We have a value-added brief that provides a summary of how value-added models work in general. For specifics about Wisconsin's calculation, we also have a value-added technical manual with all the details of the calculation.
In general, though, value-added models calculate a projected growth for a school or district, controlling for a variety of demographic characteristics of students in the school or district. The model then compares that projected growth to the actual growth demonstrated by the population. The difference between the projected growth and the actual growth is the value-added.

What is the easiest way to improve (statistically, the low hanging fruit on the report card)?
I think "low hanging fruit" is really relative, dependent upon the strengths and struggles in your own school. I suggest first reviewing the student engagement indicators on your report card. Do you have any deductions? Not that it's easy to get students to take the test, or attend school at greater rates, or stay in school if they're a dropout risk, but these indicators are five points of your score. For the other priority areas, it's simply critical that you dig into your data, examine subgroup performance and trends in relation to the content areas and determine what is necessary in your school. One of the strengths of this accountability structure is that it really is compensatory; in other words, in some cases, a focus on improving growth rates will help, in others a focus on particular subgroups will help. Again, it really depends upon your local performance context. If you want any help understanding the data on your report card, please feel free to contact us: oeamail@dpi.wi.gov.

If our data is locked and loaded in ISES, but has errors will this be used against our school report card? We have submitted the information in response to the school report card release, but will this need to be done annually due to the three year rolling data?
Any manual data changes made as a result of an inquiry process remain in the report card calculations; they will carry forward into future years so you will not need to make the same corrections next year or the year after.
The transition to WISEdata should also improve data quality and our goal is to transition away from inquiries altogether in coming years.

On our school report cards in district and from my understanding with others, there are a large number of schools who are showing a deficit in the achievement gap for reading and math scores. Can you explain how the gap scores are calculated? I am interested to know what needs to be done to address this area and how districts are affected differently in this area.
The closing gaps calculation looks at three- to five-year trends in performance for any subgroup in the school or district that has at least 20 students. It compares each of those trends to students not in that group at the state level. Then, it looks at the differences in those two trend lines, with the goal being for the trend of the target group in the school or district to be closing in on the trend of the comparison state group.

The trends are based upon the same points-based proficiency rates that are used in the achievement calculations. In short, instead of a straight percentage of proficient or advanced, points-based proficiency awards points in the following manner: 0 points for below basic; .5 point for basic; 1 point for proficient; 1.5 points for advanced. You can see this on the supplemental data pages of the report card.

The closing gaps calculations are designed to work across different assessments, but it must be noted that having three different general education assessments across three years for grades 3-8 is not ideal. Having more years of consistency in assessment will be good.

What impact does your school's overall EcD % have on your report card score? Specifically, how is your score affected if your EcD % significantly changes from year to the next?
The percentage of economically disadvantaged (ECD) students in a school plays out several ways in the report cards. First, the percentage impacts value-added calculations, which control for demographic characteristics including poverty. Second, if you have at least 20 full academic year ECD students with test results in your school, they would be part of the closing gaps calculation, impacting that score. Third, if you have at least 20 ECD students enrolled, they are included in test participation calculations. Finally, if you have both achievement and growth scores, the percent of ECD students in the school determines the weighting of each of those priority areas relative to one another. This variable weighting could impact your overall score, particularly if your ECD rate is above 35%, at which point the growth score is weighted more than the achievement score.

I am assuming this will be covered, but I am very curious to know how the academic components are figured.
I'm not quite sure what's meant here; are you looking for a description of each of the priority areas? I'm happy to cover this in the webinar (or Mary Ann will), but I also suggest a quick review of the interpretive guide or any of the priority area pages in the report cards, which provide an overview of each of the calculations.

I was told the absenteeism rate was actually 2014-15 data. Is this true? In the future will that absenteeism rate data always be a year behind? Why would we include that for a 2015-16 report card?
Attendance/absenteeism, and graduation rate data have always lagged by one year. This is because your districts report this data to DPI the fall following the prior year; the data aren't available for report cards that come out in September/October. This is also true in WISEdash.
The transition to WISEdata may make it possible for attendance no longer to lag, but DPI cannot collect graduation data until the beginning of the following school year because students have until the end of the summer to graduate, so I expect that indicator to continue to lag by a year in report cards.

How were school leaders notified ahead of time that sub groups would be given a 5-point deduction if 95% participation was not met? What is the minimum number of students that constitute a subgroup that could receive a 5-point reduction for participation and how was that communicated to schools ahead of time? Why is there a full 5-point deduction for these sub groups when 95% subgroup participation can hinge on less than a handful of students out of 200 + students in a class not testing, especially considering only 2 days are provided for testing and 4 of the students could be habitually truant/runaways? It is completely reasonable and fair that a 5-point reduction would be assessed to a school for not meeting the 95% participation rate across the entire junior group. It is also fair that a school would be marked down for one of these subgroups not meeting appropriate growth measurements, which is already reflected in the report card. Our overall participation was above 98%. Thank you for providing this opportunity to ask questions.
The test participation deduction has been in place since 2011-12 report cards; no aspect of the test participation calculation has changed since the last time we produced report cards in 2013-14.

We calculate test participation for all students and each subgroup that has at least 20 students. We calculate the rate using just the current year of data and using three years of test participation data. A school or subgroup must miss the target with *both* calculations before we would apply a deduction. Again, this has not changed since prior report cards.

Please note that non-tested students are not included in any achievement-based calculations. In other words, they do not count against any of your priority area scores. They are completely removed from those calculations and only count in test participation.

The test participation requirement in federal law has been in place since the 2002 NCLB reauthorization of ESEA. Wisconsin has a particular challenge because federal law requires 100% participation (we set a target of 95% to account for year-to-year fluctuation) while state law allows parents to opt their child(ren) out of state tests. We account for these two laws in the manner I articulated above, by counting non-tested students in test participation calculations (i.e., basing that calculating on federal law) and not including non-tested students in any achievement calculations (i.e., basing those calculations on state law). It is important from both equity and data accuracy standpoints that all students have an opportunity to participate in the state tests. When we don't have data for all students we can't understand and close achievement gaps and our ability to accurately summarize school performance in the report cards is hindered. OEA has done analyses where we randomly remove students from report card calculations and when we remove more than 5% of students already 14% of schools would receive a different overall report card rating than if all students were included in the calculations. Again, this is a data validity issue as well as an equity issue.